

**Village of Lexington
Planning Commission Regular Meeting
Via Zoom
February 1, 2021
7 PM**

Call to Order Regular Meeting: Mike Ziegler

Roll Call: Beth Grohman

Members: Ziegler Stencel McCombs Fulton
 Kaatz Picot Macksey Morris
 Huepenbecker

Approval of Agenda:

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of Regular Meeting January 4, 2021 Page 1-3

 Minutes of Special Meeting January 20, 2021 Page 4 -6

Public Comment: (3-minute limit)

Zoning Administrator's Report (There is nothing new to report)

Old Business

1. Discuss Design Guidelines
2. Discuss accessibility on state roads (M25 and M90)
3. Discuss public and private roads
4. Approve Revised Meeting Schedule Page 7

New Business

None

Public Comment: (3-minute limit)

Adjournment

To join the Zoom Meeting

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89474236750>

Passcode: 8631

To dial in call:

+1 646 558 8656

Meeting ID: 894 7423 6750

Passcode: 8631

FVILLAGE OF LEXINGTON
Planning Commission Regular Meeting
Via Zoom
January 7, 2021
7 p.m.

Regular Meeting called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairperson Mike Ziegler

Roll Call by Beth Grohman, Clerk

Present- Stencel, Fulton, Macksey, Picot, Morris, Huepenbecker, Ziegler

Absent – Kaatz, McCombs

Others Present –Holly Tatman, Chris Germain, and five citizens

Approval of Agenda: Motion by Macksey, seconded by Morris, to approve the agenda as presented.

All ayes

Motion carried

Approval of Minutes – Motion by Fulton, seconded by Picot, to approve the minutes of December 7, 2020 as presented.

All ayes

Motion carried

Public Comment –

None Offered

Kaatz joined the meeting at 7:09 pm.

Zoning Administrator Report – Tatman reported on land use permits for one LED sign (A&W), one pole barn, new mobile in the Maples, demolition of a house on Simon Street, land use application from Moore Public Library for expansion, 2 driveways in the mobile home park and three lot splits (Huron Avenue, Main Street, and Old Orchard Bluff).

She has had conversations with the new owner of the Noble Store. He plans a possible VRBO on the top floor and leasing the lower floor for retail.

Developers for Dollar General have inquired about the Ehardt property on M25. They have gone through our ordinance, and she has walked them through what they can and cannot do. They have not purchased the property. Typically, their buildings are kits with steel sheet walls on three sides of the building. However, our ordinance is tight and specifies the masonry or concrete that must be used if a building is in view of a main road or residential area, They would need to build to close to the sidewalk with parking in the rear. MDOT won't give them right-of-way to M-25, they would have to go through the entrance to Porter Apartments. They need to have a stormwater retention area.

They are trying to work within our ordinance and expectations.

McCombs joined the meeting at 7:15 pm.

Stencel raised concerns about the traffic situation on M25 because that would be a busy corner with the restaurant, Porter apartments, and the doctor's office. Tatman said the Village doesn't have much to guide them on that but they would need to work with the state and possibly the county. Stencel said he was concerned about stormwater retention and surface water was a positive thing for residents. Tatman said she would be happy to send out the site plan if anyone wanted to see it.

Ziegler said that Dollar General is willing to change the façade. In Port Sanilac, they were told they would need to be located in the brick building on the corner, which they did. McCombs added that Dollar General had a problem dealing with a façade issue on another piece of property so that is why they would up in a building that was already there. She asked if they had been spoken to about altering their usually building to meet our standards. Tatman said she was working with them on that and Ziegler said there are guidelines on exteriors and fencing in our ordinance.

McCombs said it is rather a broad brush, it's not very specific. Huepenbecker agreed and said that was one of the things we'll be working on. McCombs said she knew that was a major concern of the Planning Commission.

Tatman said she told the developers that we are going for a "small-town" feel. Our guidelines are much better now, but there is always room for improvement.

Motion by Morris, seconded by Stencel, to accept the Zoning Administrator's report.
Motion carried.

Old Business:

1. Discussion of the RRC- Chris Germain- Best Practice #3- Development Review Process –

He said the Village has done much work toward RRC and is in a good position with a new Master Plan, Zoning Ordinance, and Capital Improvement Plan in place. MEDC has three arms: Business Development, Pure Michigan (tourism and marketing), and Community Development.

They help create vibrant places for communities and streamline development process. At its core, RRC is a technical assistance program. They help the community establish a vision of what it wants to be, then help them to get there.

He stressed the importance of getting a development process in place so people/ developers know what to expect – predictability. He used a series of slides with examples to explain a streamlined review process and suggested a review team.

