

**REGULAR MEETING OF
CASCO TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
May 9, 2018, 7 PM – 9 PM**

Members Present: Vice Chairman David Campbell, Lewis Adamson, Dan Fleming, Judy Graff and Dave Hughes

Absent: Greg Knisley and Chairperson Dian Liepe

Staff Present: Janet Chambers, Recording Secretary

Also Present: Supervisor Overhiser and approximately 6 interested citizens

In Chairperson Liepe's absence, the meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Campbell at 7 PM. Campbell said Zoning Enforcement Officer Ellingsen was unable to attend.

A motion by Graff, supported by Fleming to approve minutes of the regular April 9, 2018 meeting. All in favor. Minutes approved with the following correction on pages 3 and 4, 2nd paragraph of #8:

Graff said, in preparing for tonight's meeting, she noticed in the non-conforming Section 3.28, has a discrepancy between the website copy, dated 2014, and copies printed June of last year. The changes are not listed in the change log. This needs to be discussed at the next meeting. The following is 3.28 ~~G & H~~ **A Intent, #1 & #2** referred to by Graff:

Words in bold were not in the 2014 version but were added to the 2016 version. Stricken words were in 2014 version, but not in 2016 version.

SECTION 3.28 NONCONFORMING LOTS, USES OR STRUCTURES

A. Intent

1. Within the zoning districts established by this Ordinance, or any subsequent amendments thereto, there exist lots, structures, uses of land and structures, and characteristics of use which were lawful before this Ordinance was passed or amended but which would be prohibited, regulated, or restricted under the terms of this Ordinance or future amendment. It is the intent of this Ordinance to permit these nonconformities to continue until they are removed but not to encourage their expansion or continuation, **except in compliance with this Section.**

2. Nonconforming uses are declared by this Ordinance to be incompatible with permitted uses in the zoning districts involved. A nonconforming use of land or a nonconforming use of structure and land in combination shall not be extended or enlarged after passage of this Ordinance ~~by attachment on a building or premises of additional signs intended to be seen from off the premises, or by the addition of other uses of a nature which would be prohibited generally in the zoning district involved.~~ **or an amendment to this Ordinance except in compliance with this Section.**

A motion by Graff, supported by Fleming to approve minutes of April 11, 2018 Regular meeting with the addition of a letter from Daron Massey added as an attachment. All in favor. Minutes approved.

Trustee Graff gave a report on the last Board meeting including the following topics:

- The new phone system has been installed.
- There will be a 911 millage on the ballot.

Approved 6/6/18

- There has been a referendum request filed on the STR Zoning Amendment. 144 signatures were required to get STR amendment on the ballot. There were 271 signatures and it will be on the August 7th ballot.
- The board is holding off on a fireworks amendment.
- The board approved the Special Event Venue ordinance amendment.
- The board did not approve the height restriction amendment and asked the PC to list reasons for the amendment.

Hughes gave a report on the ZBA. There will be a ZBA meeting on two variance requests on May 24, 2017.

Adamson gave a report on Water & Sewer. There were 18 new connections. SHAWSA should have their first meeting July 1, 2018.

Campbell asked what season was best for new hookups. Adamson said mostly fall or spring. Many people try to button up construction before winter.

Campbell said Ellingsen had 56 building permits combined in the 3 townships he works at. Adamson said that would be 5 new homes in Casco.

Graff shared an article from the Palladium (attachment #1). The article was about a moratorium on new STRs in South Haven. Residents have complained that South Haven is becoming too much a tourist town and not enough opportunity for locals.

Campbell talked with Ellingsen prior to the meeting with the following updates: Ellingsen met with two individuals interested in Special Event Venues. Two of three expressing interest in Special Event Venues are moving forward.

Ellingsen said the PC could expect an application for another B&B on Blue Star in the big farm house at the entrance of Glenn Haven Shores.

The development in the old golf course is still in discussion. The discussion is for a large planned community with open spaces. Campbell questioned Ellingsen about the possibility of the development in the old golf course hooking up to water and sewer. Water and sewer pipes run right by the golf course. Campbell asked if there should be dialogue with the developers about water and sewer. Adamson said if they are 250' or more back from the water and sewer they are not required to hook up. Campbell said this would leave 100 yards worth of water and sewer lines unused. Ellingsen did not think, at this time, the developer has planned to hook up. Graff said if the development is a PUD, everything is totally negotiable. Campbell said he would not like to lose the opportunity to add hookups. Adamson said if the health department approves well and septic, he did not see how they could be forced to hook up. Supervisor Overhiser said he did not know how the land would perk. Hughes added, they may want sewer and water.

