

# **COLUMBIA TOWNSHIP**

## **Summary Comparison**

of the

## **Current Zoning Ordinance in Effect**

and the

## **December 21, 2015 Draft Zoning Ordinance**

*February 4, 2016*

The information presented in this Summary Comparison strives to provide an overview of the most current draft of a new Columbia Township Zoning Ordinance, dated December 21, 2015, and highlight the more substantive differences between this draft and the current Columbia Township Zoning Ordinance in effect. Such a comparison is challenging due to the vagueness of the current Ordinance and seemingly conflicting provisions in some cases, and the differing wording used by the two documents. Still, this summary reasonably captures principal departures from the current Zoning Ordinance in effect.

***This summary information is not a substitute for a careful reading of the draft December 21, 2015 Zoning Ordinance.***

## Article 1: Title and Purpose

Section 1.2 addresses the purpose of the Ordinance and carries forward the specific wording of the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act (MZEA).

## Article 2: General Administration, Enforcement and Penalties

The Michigan Zoning Enabling Act (MZEA) stipulates that a zoning ordinance must specify the manner of administering and enforcing the ordinance. Beyond that requirement, the Act does not generally make specific requirements as to how the administration is to be carried out. This Article presents the general administrative scheme for the Ordinance.

- 1) Draft Section 2.2 clarifies up-front that a Zoning Permit and Building Permit are required for construction. Subsection (C) specifies the limited Zoning Permit exceptions, a matter about which the current Ordinance in effect is vague.
- 2) Draft Section 2.4 describes the general review and approval procedures for Zoning Permit applications. Draft Section 2.4(A) addresses a number of application issues including the necessity for a plot plan or site plan, and refers the reader to the various other Articles that may have relevance. The current Ordinance in effect lacks any clear overview of this nature.
- 3) Section 2.4(B) presents the specific review and approval process for single family and two-family dwellings – the majority of future development in the township and a matter about which the current Ordinance in effect is vague. The required plot plan information is far more extensive than which is required by Sec. 9.4.1 of the current Ordinance in effect including a legal description and a property line survey. The current Ordinance in effect lacks any clear process specific to single family and two-family dwellings.
- 4) Draft Section 2.4(C) addresses, in part, the expiration of zoning permits. These provisions are more detailed and extensive than Sec. 9.4.2 of the current Ordinance in effect in order to address various unanswered questions. While current Sec. 9.4.2 requires construction to be completed within 1.5 years of the permit issuance, the draft Section 2.4(C) requires construction to have passed its first building inspection within one year of the permit issuance (very common approach) and provides for waivers under certain conditions.
- 5) Draft Sections 2.6 (Performance Guarantees), 2.7 (Timely Action on Applications), and 2.8 (Application Fees) are included in Article 2 so that similar sections need not be unnecessarily replicated in subsequent Articles. The Section 2.6 (Performance Guarantees) provisions are generally based on the requirements of the MZEA which stipulates the purpose of such guarantees and what the guarantees may cover, and the return of a guarantee. The Section 2.7 (Timely Action on Applications) provisions are intended to ensure township officials do not unnecessarily delay action on an application (something the courts frown upon) while, at the same time, assuring adequate time to responsibly act upon an application. The current ordinance in effect is silent on performance guarantees and timely action on applications, or is otherwise vague, and devotes only several sentences to the matter of fees.
- 6) Draft Section 2.9 expressly authorizes the Zoning Administrator to make site inspections, though also recognizing that the Zoning Administrator may need a search warrant should access to the property be denied by the owner. The current Ordinance in effect is vague on this matter.
- 7) Draft Section 2.10 addresses violations. The provisions are more detailed but substantively similar to Section 9.7 of the current Zoning Ordinance in effect. The provisions continue to treat ordinance violations as misdemeanors except where the violation involves failure to obtain a zoning permit prior to commencement of construction, in which case the violation is classified as a civil infraction.
- 8) Draft Section 2.11 addresses public hearing notice requirements according to the MZEA. This section avoids the necessity for having to duplicate these provisions throughout the document. The current Ordinance in effect relies on outdated notice requirements.

### **Article 3, Zoning Districts, Regulations and Map**

Refer to page 13 for an overview of the proposed districts and how they compare to the current Zoning Ordinance in effect.

### **Article 4, Planned Unit Development (PUD) District**

Planned unit developments (PUDs) allow for projects that may well be viewed as beneficial to the Township but, because of the limitations of the conventional zoning district standards in which the parcel is located, such a project cannot be pursued (such as a mixed use development consisting of commercial and residential uses).

