



7275 W. MAIN STREET, KALAMAZOO, MI 49009-9334  
269-216-5220 Fax 375-7180 TDD 375-7198  
www.oshtemo.org

**NOTICE  
OSHTEMO CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Regular Meeting  
Thursday, January 11, 2018  
7:00 p.m.  
AGENDA**

1. Call to Order
2. Pledge of Allegiance
3. Approval of Agenda
4. Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items
5. Approval of Minutes: December 14, 2017
6. Election of Officers – Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary
7. Appointment of Planning Commission Liaison to the Zoning Board of Appeals
8. Old Business
  - a. Condominium Ordinance - Draft
9. Any Other Business
10. Planning Commissioner Comments
11. Adjournment

**Policy for Public Comment**  
**Township Board Regular Meetings, Planning Commission & ZBA Meetings**

All public comment shall be received during one of the following portions of the Agenda of an open meeting:

- a. Citizen Comment on Non-Agenda Items or Public Comment – while this is not intended to be a forum for dialogue and/or debate, if a citizen inquiry can be answered succinctly and briefly, it will be addressed or it may be delegated to the appropriate Township Official to respond at a later date.
- b. After an agenda item is presented by staff and/or an applicant, public comment will be invited. At the close of public comment there will be board discussion prior to call for a motion.

Anyone wishing to make a comment will be asked to come to the podium to facilitate the audio/visual capabilities of the meeting room. Speakers will be invited to provide their name; it is not required unless the speaker wishes to have their comment recorded in the minutes.

All public comment offered during public hearings shall be directed, and relevant, to the item of business on which the public hearing is being conducted. Comment during the Public Comment or Citizen Comment on Non-Agenda Items may be directed to any issue.

All public comment shall be limited to four (4) minutes in duration unless special permission has been granted in advance by the Supervisor or Chairperson of the meeting.

Public comment shall not be repetitive, slanderous, abusive, threatening, boisterous, or contrary to the orderly conduct of business. The Supervisor or Chairperson of the meeting shall terminate any public comment which is in contravention of any of the principles and procedures set forth herein.

(adopted 5/9/2000)  
(revised 5/14/2013)

**Policy for Public Comment**  
**6:00 p.m. "Public Comment"/Portion of Township Board Meetings**

At the commencement of the meeting, the Supervisor shall poll the members of the public who are present to determine how many persons wish to make comments. The Supervisor shall allocate maximum comment time among persons so identified based upon the total number of persons indicating their wish to make public comments, but no longer than ten (10) minutes per person. Special permission to extend the maximum comment time may be granted in advance by the Supervisor based upon the topic of discussion.

While this is not intended to be a forum for dialogue and/or debate, if a citizen inquiry can be answered succinctly and briefly, it will be addressed or it may be delegated to the appropriate Township Official to respond at a later date.

Anyone wishing to make a comment will be asked to come to the podium to facilitate the audio/visual capabilities of the meeting room. Speakers will be invited to provide their name; it is not required unless the speaker wishes to have their comment recorded in the minutes.

Public comment shall not be repetitive, slanderous, abusive, threatening, boisterous, or contrary to the orderly conduct of business. The Supervisor shall terminate any public comment which is in contravention of any of the principles and procedures set forth herein.

(adopted 2/27/2001)  
(revised 5/14/2013)

**OSHTEMO CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MINUTES OF A MEETING HELD DECEMBER 14, 2017**

---

**Agenda**

**PUBLIC HEARING: MASTER PLAN UPDATE**

**CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT MASTER PLAN UPDATE TO INCLUDE:**

- a. Introduction and Planning Drivers
- b. Rural Character Preservation Strategy
- c. Maple Hill Drive South Sub-Area Plan
- d. Future Land Use Plan

**PUBLIC HEARING: ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS**

**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS TO INCLUDE:**

- a. Section 11.000: Definitions – specifically Section 11.237: Building Official
- b. Section 60.000: Special Exception Uses – specifically Section 60.400: Planned Unit Development
- c. Section 68.000: Off-Street Parking of Motor Vehicles – specifically Section 68.300: Off-Street Parking and Site Circulation Requirements
- d. Section 77.00: Addressing Requirements for Structures

**ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- a. 2018 MEETING DATES
- 

A meeting of the Oshtemo Charter Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, December 14, 2017, commencing at approximately 7:00 p.m. at the Oshtemo Charter Township Hall.

