Peitz called the Bedford Township Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. The Pledge of Allegiance was said. Schneider called the roll. Quorum present.

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

Motion by Goebel, supported by Schneider, to approve the agenda. Motion carried.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Motion by Welling, supported by Goebel, to approve the minutes of July 22, 2009. Motion carried.

**PUBLIC COMMENT (LIMIT 3 MINUTES)**

None.

**NEW BUSINESS**

A) **OPEN PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE ST. GERMAIN REZONING FROM R-2A, SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL, TO PBO, PROFESSIONAL BUSINESS OFFICE ON PARCEL NUMBER 5802-031-091-00, 6801 SECOR RD.**

Jenkins reviewed the site analysis.

Frank St. Germain, 3184 Edgevale Dr., Lambertville, MI 48144, explained the history behind the parcel and his difficulty in marketing the property with a residential zoning. Mr. St.Germain felt that since the adjacent property was rezoned to PBO and surrounds his property on two sides that his request is consistent with the surrounding area.
Peitz informed the applicant that the commission was one member short, offering the option to defer to a later meeting when all members could be present. Mr. St. Germain opted to proceed as scheduled.

Goebel asked for clarification on the size of the parcel. Mr. St. Germain stated that the parcel has 200 feet of frontage and is .99 acres in size.

**Motion by Goebel, seconded by Schneider, to open the public hearing at 7:10 p.m.**


There was no public comment.

**Motion by Bourque, seconded by Schneider, to close the public hearing at 7:11 p.m.**


Bassinger asked Jenkins if the property would be non-conforming if the zoning change were approved. Jenkins explained that someone could occupy the building as it currently exists provided that no changes to the site are required. If additional parking or building is needed then a formal site plan would be required.

Welling was not clear on the existing parking. Jenkins explained that the site was reviewed when the day care was approved and there is adequate parking for that use. Any new use would require a separate review.

Bourque asked if the vacancy of the building meant that it lost its non-conforming status. Jenkins explained that the day care was a permitted use in residential.

Schneider added that she didn’t feel that the change was significant and would square off the surrounding PBO.

**Motion by Schneider, seconded by Bourque, to recommend approval of the St. Germain rezoning from R-2A, Single Family, to PBO Professional Business Office on parcel number 58-02-031-091-00, 6801 Secor Road for the reason that it is compatible with the surrounding PBO zoning and the infrastructure is suitable for the zoning.**


**OLD BUSINESS**

A) **SECOND DISCUSSION REGARDING A PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE FENCE ORDINANCE AND RECREATIONAL VEHICLE STORAGE ORDINANCE**
Jenkins asked Mr. Tucker to review the background on the amendment and the changes that have occurred since the previous discussion. Mr. Tucker reviewed the new language and said the previous discussion centered around temporary fences and the problems we have been having with residents erecting snow fences that became permanent. Language was amended to include language that gave the ordinance department the ability to regulate these temporary fences. Changes were made to clarify the issue of safety fences. Mr. Tucker indicated that the language was changed to distinguish fences used for safety barriers from permanent fences. Mr. Tucker also explained the language regulating when the temporary snow type fencing could be installed.

Peitz suggested that the safety fence section should be taken out of section J and given its own section K. Marty Kamprath, township attorney agreed that it should be separate for clarity. Kamprath questioned the difference between a temporary fence and a permanent fence since they are both required to comply with the fence ordinance. Mr. Tucker explained that the materials and construction methods distinguish the two.

Tucker proceeded to read the proposed amendment regulating recreational vehicles. The first issue dealt with the definition of recreational vehicles, which is now defined as vehicles that are towed or driven to a destination and used as sleeping quarters. The current ordinance allows recreational vehicles to be parked behind the front building line of the home. The issue for the ordinance department has been complaints that RV’s are being parked in the front of dwellings for extended periods of time prompting complaints from neighbors.

In order to allow limited parking in the front of the dwelling a time frame has been proposed to allow parking in front for no more than 48 consecutive hours with a cumulative total of 14 days in any one year.

A change is also being proposed to the Construction of Languages to include a new definition of recreational vehicles to include boats, trailers, personal watercraft, etc.

Schneider questioned the duration of allowed parking and how it would be monitored. Tucker explained that our ordinance department would monitor through observation and citizen complaint. Goebel questioned the language that would allow an RV owner to park in front for 48 hours, move it for an hour thereby qualifying for an additional 48 hours. It was agreed that Mr. Tucker and Mr. Kamprath would work together to draft suitable language to clarify the issue.

Bourque asked how far from the neighboring property a parked RV could be. Tucker explained that a driveway could be located up to the property line.

PUBLIC COMMENTS –

None.

INFORMATION –

None
COMMISSION/STAFF COMMENT –

None.

ADJOURNMENT –

The meeting duly adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis Jenkins,
Recording Secretary