He recommended we not start from scratch, but use the resources in the MiPlace RRC library. He also suggested using the Trello program to help organize our projects.

Fulton said that he and Picot are working on the Development Review Process and asked if anyone has questions or input to contact one of them.

2. Discussion of the Implementation of Master Plan

Fulton has taken a leadership role on this and he and Tatman will meet this week. Holly and Mike will meet on this later in the week. Kaatz stressed the importance of coordination and communication with the various committees.

New Business:

1. Election of Officers

Chairperson – Nomination for Mike Ziegler for chairperson was made by Macksey and supported by McCombs. Ziegler asked if there were other nominations. Hearing none, he moved that nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot be cast for Mike Ziegler for chairperson. All ayes. Motion carried.

Vice-chairperson – Nomination for Will Morris for vice-chairperson was made by Macksey and supported by Ziegler. Huepenbecker moved that nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot cast for Morris for vice-chairperson. All ayes. Motion carried.

Secretary – Nomination for Huepenbecker for secretary was made by McCombs and supported by Macksey. Ziegler moved that nominations be closed and a unanimous ballot cast for Huepenbecker for secretary. All ayes. Motion carried.

2. Set schedule of meetings 2021 – Motion by Huepenbecker, supported by Ziegler to approve the schedule as corrected. All ayes. Motion carried.

Public Comment –

Dina Wurmlinger – Commented that she is surprised to just be learning about the Dollar General when it hadn't been discussed at any Planning Commission for the past three months and that the Dollar General did not have a small-town feel.

Kathleen Parraghi – Commented that she is surprised about the Dollar General with the location already picked out and this is the first she's hearing about it. She is concerned about the area with the large delivery trucks.

Kaatz confirmed with Tatman that the Village did not seek out Dollar General; they approached her about the property. Kaatz said she heard about the inquiry about three weeks ago, and to her knowledge, they have not purchased the property. The Village can't forbid someone to purchase here as long as they fall within the category of the zoning in that area.

Tatman said that any developer can inquire about property in the Village. We do not control the purchase of private property; we provide information.

Adjournment - Motion by Huepenbecker, seconded by McCombs to adjourn at 8:06 p.m. All ayes. Motion carried.

Beth Grohman
Village Clerk

VILLAGE OF LEXINGTON
Planning Commission Special Meeting
Via Zoom
January 20, 2021
7 p.m.

Regular Meeting called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairperson Mike Ziegler
Roll Call by Beth Grohman, Clerk
Present- Stencel, Picot, McCombs, Morris, Fulton, Huepenbecker, Ziegler,
Absent – Kaatz, Macksey
Others Present –Holly Tatman, and 10 citizens

Approval of Agenda: Motion by Huepenbecker, seconded by McCombs, to approve the agenda as presented.

All ayes
Motion carried

Public Comment –
None Offered

Old Business:

New Business:

1. Discuss Corridor Mixed Use- Design Guidelines, right-sizing, access, and dealing with double zoned lots-

Huepenbecker reviewed the questions and answers that Adam Young (Wade Trim Planning consultant) gave to the Planning Commission.

Interpretation of Intent of C-MU.

In general, the PC does not need to be too caught up in interpreting the intent statement and what it specifically means by “small-scale pedestrian-oriented retail.” The C-MU zoning ordinance provisions, when applied, work to ensure that any retail use – whether it is a big box store or a mom and pop store – feels small scale and is pedestrian-oriented. These zoning ordinance provisions relate to building design, building and site layout, frontage standards, pedestrian/bicycle amenities, landscaping and screening. These key C-MU District provisions are found in Sections 4.8.5 (Siting and Building Requirements), 4.8.8 (Definitions and Rules pertaining to Siting and Building Requirements), 5.6.4 (Building Design) and 6.2 (Landscaping) of the zoning ordinance.

Size of mall-Scale Retail.

In general, the PC does not need to establish a size limitation on retail buildings. Again, the C-MU zoning ordinance provisions, when applied, work to ensure that any retail use – whether it is large or small – feels small scale and is pedestrian-oriented. See previous response.

Specificity in Architectural Design and Materials.

Lexington’s building design provisions, found in Section 5.6.4 of the ordinance, seem clear and strong enough to achieve higher quality building design. However, the

regulations will still allow for architectural creativity on the part of the owner. If the Village would like to be more specific about its optimum architectural character or a unified Village design scheme, consider developing a stand-alone design guidelines document.

MDOT and Access Management to State Roads.