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Cheri Bell, Chairperson  
Fred Antosz, Vice Chairperson  
Ollie Chambers  
Dusty Farmer, Secretary  
Mary Smith

**MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Kathleen Garland-Rike  
Bruce VanderWeele

Also present were Julie Johnston, Planning Director, James Porter, Township Attorney, Martha Coash, Meeting Transcriptionist, and approximately 20 interested persons.

## **Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance**

Chairperson Bell called the meeting to order at approximately 7:00 p.m.; the “Pledge of Allegiance” was recited.

## **Agenda**

Chairperson Bell asked if there were any additions, deletions or corrections to the Agenda. Hearing none, she asked for a motion to approve the agenda.

Mr. Antosz made a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Ms. Farmer supported the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

## **Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items**

The Chairperson called for public comment on non-agenda items. Hearing none, she moved to the next agenda item.

## **Approval of the Minutes from the Work Session and from the Regular Meeting of November 9, 2017**

Chairperson Bell asked if there were additions, deletions or corrections to the Minutes of the Work Session or the Regular Meeting of November 9, 2017. Hearing none, she asked for a motion.

Mr. Antosz made a motion to approve the Minutes of the Work Session and the Regular Meeting of November 9, 2017 as presented. Ms. Farmer supported the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

## **PUBLIC HEARING: MASTER PLAN UPDATE**

### **CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT MASTER PLAN UPDATE TO INCLUDE:**

- a. **Introduction and Planning Drivers**
- b. **Rural Character Preservation Strategy**
- c. **Maple Hill Drive South Sub-Area Plan**
- d. **Future Land Use Plan**

Chairperson Bell moved to the next item on the agenda, a public hearing considering the draft Master Plan and asked Ms. Johnston for her presentation.

Ms. Johnston told the Board per the requirements of Public Act 33 of 2008, Michigan Planning Enabling Act, the Master Plan must be reviewed for changes every five years, and the Planning Commission must hold a public hearing on the Master Plan Update before making a recommendation to the Township Board. This hearing allows the Planning Commission a final chance to make any changes to the draft Master Plan Update before it is forwarded to the Township Board. It is also an opportunity for the

public to voice their support or any concerns regarding the draft document before the Planning Commission makes its recommendation. She noted the process to this point to develop needed updates has taken place over the last twelve months. She indicated the draft Master Plan Update includes four main chapters:

Introduction and Planning Drivers: Outlines the demographic changes occurring in the Township that influence planning decisions and includes how changes have occurred over the last five years and how changes may occur for future planning.

Rural Character Preservation Strategy: Details the goals, policy statements and strategies for preserving rural properties and character within the western 2/3rds of the Township. This section includes the detailed environmental mapping conducted by Western Michigan University and the public outreach steps taken to develop the proposed strategies. Many months of strategy discussion have taken place to help preserve the rural character.

Maple Hill Drive South Sub-Area Plan: This Plan was based on a recommendation in the 2011 Master Plan, which indicated this particular area of the Township was prime for redevelopment and that a more detailed Sub-Area plan was needed. The recommendations in the Sub-Area Plan are based on community outreach and careful consideration of the Planning Commission with regard to the uniqueness of this area and its location in that portion of the Township slated for more intense development, including the need for buffering from neighborhoods.

Ms. Johnston noted the extensive outreach to and participation by residents at work sessions and additions/changes to the plan that were made as a result, including the importance of green space, stronger language on incentives in zoning to support public spaces in the Sub-Area, and a goal the Township to work with the Road Commission to consider closing the Driftwood access once a secondary access has been developed to connect Green Meadows to Maple Hill. Another change was made regarding evaluating building scale rather than height, to provide transitioning to protect neighborhoods to the south.

Future Land Use Plan: This section of the Update replaces the 2011 Future Land Use Chapter. Incremental alterations to the Future Land Use Map have been proposed to address changing conditions and support the planning drivers affecting the Township.

Chairperson Bell asked if there were questions from the Board for Ms. Johnston.

Mr. Antosz suggested the inclusion of a definition or example of the “street connectivity index on page 64.

Chairperson Bell suggested including explanation or clarification regarding planning drivers in the appendix, specifically “community tapestry segments.”

