

GOLDEN TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES  
JANUARY 15, 2003

7:30 PM Meeting called to order.

PRESENT: Avery Wilson, Bill Kolenda, Terry Wiegand, Brad Whitney, Anita Foster, Helen Lefler, Steve Marciniak.

ABSENT: Carl Fuehring, Leo Terryn

Minutes of the November 26, 2002 meeting are not available at this time.

Bill, Terry, and Brad were welcomed as new additional members to the PC.

**Workshop for Open Space Development-**

These provisions provide for the developer at their choice to cluster homes on smaller lots and permanently provide open space. We previously reviewed Marion and Hamburg Townships OSD plan. It became apparent to us in our discussions that several options might be available to us, in addition to the Land Division option. With each option there would be incentives to encourage the developer to select that option. The law requires that The OSD apply to land zoned for residential development and requires it to be applied to situations where three or less residences per acre are contemplated. In Golden Township we're required to have the AG and low density residential zones covered with the OSD. It might be to our advantage to also consider the R/R zone. Lot sizes in that zone are more dense per acre, but we have a lot of large size parcels in that zone. Tonight we are discussing the option and the incentives available. Incentives could be that unbuildable lands, such as wetlands, steep slopes, flood plains may not count toward 50% open space minimum as contemplated by the State law. State law also requires that a developer submit two plans. the first one would be a viable plan under the Land Division Act and the second plan would be an alternate plan with an established number of parcels that could be developed on the OSD.

Helen would like committee input with options and incentives. The Marion Townships option has the Land Division Act, etc. do we want that to be our guide? It also allows bonus' for the developer for lot densities and preserving larger parcels than the 50%.

Jake commented that we need to decide the lot sizes. The developer will want to get the maximum. The ZO supercedes the Land Division Act.

Helen feels that the Land Division Act could be our guide.

Steve wondered if in the Ag zone should we have 5 acres?

Dan Suman commented that 12,00 square feet is small. The trend for developers is to have neighborhood lots where the lots are small and in a wagon wheel shape with a green

a common area in the center.

Jake comment that 15,000 square feet is about a third of an acre. In a concentrated development how small a parcel do we want to go?

Terry asked if we could set a five acre minimum, but allow smaller parcel as an incentive?

Jake said it is a possibility, but we would have to change the sizes in the zone. The Township Zoning Act says that you can write whatever reasonable regulations that will apply to your community.

Helen remarked that the ZO can make lots larger or smaller For purposes of the OSD Act, instead of using the Land Division Act numbers as a baseline, we can set our own. This puts a new light on our previous discussion.

Brad likes the idea for encouraging developers.

Terry feels that the 12,000 square feet is too small a lot size. If we have the ability to enlarge that, then we could save ourselves a lot on variance, etc.

Dan Suman asked about the common element, is that part of the Open Space? He also agrees with Terry on 15,000 square feet.

Dave Roseman commented that in the Master Plan sounds like it is pushing towards 1/3 acre.

Dan commented that regarding the well and septic as a developer, what the State requires is way too costly. PUD has more flexibility for the developer and more control for the PC.

Helen said the lot size is a good incentive, common elements, roads are also good incentives.

Dave Roseman asked if you can get 4 divisions on the Land Division Act, does that mean four building sites? He doesn't see any need to go with smaller lot sizes.

Helen informed him that the smaller lots were for Residential zones.

Jake explained that if it is done as a and Division they can get four lots, but as a site condo, we need to know what size lot.

Helen said that AG and low density as a base line for incentives we could change the minimum lot size from 2 acres to 5 acres. We need different sizes for different zones: Active Ag= 5 acres, non-Active Ag=?, R/R= one acre minimum. It might attract developers to that area.

Terry asked what determines a non-active Ag?

Helen informed him that the useability and use makes the determination. We need incentives and acreage for each zone and the next meeting. Would types of housing be an incentive? Dan said yes- multiple housing.

Dave Roseman asked what is the advantage to the community to offer incentives. His biggest concern is with the density and water and sewer.

Helen said that it would avoid the sprawl look, and there is less density with Open Space. The ground water is already strained. We do not want to attract development to the Active AG. Low density Ag will take up about half of the Township.

Terry told that he has seen a complete hydrology map of Oceana County.

Next meeting will be Tuesday, January 28, 2003.

Meeting Adjourned at 9 PM.