Vice Chair Campbell referred to a letter from Supervisor Overhiser (attachment #2) concerning his reasons for asking the PC to revisit the zoning amendment on height restrictions. Graff said the board would like a list of reasons they feel the height restriction change should be made.

Campbell reflected on several relevant points he made at the public hearing. Campbell said Chairperson Liepe asked the PC if there were any objections. There were none. Campbell said regarding the individual who felt he was being targeted, we have made an attempt for balance. To protect those owners who have built by the then guidelines, which have been increased by 10%. We must set a standard. On the other hand, if someone buys 30 lots, they should be able to build the house they want. The bottom line is we must protect historically platted subdivisions.

Prior to tonight's meeting, Campbell went back to the MP and map of historically platted small lot developments. He said it is his understanding that the height restriction amendment would only apply to the historically platted subdivisions. Campbell read from the Master Plan on pages 9 & 10 Historically Platted Small Lots:

HISTORICALLY PLATTED SMALL LOTS

An existing condition that significantly influences the future direction of portions of the Township is the presence of pre-existing platted subdivisions that fail to meet even the most liberal standards for conventional development. Many of the lots within these older plats are unacceptably narrow, making development congested and potentially hazardous for the residents. Several issues arise as a result of these plats. Among them are the ability to build on those lots that are currently undeveloped; the potential density if all lots are developed; compatibility of such development with surrounding land uses; the ability to replace existing homes with new and larger ones; health concerns due to the lack of public sewer; and safety concerns related to fire protection.

While such projects would not be permitted under current land use regulations, their presence must be recognized and the use of those lots must be accommodated to a reasonable extent.

Campbell said the Planning Commission reviewed this, looked at old minutes, and specifically left this in the Master Plan. It is not a one size fits all for the whole Lakeshore. Graff added the height amendment was only directed to non-conforming small lots. Campbell said north of 107th there are no fire hydrants, and this would be a legitimate concern.

Graff said a key point is the height amendment would not prohibit anyone from building on their property. In previous discussion they talked about the importance of having a neighborhood and staying a neighborhood.

Fleming referred to a comment he made at the last meeting from the minutes, page 5, 8th paragraph: "Campbell said if they want to come in and build, they should be prepared to buy the lots. There must be some reasonable standards. Bottom line, there is a reasonable test in everything".

Hughes added, if all available lots were developed, you are going to have quite significant density levels.

Fleming said we should be prepared to quantify suffering of what we have taken away and compensate. Fleming said he agreed with Valerie Baas, the smaller houses look better, but he doesn't see how we can take away their rights without a good reason.

Graff said there are two sides to every story. You must consider the neighbor next door. What are we taking away from them? We forget about them and look at the new kid on the block. We talk about compensation, we must talk about the neighbors. We have to look at both sides, or all 3 sides if there is a neighbor on each side.

Fleming said he would not choose to live close to someone else's property, even if it is wooded. If it belongs to someone else, it might get developed. Property is property. If you take away from one, how do you balance it. We need to quantify suffering on both sides.

Campbell said this is not something we can do in this group. We are talking about Historically Platted lots. The proposal we have put on the table is a reasonable compromise. We are not saying they cannot build, just that they need to be reasonable.

Campbell presented the PC with copies of a chart (attachment #3) from the previous Zoning Ordinance that summarized, lot size, setbacks, building heights and maximum number of stories. In all districts except industrial the maximum building height was 35'. The maximum number of stories was 2 ½. Campbell said the chart was an easy way to show height limitations in a clear, easy to understand chart.

Approved 6/6/18

The chart was left out because the PC said it was difficult to maintain if changes were made, and the chart was redundant because the same information was given in text of the Zoning Ordinance.

Adamson asked why the PC is changing what already exists. Campbell stated we are changing it because of these pictures (Campbell held up a picture of very tall 3 story houses – attachment #4). Because the information from the chart was already highlighted under various districts, and they could not decide who would maintain the chart, it was left out.

Discussion continued the definition of a story and half story (page 22 of definitions), Average Grade (page 3 of definitions) and Building Height (page 4 of definitions).

Fleming suggested asking Ellingsen how he connects the dots. Campbell said the PC ought to be able to do this as a group. There have been letters from the public saying they could not put in a basement because of the water table.