Ms. Farmer shared four changes to the Maple Hill Sub-area plan suggested by participants at the November 9 public workshop: 1) the importance of language to address green space preservation, 2) Stronger language on incentives and zoning to support public spaces, 3) Work with the Road Commission to close Driftwood access once a secondary access is initiated and created, and 4) a change in wording that talks about building scale rather than building height to provide protection for neighborhoods to the south.

The Chair noted the Board had received a letter from Frank Wiers and Margie DeGroot December 1<sup>st</sup> stating their concern regarding green space, buffer zones, and traffic volume.

Mr. "Z", 293 Westview, felt the language about working with the Road Commission regarding closing the Driftwood access was too vague and "should consider" should be changed to be stronger, for example, "the Township will request."

Ms. Michelle Contraris, 5015 Driftwood, shared her concern about the vague language regarding closing Driftwood access and felt it would be good to close it soon.

Ms. Melanie James, Skyridge, told the Board a number of promises made to residents at the time the condos and apartments were built were not honored, including Skyridge being used strictly as an emergency access to the condos, and a noise buffer from U.S. 131. She noted speeding vehicles from the condos and apartments result in residents coming close to being hit, and a substantial increase in broken windows from thrown rocks, which she felt was a result of minors not having enough to do. She suggested providing an activities center for them.

Mr. George White, representative of the condominium association indicated condo residents would very much object to closing off Skyridge while the result would be only one other entrance.

Ms. Anna Versale, Mandalay Drive, was concerned about the amount of traffic and advocated closing the entrance at Driftwood. She felt strongly about keeping green space available for residents and said there are many development opportunities elsewhere in the Township.

Mr. Brian Stoltz said when the Driftwood/Skyridge neighborhood was developed the County Road Commission said there had to be two points of access primarily for emergency vehicles and they were the stumbling block in that process. He thanked Commissioners for including wording regarding the closure of Driftwood in the document. He noted the original plans did not call for subsidized housing and that the change of demographics has resulted in many children in the neighborhood. He said many school buses travel through the neighborhood each day. He also reported he had filmed traffic from his driveway during rush hour and recorded 63 vehicles passing his home during that time, which did not agree with the 13 estimated by the Road

Commission. He did not count vehicles that did not pass in front of his home. He also reported loud mufflers and much speeding from the recording.

Ms. Karen Curtis thanked the Commission for including the wording regarding closure of Driftwood access and asked that residents be informed when anything regarding that issue develops.

Hearing no further comments, Chairperson Bell closed the Public Hearing. She noted surrounding municipalities had been provided the draft of the updated Master Plan for comments. Neither the City of Kalamazoo nor the County of Kalamazoo had any concerns. She said concerns about the number of school buses expressed by Mr. Stoltz were also voiced at the November 9 public work session and that KPS confirmed that 29 buses travel through the neighborhood during the day.

The Chair moved to Board Deliberations and asked if there were comments from Trustees.

Ms. Farmer reminded the group the suggestion to include the Driftwood closure in the Plan was generated by Planning Commission members. She supports it, but noted neither the Road Commission nor the Township Fire Department would ever support it while only one entrance was left since it would be very unsafe for the neighborhood. She also explained the Township cannot dictate that the golf course stay as is, but that they can provide incentives to owners to have, sell or donate land for public space. A lot of work went into providing language in the Plan to do that – the Township is doing all it can do legally to encourage it. At the least there will be a green space buffer. She thanked Ms. Johnston for encouraging and providing so much opportunity for public engagement and thanked those who came to provide input at the various meetings. She felt the Staff and Board did a good job and produced a great document.

She concluded by saying she would support changing the wording on page 56, “Vehicular Circulation Connectors” from “*the Township should consider closing the connection between Green Meadow Drive and Driftwood Avenue*” to “*the Township will work with the Road Commission of Kalamazoo County to close the connection to Green Meadow Drive and Driftwood Avenue,*” but only after there is a secondary access.

Chairperson Bell suggested text changes:

- Page 52 of the Maple Hill Sub-Area Plan - add “recreation” as the last word in the second paragraph in the right column.
- Page 12, table three should add to 100%.

The Chair thanked Ms. Johnston for the great draft update of the Master Plan and she thanked members of the public for their continued efforts and how it educates the Planning Commission.

Ms. Smith noted the comments from the County of Kalamazoo encouraged careful consideration to the change from a golf course in future planning. She encouraged people to continue to attend meetings and said the Planning Commission would do what they can to make things work for everyone.

