

**ACME TOWNSHIP  
M-72 CORRIDOR ORDINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Acme Township Hall**

**9:00 a.m. Monday, February 18, 2004**

**Meeting called to Order at 9:10 a.m.**

**Members Present:** H. Smith, Chair, D. Krause, P. Salathiel

**Members Excused:** D. Hoxsie

**Staff Present:** S. Corpe, Office & Planning Coordinator/Recording Secretary

B. Kaye, Gourdie Fraser, Planning Consultant

The purpose of today's meeting is for the M-72 Corridor Ordinance Subcommittee of the Planning Commission to discuss the second draft of the proposed new Ordinance drafted by Brad Kaye, Gourdie Fraser. Smith stated that the Township Board retained Gourdie Fraser to work on this project on a contract bid basis. The meeting has been posted as open to the public because a quorum of the Planning Commission is serving on the committee. A public hearing will be held before the full Commission to allow public comment at a later date.

Smith mentioned that he and Corpe attended a County Planning Meeting yesterday. They are inviting all townships to come and inform them about key events and issues in their jurisdictions. Corpe prepared a handout that seemed well-received.

Kaye led a review of the changes made to the ordinance draft since the last meeting. Key points included:

- Removal of the reference to wind energy conversion systems in Section 6.12.3, as they are not currently addressed elsewhere in the Ordinance. At such time that wind systems are permitted within the Ordinance, they may be added back as a prohibited use within the M-72 Corridor.
- Salathiel asked about whether or not water towers should be permitted. Krause suggested that perhaps rather than trying to determine a thorough list of possibly undesirable structures, it would be more efficient to place a height restriction on all structures. After some deliberation, it was determined that the subcommittee wished to impose a 40' height restriction within the entire corridor, and that within the corridor the supplemental height restrictions that allow buildings to be higher than normally allowed (i.e. trading additional setback space for increased height) shall not apply. The height restriction will apply to structures (water towers, silos, etc) as well as buildings (places for active human use)
- There was some discussion about how the new Ordinance might impact the Town Center, which currently has an approved development plan. It was agreed that while elements of the Town Center plan currently approved would be "grandfathered" to the existing regulations, any amendments or annexations to the town center would be expected to conform to any new regulations in effect.
- Discussion turned to parking requirements relative to setbacks from M-72 and to buildings and structures on the same property. The general parking ordinance does not permit parking in a front yard, which is defined as the area between the leading part of the

structure housing the primary property use and the right-of-way from which access to the property is gained. The goal seems to be to minimize the visual effects of parking to the maximum extent possible.

- The master landscape plan for the M-72 right-of-way buffer plan needs to be formally named. It will be developed as part of the Ordinance itself. Language will be inserted to clarify that standard lot line and parking area landscaping requirements will apply along with special requirements for the right-of-way buffer.
- There was discussion about the viewshed protection requirements. Looking at the M-72 Corridor study, Kaye felt that most of the identified views seem to be of fields and woodlands rather than the bay. It would be easier to protect these views than the bay views, which would be more key. Krause noted that for most bay views a person traveling the corridor will already be at a higher elevation and it will be naturally harder to block the view. The goal is to protect the key views without making use of the property overly restricted.
- In the section regarding utilities, the word “utilities” will be changed to “service lines” to draw a distinction between lower voltage lines coming in to serve each property from the higher voltage trunk lines that can’t be reasonably underground per Dave Langhorst, MDOT.
- Under the Driveway Width section, in item C the minimum width will be reduced per Mr. Langhorst’s suggestion, along with making the minimum size of a median dividing a driveway into ingress and egress lanes 10’ rather than this being a maximum size. A landscaping plan for such median shall also be required.
- Under shared driveways, point C will be amended as recommended by Mr. Langhorst to include the possibility of using a recorded shared driveway agreement instead of a formal easement when sharing driveways.
- Salathiel recommended that we require a service drive/private road maintenance agreement in this corridor.
- Kaye will review Section 7.2.10, Service Drives to ensure that it is entirely compatible with the new M-72 Corridor ordinance.
- Under 6.12.8(3) the determination of the level of costs reasonable to incur to bring redevelopment of an existing developed property into compliance with the new regulations shall be specified as being at the Planning Commission’s discretion.
- Kaye will double-check his definition to be added for “Wireless Communication Facilities” to ensure it matches up with our existing Wireless Facility Ordinance.
- Corpe noted that we will be deleting existing section 7.2.8, Supplemental Regulations - M-72 Corridor in entirety (for when we publish the hearings)
- There was much discussion about the fact that we are fairly certain that M-72 will be widened, and how can we design the ordinance to take into account the future widening for more immediate projects? It is important to get in touch with MDOT and/or reread the Access Management Survey to try to narrow down the current unknown of how much right-of-way widening may occur to at least a likelihood. This is important for establishing final minimum building, landscaping and service drive setback figures. If new information from MDOT is available, Corpe and Kaye will find out and try to incorporate it. If not, all currently discussed setback dimensions will be increased by 25’.
- Discussion turned to architectural standards for the district.
  - Krause has come to a conclusion that there needs to be distinct standards for different types of uses

- It may be more effective to make a list of what not to do than creating a lengthy dissertation on what to do.
- All subjective references to taste such as “up-north” or “character” should be eliminated.
- Salathiel provided printouts from the Chesterfield County, VA website relating to their architectural standards as a possible example.
- Each committee member will do some independent research and come up with some suggestions, which will be forwarded to the office. Staff will compile the suggestions and prepare a report that notes similarities and differences between each submission to hand out along with the original suggestions to facilitate further discussion.
- Krause suggesting asking the Board to hire Russ Clark to work on the corridor landscaping plan. He will write a proposal for Russ to review as far as scope of work so that Russ can in turn provide a cost estimate for the Board’s consideration.

The next subcommittee meeting was set for Thursday, February 26 at 9:00 a.m.

Architectural standards information is due to the office by the morning of Tuesday, February 24 so that staff can compile and assess and redistribute. Salathiel thought it might be nice to see what other local municipalities have in this regard; Corpe will ask Hull to make some phone calls.

**Public Comment**

Dave Amon, Township Supervisor congratulated the subcommittee for the work it is doing, which is both intensive and timely. He asked if the proposed ordinance has been reviewed by TC-TALUS. Corpe responded that MDOT has reviewed it but TC-TALUS has not to date. She will send both groups the next draft. He also suggested that the Chamber of Commerce review the document as well in the name of gaining as much broad-based support as possible. Smith noted that including all of the municipalities who come to the quarterly M-72 Corridor Task Force meeting would be nice as well.

Amon also asked if this subcommittee would be interested in involvement in any future discussions that may evolve regarding the US 31/M-72 Intersection. Right now the scope of the group is to set standards for development of properties fronting on M-72, but in the future township input will likely be sought when and if redesign of the intersection is sincerely discussed.

Amon feels it might be helpful to be sure to credit MDOT for any standards of theirs that are incorporated in the Ordinance and the date of those standards. His concern is that we stay current if MDOT requirements change over time, and also that we establish that the standards come from some objective place rather than having been created on whim and that we are working in coordination with other agencies.

There was some general discussion about our need to update our parking requirements.

**Meeting adjourned at 12:37 p.m.**