MDOT has jurisdiction over M-25 and M-90 and would need to review and approve any proposed driveways. The typical approach is that a developer would need to seek feedback from MDOT up-front so they know how MDOT's rules will affect their project design.

Reaching out to MDOT to better understand their access management standards was a good idea. The two "primary roads" in the Village are both under MDOT jurisdiction. The Village can consider adopting its own access management standards, but given MDOT's present jurisdiction, it may not be as critical to do so. However, it is always good to engage in these types of discussions and a corridor study may be a potential project to tackle down the road.

Dealing with double-zoned Lots.

If a property is split-zoned, any development on that property could only occur on that portion of the property where the use is allowed. For example, if the property is split zoned industrial and residential, a proposed industrial use, as well as any accessory facilities that are needed to support that industrial use (i.e., parking areas, storm water detention facilities), could only occur on that portion of the lot that is zoned industrial. If that proposed industrial use needs to extend into the portion of the property zoned residential, a rezoning would first need to be secured.

Defining pedestrian-friendly.

In a sense, your specific C-MU District requirements relating to building placement along the street, sidewalks, dooryards, pedestrian amenities, etc., work together and serve as your definition.

60 Day Moratorium on C-MU

A moratorium could be considered with consultation from your Village attorney. However, the Village is well positioned with a new master plan and newly adopted ordinance requirements. Trust and rely on your ordinance requirement to produce good development that fits the character of the Village. Down the road, after the new regulations have been "tested" by new development, you may find that some "tweaks" are necessary. That is very common with a new zoning ordinance.

Greenbelt in north Corridor-Mixed Use

Your zoning ordinance does require "greenbelts" along the road frontage. Within the C-MU District, buildings are required to be placed 15 feet from the front property line. This area (the "dooryard") is intended as a transitional area between the public realm and private property for pedestrian-oriented amenities (see Section 4.8.8,(5) of the ordinance). Further, a minimum 15-foot parking lot setback is outlined in the C-MU

District. Further to the north, the Industrial Mixed Use (I-MU) District requires a minimum 50-foot front greenbelt area (see Section 6.2.6 of the ordinance).

Depth of Fenestration

A minimum viewing distance (in to the interior of the building for a depth of at least 12 feet) is stipulated for the CBD District but not the C-MU District. This may be a provision that you consider for the C-MU District down the road. For now, the specific and general fenestration standards of Sections 4.8.5 and 4.8.8,(7) will put the Village in a good position to ensure that the intent of the ordinance is met for any proposed development.

Parking Restrictions

The prescriptive building placement standards of the C-MU District will be a key determinant for where the off-street parking lot can be located. For example, the C-MU building placement standards require the buildings to be along the road frontage (see Section 4.8.5); thus, the parking lot would have to be located in the side or rear. Beyond that, the C-MU district does require a minimum 15-foot front yard parking lot setback. One final note is that for any parking lot that is visible from a public road, Section 6.2.5,(2),(b) requires a solid wall at least 3 feet in height to be constructed along the perimeter to screen it from the road.

Tatman – Comments from Adam Young – Great idea to look at design guidelines put something in place that the Village may feel comfortable elaborating on it. One thing empathized that the Planning Commission spent a year and half working zoning ordinances that are very good and strong. Trust in the ordinance and trust in the process. If the Planning wants to set guidelines to keep the downtown charm it may be something to look into.

Picot reminded members of Tatman's comment at the previous meeting that the Planning Commission isn't about choosing which business come to the Village, rather about ensuring that they abide by the ordinance.

Public Comment –

Dina Wurmlinger – Asked for a copy of the questions and answers presented.

Ed Jarosz – Commented M25-M-90 and further development, concerns on design guidelines, and enforcement of zoning ordinances.

Adjournment - Motion by Picot, seconded by Morris, to adjourn at 7:44 p.m.

All Ayes

Motion Carried

Beth Grohman
Village Clerk

(I messed up several of the dates on the schedule we approved. – J. Huepenbecker)

**Planning Commission
Revised Regular Meeting Schedule for 2021**

Monday January 4, 2021

Monday February 1, 2021

Monday March 1, 2021

Monday April 12, 2021(second Monday)

(Easter is April 4; suggest postponing it a week)

Monday May 3, 2021

Monday June 7, 2021

Monday July 5, 2021

Monday August 2, 2021

Monday September 13, 2021 (second Monday)

(Labor Day is Sept. 6, suggest postponing meeting a week)

Monday October 4, 2021

Monday November 8, 2021 (second Monday)

(The Election is Nov. 2, suggest postponing meeting a week)

Monday December 6, 2021