There was consensus to recommend the Master Plan Update as presented to the Township Board for approval; the Chair asked for a motion.

Ms. Farmer made a motion to recommend the Master Plan Update with the amendments to the draft as discussed to the Township Board for approval. Mr. Antosz supported the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

**PUBLIC HEARING: ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS**  
**CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS TO INCLUDE:**

- a. **Section 11.000: Definitions – specifically Section 11.237: Building Official**
- b. **Section 60.000: Special Exception Uses – specifically Section 60.400: Planned Unit Development**
- c. **Section 68.000: Off-Street Parking of Motor Vehicles – specifically Section 68.300: Off-Street Parking and Site Circulation Requirements**
- d. **Section 77.00: Addressing Requirements for Structures**

Chairperson Bell moved to the next item on the agenda, a public hearing considering the draft Zoning Ordinance Amendments.

Ms. Johnston told the Board the initial requested changes to the Off-Street Parking Ordinance began with recommendations related to accessible spaces and the desire to ensure the Americans with Disabilities Act regulations are met. Staff recommended changes that would require the use of concrete or similar material, as opposed to asphalt, for all accessible spaces. Concrete is a more rigid product, which will allow the required slopes and cross-slopes of the accessible spaces to be more easily managed.

While reviewing the Off-Street Parking Ordinance for accessible spaces, Staff made four additional changes:

1. Amendments are recommended to Section 68.300 that reduce and re-organize the current Ordinance language into a more user-friendly configuration. Section 68.300 now just regulates parking lots and circulation aisles. Anything not related to parking lots and circulation aisles, like drive-through windows, has been moved to its own section of the code. In addition, those regulations that just reiterate that the parking lot must meet other code requirements have been removed.
2. Staff would like to change Section 68.300 to include requirements for site circulation. The current ordinance does not specifically mention circulation aisles



on site, which does not give staff the regulatory leverage to require certain pavement widths outside of parking lot areas.

3. Bicycle parking is not explicitly required on any development. The current Ordinance states bicycle parking is encouraged and may be required. Without guidance as to when bicycle parking is required, this regulation seems difficult to administer. Staff thought by including language related to special exception uses, the Planning Commission could consider bicycle parking when uses are reviewed that require additional scrutiny because of their intensity or size. For example, requiring bicycle parking within larger PUD projects may be warranted.
4. Subsection I of Section 68.300 indicates a regulation related to shared access reduction under Section 67.600, which is the Access Management Guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance. The current regulations under Section 67.600 are:

**67.600 - Shared access reduction schedule.**

1. *When a driveway is established to serve two or more parcels, lots, or building sites, and where such parcels, lots, or building sites are not served by any other access point, the total parcel, lot, or building site size and road frontage required by the Township Zoning Ordinance shall be reduced by ten percent.*
2. *When a frontage road or service drive is established on a parcel, lot, or building site, the total parcel, lot, or building site size, road frontage, and number of parking spaces required shall be reduced by ten percent.*
3. *When a cross parking arrangement or agreement has been reached (and written evidence thereof in existence) regarding two or more parcels, lots, or building sites, the number of parking spaces required for each of the parcels, lots, or building sites in question shall be reduced by ten percent.*

Staff would like to eliminate subsection 1, which allows a reduction in parcel size or frontage. To our knowledge, this regulation has not been employed anywhere within the Township. In addition, tracking this requirement overtime could be tremendously difficult as sites redevelop and parcel lines change. Future Planning staff may believe lots to be nonconforming because of the reduction in lot size or frontage requirements. Finally, the use of a parking reduction seems an adequate incentive to encourage shared access. In addition, Staff would like to move subsections 2 and 3 to the Off-Street Parking Ordinance. A new subsection 68.303 titled Shared Access Reduction would be created.

**Addressing Requirements:** The development of this draft Ordinance was completed through a coalition of the Fire Department, Planning Department, Public Works Department and Legal Department. Ben Clark, Zoning Administrator, reviewed ordinances from other communities and spoke with a representative from a sign

company to learn if there were existing conventions related to distance, address size and legibility. Based on his research, internal discussions among the departments noted above, and final staff review, a draft ordinance was developed for the Planning Commissions review.