PUDs are addressed in multiple locations in the current Zoning Ordinance in effect including the *Planned Unit Residential District, Planned Commercial District and Planned Industrial District*. Each of these sections provides limited direction to the applicant and they all rely on repetitive wording. None of the districts correlate the appropriateness of an acceptable PUD application with its compatibility with the Master Plan, and the existing provisions make potentially beneficial projects and/or parcels ineligible as PUDs.

Draft Article 4 presents a clearer singular set of provisions applicable to all PUDs, whether of a predominately residential, commercial or industrial character. According to draft Article 4, PUD approval requires a rezoning of the subject property to a "PUD District" designation and the rezoning is tied to a preliminary site plan. Actual construction cannot be initiated until a final site plan is submitted and approved. There are multiple instances where Article 4 emphasizes that a PUD is not intended to undermine the planning policies of the Township or be otherwise inconsistent with the Master Plan.

### **Article 5: Reserved for Future Use**

This Article is reserved for future use to address district matters that may arise as part of a lengthy amendment and that would not be appropriate to include in any of the other Articles.

### **Article 6: Nonconforming Lots, Uses and Structures**

Article 6 addresses nonconformities that may arise as a result of new provisions in the ordinance that may cause certain existing lots, uses or structures to no longer conform to zoning provisions. This draft Article generally corresponds to Article VIII of the current Ordinance in effect. The overall intent of the provisions is to clarify that nonconformities cannot be expanded or altered so as to increase their nonconformity and that upon the removal/destruction of such nonconformity, the use or structure must thereafter conform to the provisions of the Ordinance.

- a. Draft Section 6.2 provides that any nonconforming lot may be used for a permissible use provided all other requirements of the Ordinance are met unless variances are otherwise issued by the ZBA. This is in contrast to Section 8.7 of the current Ordinance in effect which grants discretionary approval authority to the Township Board for nonconforming lots less than 10,000 sq. ft. in area. Denying the use of a lawful lot raises questions of "unconstitutional taking" without just compensation.
- b. Draft Section 6.2 provides that two nonconforming lots under same ownership and sharing continuous frontage shall be considered one lot for zoning purposes. Section 8.7 of the current Ordinance in effect does not address this matter.
- c. Draft Section 6.3(A)(5) provides that a nonconforming use can be replaced with of nonconforming use of lesser nonconformity, and that the ZBA shall be the deciding body regarding the determination of whether the replacement use is less nonconforming. The current Ordinance in effect does not authorize such a substitution.
- d. Draft Section 6.4(A)(2) permits the replacement of a nonconforming structure provided a building permit is issued within one (1) year of the previous structure's destruction, and the replacement structure is completed to an extent equal to fifty percent (50%) or more of its construction cost within two (2) years of such destruction. Section 8.3(b) of the current Ordinance in effect establishes no time limitations.

- e. Draft Section 6.4(A)(4) addresses repairs and maintenance to nonconforming structures, and increases the permitted dollar value for repairs from the current 10% to 25% of the structure's replacement cost.
- f. Draft Section 6.6 clarifies that illegal nonconforming conditions are not protected under the provisions of Article 6. Article VIII of the current Ordinance in effect does not clearly address this matter.
- g. There are several instances in Article VIII of the current Ordinance in effect that make reference to destruction of a nonconforming structure by more than *"50% of the structure's replacement cost."* The draft Article 6 expressly exempts the replacement cost for the foundation from such calculations as the foundation replacement cost is not relevant if the structure is to be located on the same foundation.

### **Article 7: Standards and Regulations for Specific Land Uses**

This Article presents site development requirements for specific uses. The current Zoning Ordinance is silent on this matter, relying solely on traditional site development criteria such as generalized lot area, lot width, and setback standards. The exceptions are Sec. 5.12.7.F (Telecommunication Facilities) and Sec. 7.17 (Bed and Breakfasts) of the current Ordinance.

The additional standards of draft Article 7 are intended to better ensure that the potential negative impacts of certain new land uses are minimized including in regard to adjacent properties and the township as a whole. Most modern zoning ordinances include some sort of section like Article 7 though the specific content, scope of standards, and level of detail may vary considerably.

This Article reflects one of the most substantive departures from the current Ordinance in effect. This Article may be perceived as unnecessary, overly restrictive, and/or unnecessarily increasing the bulk of the Ordinance. On the other hand, the provisions of Article 7 enable officials to treat similar uses in a more consistent fashion, encourage consistent decision-making, and minimize negative impacts of new development.