Campbell stated the 2 ½ story maximum has always been there. Fleming said if this is true, there is no reason to change it. Campbell added, if we go by the chart, it applies to all districts.

Graff stated this is not what the current zoning ordinance says. Campbell said the way he understands the chart, it would be the “lesser of”. Graff agreed, the chart says the maximum height of 35’ and maximum stories of 2 ½ both apply.

Adamson said the chart seems clear.

Fleming said this is something the building inspector is going to have to answer.

Campbell said it has been working fine until last 2 or 3 years. If the chart applies, we do not even need to change it.

Campbell asked, in reading the letter from Overhiser, how does it hinder the ability to develop? It is clearly a money issue.

Graff said it is the PC’s job to come up with responsible, reasonable balanced land use. The PC’s concern is only land use. Her decisions have never been based on financial decisions.

Adamson said everything should be considered including the financial implications.

Fleming said all we can do is recommend to board and board they can pass it or not. We can only suggest.

Hughes said the board asked the PC to reconsider. The letter is pretty strong in terms of the financial issue. The financial impact may not be a big factor for us, but it is for them.

Campbell said the board’s issue is water and/or sewer. Water and sewer is one thing and the other is special assessments. He said if he understands it, the part that is the real issue is where someone wants to put in a road and take water and sewer up the road and the township finances it. We are basically taking out a bank note. That is something the township needs to pay closer attention to and make sure they understand the costs. If we are worried about people walking away from a project, the township would come out like gold and sell the lots for more. Campbell said he did not see the down side of not allowing people to build 3 stories. He cannot see them walking away because of that. An issue the board needs to be aware of is the fact that we have lake shore north and south of 107th. This is a debt on the shore and the extension up the streets that the township takes on until they are paid off. There are risks of being a developer. If we are pushing growth, we are becoming land managers, and there is a risk in that.

Campbell said he can sympathize, it is a legitimate concern when you have lots that get flooded when developments come in.

Approved 6/6/18

Graff referred to Overhiser's letter (attachment #2). Overhiser's letter states that the Township is in partnership with land owners in special assessment districts. If anyone wants special assessment water and sewer, they pay 100%. As a board member, Graff would never consider herself in partnership with people who want to develop. It does not involve the township. It would be an administrative liability of someone who defaults. Therefore, partnership is something we can't afford to make.

Campbell said he feels strongly that the master plan talks about the uniqueness of platted subdivisions. They have been around for 80+ years. Even Macyauski said people need to buy more lots to put in larger homes. It is a unique situation and the township must recognize that. Campbell feels the PC has done a good job being reasonable with the height amendment.

Discussion continued. If there is a technical issue between the chart and the ordinance, the PC needs to address it. There is nothing in the change log that indicates the PC intended to change from the 35' maximum height *and* a maximum of 2 ½ story.

Hughes said there needs to be some discussion about how the height of a building is measured. Ellingsen needs to clarify that also.

Campbell said he would vote to keep the *lesser of 35' and 2 ½ stories* as a height requirement. He can justify it on historically platted small lots. They are unique because of the small lots and everything fits.

Fleming asked what the next step would be. Graff said if we still recommend to the board to have the *lesser of 35' or 2 ½ stories*, the board would like to see reasons itemized to support the change.

Campbell said the priority is to get answers on Average Grade and the 2 ½ story thing. There are several issues needed from the Zoning Administrator on this.

Graff suggested the action be put in the form of a motion.

Fleming made a motion to ask Ellingsen to explain the following: 1. How you get a house in that picture (attachment #4) based on the chart Section 4.07 (attachment #3) 2. How he computes the average grade to get the height of a building. 3. The definition of average grade. Motion supported by Adamson. All in favor. MSC.

Campbell added, if the chart is correct, we will not need to do anything on the height amendment.

Graff stated we must recognize the chart is not in the current zoning ordinance. But, there are no log of changes dealing with this and no record of discussion on the change.

Campbell said, after what we are going through today, it is a mistake if someone at this table, including myself, doesn't take the responsibility of going over changes with Ellingsen and the Board. We would not be having this debate tonight. One of us should take responsibility of working with Ellingsen to keep updated once a year. We should rethink the process. It could be the job of the Vice Chair.

Graff commended Campbell on the good work he did. Campbell did his homework. There are additional discrepancies in the Zoning Ordinance that are not documented as decisions the PC has made. We need to look at them.