The importance of requiring addresses on non-residential buildings for public safety was brought to the Planning Departments attention by Chief Mark Barnes and Fire Marshal Jim Wiley. Currently, the Township does not have an ordinance or policy that manages the placement of addresses on buildings in a systematic way. This has led to a variety of addressing types, sizes, fonts, etc. on commercial and industrial buildings, causing confusion and possibly reduced emergency response times. This draft ordinance will support uniformity among projects that require site plan review in the Township.

**Definitions:** Staff conducted a complete review of both the Zoning and General Ordinances to eliminate any specific language related to a particular Building Authority. Within the Zoning Ordinance, the definition section requires a language change to something less specific that will still describe the Building Authority but will not address a particular organization.

**Planned Unit Development:** In recent years, the Planning Commission has approved two special exception uses for commercial planned unit developments (PUD) within the Township; the Corner@Drake and Westgate PUDs. During the approval process for these developments, it became clear that our zoning ordinance language did not provide the type of public notice generally warranted for a project of this type, scale and intensity.

The Planning Commission requested changes to the PUD approval process that would require a public hearing at the time of concept plan approval. The current ordinance requires the approval of the special exception use, which includes the public hearing, at the time of site plan review. This public hearing seems late in the process, as the Planning Commission has already approved a concept plan for which the site plan must conform. Giving public notice at the time of site plan does not allow neighboring property owners and residents the opportunity to weigh in on the concept plan, which governs the development after its approval by the Township.

Recommended amendments would change this process and require the special exception use public hearing and approval at the time of concept plan.

Ms. Johnston said if the Planning Commission was comfortable with the Ordinance changes presented, Staff would request a recommendation of approval be forwarded to the Township Board.

Chairperson Bell asked if there were questions from Commissioners.

Ms. Johnston responded to questions, confirming it is the Planning Commission's responsibility to provide minimum standards on exterior building features and that some specifics will be addressed when the Commission finishes reorganization of the Zoning Ordinance next year.

There were no further questions from the Board; Chairperson Bell asked if there were any public comments.

Mr. Joe Gesmundo, questioned the need for the required size of 12" street numbers and the inclusion of street names, which he felt was redundant in #7D, "Addressing of Buildings", saying first responders should know what street they are on. He did not want to clutter up the architecture with such large letters, and felt if it is critical to have 12" letters in some cases, it would seem they would also be necessary for residential properties.

Hearing no further comments, Chairperson Bell closed the Public Hearing and moved to Board Deliberations.

Ms. Farmer said there had been a lot of discussion regarding signing and noted if the changes are adopted the Township will make all changes to their buildings to be in compliance. She explained 80-90% of calls to the Fire Department are for medical issues and that many times they are answered by "on call" responders; when the address goes out the responders may need clarification. In addition, interns act as paid "on call" dispatch volunteers

Attorney Porter added that the name of the street will be required only if there is double frontage, and that part of the reason for the change in requirements is that often fire calls are not answered by the Township's Fire Department. Other jurisdiction Departments may be answering calls because of agreements between departments county-wide, who might not be as familiar with the area.

Chairperson Bell noted the proposed requirements were scaled back from what the Fire Marshal requested.

Hearing no further discussion, the Chair asked for a motion.

Ms. Smith made a motion to recommend the Ordinance Amendments as presented to the Township Board for their approval. Mr. Chambers supported the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

## **OLD BUSINESS**

Ms. Johnston told the Board she was in the process of scheduling a joint work session with the Township Board in January to discuss the Master Plan update and to provide an opportunity to answer any questions the Township Board may have.

## **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

### **a. 2018 Meeting Dates**

Chairperson Bell moved to the next item on the agenda and asked Ms. Johnston for her presentation.

Ms. Johnston provided a tentative schedule of Meeting Dates for 2018 in the usual pattern of the second and fourth Thursday of the month at 7:00 p.m. with no second meeting scheduled in November or December. Also provided was a schedule for Joint Meetings, approved by the Township Board, for February 20, May 22 and September 18, 2018.

Ms. Farmer made a motion to approve the 2018 schedule for regular and joint meetings as presented. Ms. Smith supported the motion. The motion was approved unanimously.

## **PLANNING COMMISSIONER COMMENTS**

Hearing no comments, Chairperson Bell asked for a motion to adjourn.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Farmer made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Smith supported the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:17 p.m.