- 1. Draft Section 7.1(B) clarifies that the site development standards of Table 3-4 of Article 3 shall apply except where different standards are set forth in Article 7.
- 2. Draft Section 7.3 addresses bed and breakfasts. The draft provisions include considerably greater standards aimed at ensuring a bed and breakfast does not evolve into something other than what was envisioned. Some of the current Ordinance's provisions have not been carried over to draft Section 7.3 because they are already addressed elsewhere in the new Ordinance.
- 3. Draft Section 7.9 addresses extraction operations. The Michigan Zoning Enabling Act (MZEA) was amended by PA 113 of 2011 (effective July 20, 2011) in a very significant and far reaching manner. The MZEA was amended to provide, in part, that a zoning ordinance cannot prevent the extraction, by mining, of valuable natural resources from any property (any district) unless "very serious consequences" would result from such extraction. Tables 3-2 and 3-3 of Article 3 permit extraction operations as a special land use in all districts and Section 7.9(F) addresses this "no very serious consequences" issues (based on the wording of PA 113).
- 4. Draft Section 7.19 addresses Open Space Preservation Communities. The Michigan Zoning Enabling Act (MZEA) requires, generally, that in any district that limits residential densities to two dwellings or less per acre, the landowner must be given the opportunity to attain the same number of lots relying on lesser minimum lot areas than normally required provided the landowner sets aside a minimum of 50% of the parcel in a permanent open space status and adequate provisions are in place for potable water and sewage disposal. Section 7.19 addresses this matter. Subsection (B)(2) permits a 25% increase in the number of lots/dwellings as a means to encourage this form of development. The current Ordinance in effect is silent or otherwise vague on Open Space Preservation Communities as mandated by the MZEA.

5. Draft Section 7.26 addresses wireless communication facilities (cell towers). The Michigan Zoning Enabling Act (MZEA) was amended by Public Act 143 of 2012 (PA 143, effective May 24, 2012) to establish provisions regarding the local regulation of communication tower facilities. PA 143 provides, in summary, that wireless communications equipment must not be subject to special land use approval if the communications equipment is collocated on a legal existing support structure or in an existing equipment compound. Exceptions that enable such communications equipment to be subject to special land use approval are in the cases where the equipment increases the existing tower height more than 10% or 20' (the greater of the two), increases the width of the wireless communications support structure by more than the minimum necessary to permit collocation, or increases the area of the existing equipment compound to more than 2,500 square feet.

Draft Section 7.26 differentiates between Class 1 and Class 2 wireless communication facilities – the Class 2 facilities principally being new towers and subject to special land use approval. The provisions of Section 7.26(B) and (C)(1) regarding review time lines and fees are largely excerpts from PA 143. Some of the current Ordinance's provisions (Sec. 5.12(F)) have not been carried over to draft Section 7.26 because they are already addressed elsewhere in the new Ordinance (bonding, landscaping, etc.).

The current Ordinance in effect does not address wireless communication facilities as mandated by the MZEA.

### **Article 8: Reserved for Future Use**

This Article is reserved for future use to address site development standards that many arise that would not be appropriate to include in any of the other Articles.

### **Article 9: Signs**

Article 9 addresses signage and takes into consideration the recent Supreme Court decision in *Reed v Gilbert*, which requires increased flexibility regarding the message(s) that may be displayed on a sign.

1. Section 9.1 presents the purpose statement for the Article – to balance the need for information and advertising with interests in protecting community character and minimizing visual clutter and traffic hazards. This section is substantively similar to the current Ordinance in effect.
2. Section 9.2 presents definitions for important terms and phrases. The definitions in the current Ordinance were used as a guide but considerable changes were made:
  - a. Various defined sign terms in the current Ordinance are not actually used in the Ordinance's sign regulations, and have been deleted
  - b. Some of the terms that are used in only one or two places in the sign regulations have been defined within the regulatory sentence addressing the particular matter, so the reader does not have to flip-flop back and forth between definitions and regulations.
  - c. Some new terms/definitions have been included, such as “electronic message center sign (EMC)” and “ground sign”.
3. Section 9.3 addresses a variety of general sign regulation issues such as review/permitting procedures, materials and construction, lighting, and prohibited signs. This section incorporates various elements of the current Ordinance and provides additional provisions to address critical issues about which the current Ordinance is silent. The more significant differences between the draft provisions of this section and the current Ordinance include:
  - a. Subsection (A)(2) provides for the Planning Commission to be the approving body of a sign as part of its site plan approval responsibilities except where the building already exists, in which case the Zoning Administrator is the approving body. The current ordinance grants approval to the Zoning Administrator in all cases.