Campbell said it is the PC's responsibility to look at the MP. There is no reason not to take a high-level look at the MP every year.

Hughes added, it is an important document.

Adamson said he wants to understand "farmland preservation", etc. Should we not be putting any commercial in AG, as we just did? Adamson would like this discussed with the board for clarity.

Campbell said when Patrick Hudson was Casco's Planner he did that sort of thing, but not often enough.

Approved 6/6/18

Graff said the MP is a policy statement, no matter what you put in it, it can be interpreted differently. You will never find words as clear as “do not, under any circumstances put.....”. If five people read it, five will walk away interpreting it differently. There is no silver bullet.

Campbell said all of us are here for the right reasons. Casco is a great place. We want to continue to make it better. We benefit from all contributions.

Fleming referred to the MTA Township Guide to Planning & Zoning, where it says to continually monitor population shifts, and increases, changes, growth, etc. The point is, it's impossible. It is like running along behind a car.

Hughes asked if the planner has done work regarding lighting? Campbell said not to his knowledge. It was agreed the PC needs to do work on lighting. They need to touch base with Ellingsen to see if it is ready for discussion.

Vice Chair Campbell invited public comment:

John Barkley said he believes growth for water and sewer is important, using the MP the way it was intended. Building tall is a natural way to get more view, revenue and wealth. The problem is, when mixed in with historically platted small lots. 2nd, the problem with tall buildings is they create more disturbances, noise and light. It sounds from discussion tonight like there is confusion about 35' maximum and 2 ½ story or was it always meant to be “lesser of”.

Kathy Watt said there has been a hostile takeover of Miami Park Association. Dan Way got a lawyer and put people on a committee that all had special interests. They want more 3 story buildings on two lots. With all these 3 story buildings and 6 baths, what about the sewer? Can Miami Park sewer system handle 300 bathrooms? Is there a limit to what a sewer can handle? Adamson said there was a survey done a couple of years ago when they (Miami Park) were first going to hook up. They required grinders and lifts. Watt asked again if there is an unlimited number of 3 story houses it could handle? Adamson said, not unlimited. Adamson said it is a 2-inch pipe, forced and would eventually filter down. Not everything is going to plug at once. But to answer her question, yes there is a limit. Watt said they (developers) want more and more of these 3 story houses. There will be all sorts of repercussions.

Abonmarche did a report based on 300 gal per day and gave the number of homes could that could be accommodated. Supervisor Overhiser said they plan to split the system, ½ to Highfield and ½ to Boardwalk.

Graff asked if anyone is monitoring the process? Watt asked Adamson if they (SHAWSA) oversees this. Adamson said no, they do not have the authority. Supervisor Overhiser said the internal lines in Miami Park are their own. Watt said she does not trust them. Supervisor Overhiser said we all have concerns.

Bill Chambers asked who is monitoring the growth and its capacity?

Supervisor Overhiser stated he would at least like to be at their (Miami Park's) meetings. Adamson said we (SHAWSA) are supposed to be notified when someone hooks up. We can look at the report and see where they are. Watt said the board is all developers, they only care about money. Campbell said, if you know there is a limit, there should be monitoring. Overhiser said there is significant headroom in the system. Campbell said some of the pipes on the west side of Lake Shore Drive are in an area where it is five feet from the bluff. That will eventually need to be moved. Supervisor Overhiser said he thought it went up Michigan.

Graff said she is deducing that nobody is watching it. Is somebody responsible for watching for a problem with capacity? Graff asked if it is reasonable to ask for an updated report. Adamson replied that is a little premature. Graff asked if it is reasonable to request an updated report given all the development. Overhiser said, with the split, the new association was going to hire Midwest to look at it.

Approved 6/6/18

Graff asked again, from a municipal standpoint, are you not seeing enough reason to get a report?

Supervisor Overhiser said he had concerns about future and were looking at a split. It is reasonable to have that discussion.

Campbell asked if the township could require some type of study on a regular basis.

Adamson said he would ask Rob if there is an issue off the record. They are not officially keeping an eye on it.

Supervisor Overhiser spoke to the building height amendment. Basically, I thought the area south of 107th should be looked at differently. When you make changes to areas south of 107th it has more significance.

Campbell said people are looking at every parcel on the lakeshore communities, and we are not. We are looking at the historically platted small lots. They could put up a "Boardwalk" if they go through the hoops.