Minutes prepared:  
December 16, 2017

Minutes approved:  
\_\_\_\_\_, 2017

January 4, 2018



**Mtg Date:** January 11, 2018  
**To:** Planning Commission  
**From:** Julie Johnston, AICP  
**Subject:** Ordinance Amendments

### **Condominium Development Standards Ordinance**

Staff received a request to develop an attached condominium project on a property zoned R-2: Residence District. In reviewing the subject parcel, it became clear that the size of the property did not meet the 20-acre requirement for a Planned Unit Development (PUD). Therefore, the only option open to the property owner based on current Zoning Ordinance regulations was to subdivide the property and create individual lots where the two-unit attached dwellings could be built.

After reviewing other attached condominium projects in the Township, it became clear that many were developed as part of a larger PUD. Currently, there are no standards for the development of an attached product outside of the PUD ordinance. Staff does not believe it was the intent of the Zoning Ordinance to preclude this type of development outside of a PUD or platted subdivision or site condominium. This is especially true since the R-2 District allows two-family dwellings by right and the R-3 District allows three and four-family as a special exception use. In addition, the Condominium Act, Public Act 59 of 1978 establishes this type of development as a legitimate option for both developers and homeowners.

Utilizing language from the existing development standards for apartments and site condominiums, staff crafted the Condominium Development Standards Ordinance. This new ordinance requires any attached condominium development to request approval through the special exception use process so a public hearing with the Planning Commission would be required.

### **Requested Action**

After consideration of the proposed ordinance and any changes/edits, a public hearing will need to be set. Depending on the Planning Commission's discussions, the public hearing could take place February.

Thank you.

# DRAFT

## 61.000 Condominium Development Standards

### 61.100: Purpose

The purpose of this Ordinance is to offer an alternative to traditional subdivisions through the use of the Condominium Act, Public Act 59 of 1978. Development Provisions.

### 61.200: Zoning Districts

Attached condominiums are permitted as a special exception use in the R-2, R-3, and R-4 Districts.

### 61.300: Development Requirements

1. Density. The overall density of a condominium development shall be determined by the minimum residential parcel, lot, or building site area per dwelling unit required by the zoning district in which the development is located. In the event the development lies in more than one zoning classification, the number of dwelling units shall be computed for each zoning classification separately.
2. Interior Transportation Network.
  - a. The condominium development and all associated units shall be serviced by an interior transportation network, which can consist of public roads, private streets or private drives. No use within the condominium shall front or gain direct access from an off-site road network.
  - b. Public roads must meet all of the requirements of the Road Commission of Kalamazoo County.
  - c. If the interior transportation network is private streets, they shall be built in conformance to the standards and requirements of Section 60.800 of the Zoning Ordinance.
  - d. Private drives must be two-way with a minimum surface width of 24 feet exclusive of any area used for parking. All drives shall be paved with asphalt or other hard surface material.
  - e. For condominium developments with 50 or more units, at least two primary points of ingress or egress must be provided.
  - f. When an interior drive would service as a connecting link between different land ownerships or different public roads, either currently or within the foreseeable future, it shall, regardless of whether it is a public or private road, be constructed in accordance with the public road specifications of the Road Commission of Kalamazoo County and be located upon a reserved right-of-way of not less than 66 feet in width.
  - g. A 50-foot half-width shall be required for all primary street rights-of-way abutting a condominium project.
3. Sidewalks. Sidewalks shall be provided on both sides of any transportation network within the

condominium development.

4. Utilities. Public water and sanitary sewer shall be provided as part of the development. All private utilities shall be placed underground.

61.400: Approval process.

1. Special exception use. An application for a condominium project shall be made in accordance to the procedures for a Special Exception Use set for in Section 60.200 and the requirements outlined herein.
2. Optional pre-application review. An informational pre-application review is encouraged and may be scheduled with the Planning Department. The pre-application review may either be with Township staff or the Planning Commission per the applicants request.
3. Site plan review. A site plan, per the requirements of Section 82.000 shall be submitted for Planning Commission review.
4. The following information shall also be provided as part of the special exception use application:
  - a. The legal documents for any easement, deed restrictions, reservations, etc. proposed within the project.
  - b. The master deed and by-laws for the condominium project.
5. Approval of the site plan and condominium documents by the Planning Commission shall be required as a condition to the right to construct, expand or convert a condominium project. No permits for erosion control, building construction, grading, or installation of public water or sanitary sewer facilities shall be issued for property in a condominium development until a final site plan has been approved by the Township Planning Commission and is in effect.