- b. Subsection (A)(4) clarifies the signs that are exempt from the need for a zoning compliance permit but which must still comply with all other standards and regulations of the Article. This list of exempt signs is broader than the current Ordinance.
  - c. Subsection (B) addresses sign materials and construction, a matter about which the current Ordinance addresses to a limited extent only.
  - d. Subsection (C) addresses the lighting of signs and is far more detailed than the provisions of the current Ordinance. This subsection addresses EMC signs – a matter about which the current Ordinance is silent.
  - e. Subsection (D) addresses the measuring of sign areas and heights. The current Ordinance provides limited detail regarding sign measurements.
4. Section 9.4 identifies signs permitted in ALL districts. The signs authorized under this Section are typically more “minor” in character such as home addresses, home occupation signs, bed and breakfast signs, political signs and other temporary signs. This section does NOT apply to wall and freestanding signs in association with the identification of a business, public facility, special land use, and other principal uses of a lot (typically). These more “major” signs are addressed in Section 9.5.
  5. Section 9.6 presents the sign standards for each district. This table addresses standards for the principal signage associated with the development of a lot, such as a freestanding sign and/or wall sign in association with a business, an institution, or an industrial property.
    - a. Maximum sign heights have generally been reduced. For example, the authorized 35’ sign height for commercial districts was reduced to 5’ to 10’ in the interest of protecting community character and minimizing visual clutter.
    - b. Maximum sign areas have generally been reduced to be more in line with rural communities and community character preservation goals.
    - c. The current Ordinance is silent or otherwise vague on the matter of signage for a “business center” where multiple buildings or tenants are present. The Table 9-1 “Special Provisions” address this matter.
  6. Section 9.7 identifies additional non-temporary signs permitted in all districts, a matter about which the current ordinance is silent or otherwise vague.
  7. Section 9.8 identifies additional temporary signs permitted in all districts and generally corresponds to Sec. 7.2.10 of the current Ordinance but is very different in character due to the recent Supreme Court decision in *Reed v Gilbert*.
  8. Section 9.9 addresses off-premises signs and generally corresponds to Sec. 7.2.9 of the current Ordinance, except that unlike the current Ordinance, Section 9.9 authorizes off-premises directional signs in addition to billboards.

## **Article 10: Off-Street Parking**

This Article presents provisions addressing off-street parking and loading. This draft Article corresponds most closely to Sec. 7.3 and 7.4 of the current Ordinance. The draft Article 10 is far more comprehensive in scope and detail than the current Ordinance, but is not contrary to the current Ordinance’s provisions in any particularly substantive manner.

1. Draft Sec. 10.3(B)(3) establishes minimum driveway setbacks from intersections and lot lines for those driveways serving non-residential uses. The current Ordinance is silent on this matter.
2. Draft Sec. 10.3(C) addresses the surfacing of off-street parking areas. The current Ordinance is silent on this matter.
3. Draft Sec. 10.3(E) requires that off-street parking areas comply with the same setbacks as required for the principal building except in Commercial Districts, in which the setbacks range from 5’ to 20’. This is in contrast to the current Ordinance which requires an across-the-board 5’ setback.

4. Draft Sec. 10.3(H) includes provisions for service drives and the connection of adjacent driveways, to encourage access management along important thoroughfares. The current Ordinance is silent on this matter.
5. Draft Sec. 10.4 presents the requirements for parking spaces per specific use. These requirements are generally similar to the current Ordinance but they have been revised according to common contemporary practice, including interest in minimizing unused parking areas. Section 10.4(A) permits the Planning Commission to reduce the number of required parking spaces during site plan review proceedings rather than require the applicant to seek a variance.
6. Draft Sec. 10.5 establishes specific standards for loading/unloading areas. The draft provisions addressing required number of spaces are less stringent than those of the current Ordinance and more realistic. This section also addresses screening and setbacks, matters about which the current Ordinance is silent.

#### **Article 11: Landscaping and Screening**

Article 11 presents landscaping and screening requirements for uses subject to site plan approval. Accordingly, this Article does not apply to single family dwellings but, rather, to uses such as commercial and industrial development, institutions, and multiple family developments. The provisions identify under what conditions landscaping/screening must be provided, the minimum width of such areas, and the minimum standards for plant material contained within including spacing and size. The current Ordinance includes no comprehensive set of landscaping/screening provisions.

#### **Article 12: Environmental Protection**

This Article is intended to better assure environmental protection without placing a burden on the Township to regulate activities already addressed by state or federal authorities. The current Zoning Ordinance is somewhat silent on these matters.