Bill Chambers said Allan brings up the fact that things would be done differently with new sewer lines. Casco would never install more water and sewer until it is fully paid for. Many lots have been assessed. They are 20' pieces of property that will never be built on. Are property owners going to pay the assessments on unbuildable lots? The cake still in oven. Another question is how did we end up with a 3 story building? The same way we came up with commercial rentals in residential zones. We believe a magic elf will enforce the zoning. We have not been doing that. Go to Ellingsen and make him enforce the zoning. We have all been speeding in cars for decades. That does not matter when you get a ticket, the law was always here. You can't arbitrarily say it's unfair today.

A motion by Graff, supported by Fleming to adjourn. All in favor. Meeting adjourned at 9:00 pm.

Next meeting Wednesday, June 6, 2018, 7 PM

Attachment #1: Newspaper article S.H. moratorium on STRs

Attachment #2: Letter from Overhiser Re Building Height amendment

Attachment #3: Chart from previous version of Zoning Ordinance, Section 4.07 Schedule of Regulations

Attachment #4: Picture of 3-story structure

Minutes Prepared by Janet Chambers, Recording Secretary

City re-examines short-term rental issue

Council OKs moratorium in 2 city wards

- By BECKY KARK - For The Herald-Palladium

May 8, 2018

SOUTH HAVEN — Some South Haven homeowners who haven't registered their homes as short-term rentals will be out of luck in renting their dwellings — at least for this summer.

South Haven City Council members on Monday voted to put a moratorium on short-term rental registrations for six months in two city wards in order to give planning commission members time to re-examine if changes need to be made to the existing short-term rental ordinance adopted in 2016.

The moratorium will only affect homeowners who live in the city's Wards 1 and 2. Ward 3, where many short-term rentals have historically existed, will be exempt. In addition, any homeowner who is in the midst of building a new home or contractors involved in building units in a Planned Unit Development will be exempt from the moratorium, according to City Manager Brian Dissette.

"This does not affect any of the 406 registered short-term rentals," Dissette said during Monday's city council meeting. Nor does the ordinance affect new dwellings currently being built that might be used for short-term rentals.

The proliferation of short-term rentals in South Haven has continued to be an issue even though the City Council in 2016 passed an ordinance regulating them. The ordinance created a registration fee, a mechanism for inspecting the homes, occupancy permits and safety measures.

However, a number of city residents have continued to voice concerns that the large number of short-term rental homes is adversely affecting the town's economy, in that South Haven is being

viewed solely as a tourism town, rather than a city that can attract good-paying businesses to employ residents year-round. In addition, some residents feel that the growth of the second-home market and homes used for short-term rentals has escalated home values along the lakeshore and throughout town, preventing middle-class people from buying homes in the city.

“This has been an issue that has been reoccurring since January,” Dissette said, regarding concerns expressed by city council members. These concerns led to a workshop Monday, prior to the city council meeting, in which the issue was discussed in detail. Afterwards council members voted during their regularly scheduled meeting to adopt the moratorium.

During Monday’s meeting, Mayor Scott Smith pointed to other lakeshore towns such as Holland, St. Joseph and Grand Haven and noted that they all have less than 100 registered short-term rentals.

“At some point in time we have to take a look at what is happening,” Smith said.

Mayor Pro Tem Clark Gruber agreed. “This (the moratorium) is giving the planning commission six months to examine the short-term rental ordinance.”

Issues to Address
Concerning Amending Height Restrictions

I would like to start out by stating that I am neither for or against the proposed height restrictions but rather to state that the decision and especially the reasons for the decision are underdeveloped. In my opinion more questions need to be answered and I am concerned with potential unintended consequences. I felt that there was merit to the idea as an “occupancy control mechanism” during early rental discussions but the Rental Regulatory Ordinance now controls this concern. There could be concerns about septic systems and the ability to handle houses in areas not served by public sewer and maybe more but I haven’t heard them.

More importantly, I am concerned about treating the area north of 107th the same as south of 107th. All of our documents expressly state the areas are different given sewer and water availability and the associated debt that the township is responsible for. The Township and the board have spent a lot of time to communicate that Water and Sewer has been installed south of 107th Ave. and that a significant debt was incurred. The debt and repayment ability has been discussed at many meetings for more than 15 years. The Water and Sewer Authority refinanced some of the older debt to be able to cash flow the existing debt based on a modest growth rate. The growth rate was based on assumptions and known variables and one important variable was that the fight over how to regulate non-conforming lots of record was over.

