

**UNAPPROVED
MINUTES****Present:** Dykstra, Keppel, Larabel, Shaarda, Webster, Woltjer**Absent w/ notice:** DeHaan w/ notice**Innovation:** Shaarda**Planner:** Ransford: gregory.ransford@gmail.com, phone 638-1240**Approval of Minutes** Shaarda/Webster made motion to approve the minutes of 4/17/12 as presented. Carried**Approve the Agenda:** Dykstra/Keppel made a motion to approve the agenda as written. Carried**Public Comment:** (Limited to 3 Minutes)

None

New Business **Craig Scholten 2855 8th Avenue Accessory Building in Front Yard**

Planner The applicant request approval per Section 3.2F to replace an existing cattle shed that is 12' by 20 '. He purchased the property with this existing shed and has the intent to use the new barn in a similar way. I have sent the PC an updated revision which shows a slightly different location. It will be built in the south pasture and at that location will take up less pasture utilizing non-prime ag land.

C. Scholten I reviewed the new location with PCI and they are in agreement with the second location. I am raising black angus for personal use. We are aware of our neighbors desires and this seems to be the best place for it.

Motion to Open the Public Hearing Shaarda/Webster made a motion to open the public hearing. Carried

R. Koroleski Craig is a good neighbor and I see no reason not to allow him to build his barn.

Motion to Close the Public Hearing Webster/ Woltjer made a motion to close the public hearing. Carried

Motion to approve/ or deny Dykstra/Keppel made a motion to approve the construction of an accessory building for agriculture in the front yard per Sec. 3.2F due to the following:
 1) distance from the road right of way is approximately 600'.
 2) no objections heard from neighbors
 3) the building would be used for personal agricultural use only with no commercial use.

Carried

Proposed Text Amendments - Chapter 8 R-2 Residential Zoning District

Planner Greg stated that a recent request to the Zoning administrator for a multi-family unit in a R-2 district had initiated a review of the township zoning language. Greg reviewed a memorandum dated 4/28/2012 where the Zoning administrator noted that in the R-2 district there is no minimum language for the width and lot size of two-family dwellings. A review also indicates that 4 units are permitted as well as a special use within the District, however this language also excludes a minimum lot size and width for said use. Included in this memo is a surrounding township comparison as a guideline for establishing Jamestown zoning language.

C. Webster So we determine what would be appropriate for our R-2 district, no other districts?

Planner There are no duplex's allowed in the R-1, so yes this is just to correct the lack of language in our R-2 districts.

T. Labarbel In R-2 I would suggest a middle ground were we have 100 for duplex and 125 for a 3 unit, etc. Are you suggesting that this is just for duplex's per the second to the last paragraph?

Planner I am comfortable with changing the language to identify that a minimum lot width of 120 feet and minimum lot area of 25,000 square feet is appropriate. In single residence these lots are larger, however they may get rolled into a PD which ultimately defines the area.

PC Discussion After discussion, the PC agreed to the following Lot Width and Lot Area for Jamestown Township R-2 zoning for multiple unit housing.

Use	Lot Width	Lot Area
Duplex, R-2 district	120	25,000
3 Unit, R-2 district	125	30,000
4 Unit, R-2 district	150	30,000

The language for a single family dwelling in an R-2 district would be a minimum lot width of 120 feet and a minimum lot area of 25,000 square feet.

Master Plan

Review of a Possible Chapter for Forest Grove.

Planner This would be very similar to the Jamestown chapter with slight revisions that would incorporate the character and tone of this bedroom community which has limited commercial activity, no public utilities and who's purpose is primarily residential.

Woltjer Forest Grove is a long way down the road and I see no real need for a separate zoning district at this time.

PC Discussion The PC are in agreement that there may not be a need for a Forest Grove Chapter in the Master Plan at this time. Members agreed to review the language for

a month and bring to the next meeting suggestions or possible language that would be a more appropriate fit for this residential area.

Old Business **NONE**

Extended Public Comments Regarding Agenda Items Only (Limited to 3 minutes)

R. Koroleski I like what Ted said that government is getting into much in our lives. We should not
2967 8th Ave. be imposing on people. Do we really need to impose the master plan on Forest
Grove people in an area that has been unchanged for many years.

PC Discussion Reviewed and discussed the road improvement plans for the coming year
and reviewed our motion of request to the Township board.

Motion to Adjourn Shaarda/Woltjer made a motion to adjourn at 8:03 PM. Carried

Minutes submitted by Norma Shaarda, Sec.