In addition, most recently the Township has participated in Special Assessment Districts: Lakeview Sewer, Lakeview Water, Pacific Sewer, Pacific Water, Orchard Sewer, Lakeview Paving, 102nd Ave. Water and Sewer, and Beach Drive Water and Sewer. The Township was petitioned to have water and sewer extended to mostly vacant lots and held hearings to establish Special Assessment Districts. Districts were approved with the understanding that they would be responsible for 100% of the cost. The township incurred the debt and the assessed properties are responsible to repay the debt over a 15 year time period. You can think about it in terms that the Township is in partnership with land owners and the end game is development and that most of the lots ultimately need to develop. If we place additional restrictions on these properties, then do we place those properties at a competitive disadvantage where it would jeopardize full debt repayment and put the Township at risk.

Recently the growth has met projections and there have not been any delinquent properties in the new districts. History has taught us that “Good Times” are not a permanent condition. We know things will change and most likely will. We can’t control economic conditions but regulatory changes can also effect growth and that is what we can control. If we are going to change a practice or regulation that has been in effect for over ten years then we must answer questions and assess financial impact because financial commitments have been made based on existing regulations.

I think that when a decision to change zoning regulations south of 107th Ave. is being considered that a discussion about Water and Sewer financial impact be required at the Planning Commission and at the board level. We need to be able to state that with a high degree of certainty that any proposed change will not negatively impact debt repayment ability that the township is ultimately responsible for.

Sincerely

Allan Overhiser

SECTION 4.07 SCHEDULE OF REGULATIONS

DISTRICTS	MINIMUM LOT AREA (sq. ft.)	MINIMUM LOT WIDTH (ft.)	MINIMUM YARD SETBACKS (ft.)					HEIGHT LIMIT (except for bldgs. assoc. w/ farming or other ag. operations. Also see Section 3.03 C)		MAXIMUM LOT COVERAGE (%)
			Front* (ft.)		Side	Rear	Maximum Feet	Maximum in Stories		
			Along Blue Star Hwy or 109 th Ave.	Adjacent to Lake Michigan					Along all other roads	
AG, Agricultural	2.5 acres	250	50	N/A	50	Res. bldgs = 25 Main bldgs for Nonres. uses = 50	50	35	2 1/4	20
RR, Rural Residential	1 acre w/o sewer 30,000 w/ sewer	150	50	N/A	50	25	50	35	2 1/4	20
LR-A, Lakeshore Residential North of 107 th , West of Blue Star Hwy	30,000	125	50	MDEQ required	50	25	50	35	2 1/4	25
LR-B, Lakeshore Residential South of 107 th , West of Blue Star Hwy	12,000 30,000	85 125	50	MDEQ required, if no MDEQ regulation, 200 from Ordinary High Water Mark	25 if public sewer available; 50 if no public sewer available	50	50	35	2 1/4	25
LDR, Low Density Residential	10,000 20,000	85 100	50	MDEQ required but not less than 40**	30 if public sewer available; 50 if no public sewer available	40	50	35	2 1/4	25
MDR, Medium-Density Residential (all uses shall be served by public sanitary sewer)	7,500	75	50	N/A	50	15	30	35	2 1/4	25
	15,000	125	50	N/A	50	15	30	35	2 1/4	35
	2 acres (max density on any parcel not to exceed 6 diu/gross acre)	150	50	N/A	50	15	30	35	2 1/4	35
MHC, Manufactured Home Community						Required to be in compliance with Michigan Mobile Home Commission regulations.				
C-1, Neighborhood Commercial	20,000	100	50	N/A	Bldgs: 30 Pavement: 20	25***	35	35	2 1/4	35
C-2, General Commercial	30,000	150	50	N/A	Bldgs: 30 Pavement: 20	25***	35	35	2 1/4	35
I, Industrial	2 acres	200	50	N/A	Bldgs: 50 Pavement: 25	75***	40	40	N/A	50

* In the C-1, C-2 and I Zoning Districts, a maximum front setback of 125 feet from the front setback line shall apply.
 ** Buildings on lots adjacent to Lake Michigan shall be setback 200 feet from the Ordinary High Water Mark.
 *** Side or rear yards adjoining any lot in a residential district shall be screened in accordance with the requirements of Section 3.33.