#### **Article 13: Access and Private Roads**

The majority of this Article is devoted to the regulation of private roads. The Article establishes review procedures, application requirements, and design standards. The current Zoning Ordinance authorizes private roads but does not provide any substantive regulations addressing the matter.

#### **Article 14: Site Plan Review**

1. Draft Section 14.2 requires the submittal and approval of a site plan for nearly all uses except single and two-family dwellings, which are subject to plot plan approval by the Zoning Administrator.
2. Draft Section 14.3 presents the site plan review process. Section 14.3(A) permits an applicant to seek approval of a “preliminary plan” prior to the submittal of a final site plan (as requested) and addresses basic matters pertaining to this optional submittal. The current Ordinance in effect is silent on this matter.
3. Draft Section 14.3 (B) presents the required format and scope of information for a site plan. The draft Section 14.3(B) requires the same general scope of information as required by the current Zoning Ordinance in effect but it is presented in a more concise manner. These provisions permit the Planning Commission to waive specific submittal items due to the particular character of a proposed development or site or surrounding conditions – something the current Ordinance in effect does not permit.
4. Draft Section 14.3 (C) provides for the Planning Commission to be the final approving body of site plans, in contrast to the current Ordinance in effect that makes the Township Board the final approving body.
5. Draft Section 14.4 presents the site plan approval standards. The draft Section 14.4 standards are substantively similar to those of Sec. 6.6 of the current Ordinance in effect except for the addition of a standard regarding project phasing (Sec. 14.4(B)(8)).

6. Draft Section 14.6 addresses site plan changes and provides that the Zoning Administrator may approve “minor” changes only. These provisions are in contrast to the current Ordinance in effect (Sec. 6.11) which permit the Zoning Administrator to be the approving body for additions as large as 10,000 sq. ft. and greater. In addition, draft Section 14.6 is more detailed in clarifying the scope of changes subject to Zoning Administrator approval.
7. Draft Section 14.7 addresses the expiration of an approved site plan. Draft Section 14.7 provides that a site plan’s validity shall expire upon the expiration of the Zoning Permit. This approach ensures that the validity of the Zoning Permit and site plan is coordinated with one another. This is in contrast to the current Ordinance in effect (Sec. 6.5.F) which provides that the site plan expires one year after approval by the township. See draft Section 2.4(C) regarding the validity of a zoning permit.

#### **Article 15: Special Land Uses**

- 1) Draft Section 15.2 specifies the procedures for processing special land use applications and provides for final approval by the Planning Commission, as compared to the current Ordinance in effect which grants final approval authority to the Township Board.
- 2) Section 15.2(B)(1) clarifies that action on a special land use application generally follows the same procedures as for site plan review except for a required public hearing.
- 3) Section 15.2(B)(2) clarifies that action on a special land use application involves approval (or denial) of the use and site plan as a single unified proposal. This Article does not allow the approval of the use itself and then the subsequent approval of a site plan. Evaluating the merits of a special land use application requires an awareness of how the use is to be arranged on the site and its impacts on the site and, as such, the use and site plan must be acted upon as a single proposal. The current Ordinance in effect is vague regarding this matter.
- 4) Draft Section 15.3 provides that an appeal of the special land use decision must go to the circuit court only. Appeals to the ZBA are not authorized. The current Ordinance in effect is vague on this matter.
- 5) Draft Section 15.5 addresses changes to an approved special land use application, a matter about which the current Zoning Ordinance is silent.
- 6) Draft Section 15.6 presents the general approval standards for special land uses and is substantively similar to the current Ordinance in effect (Sec. 5.6).
- 7) Draft Section 15.7 provides for the expiration of a special land use permit where the use has been abandoned or has been otherwise inactive for a period of more than three (3) years. The current Ordinance is silent on this matter.

#### **Article 16: Zoning Board of Appeals**

Draft Article 16 is far more detailed, and provides far more direction to officials, applicants and the general public, as compared to Article X of the current Ordinance including step-by-step procedures and standards for evaluating applications for appeals, interpretations, and variances. Sections 16.1 through 16.4 largely duplicate excerpts or requirements of the MZEA. Section 16.8 is an excerpt from the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act and is included to highlight the significance of the ZBA’s actions.

#### **Article 17: Zoning Map and Text Amendments**

Draft Article 17 is far more detailed, and provides far more direction to officials, applicants and the general public, as compared to Article XI of the current Ordinance including step-by-step procedures and standards for evaluating petitions for text amendments and rezonings. The overall procedures are based on the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act.

#### **Article 18 and 19: Reserved for Future Use**

## Article 20: Supplemental Provisions

This Article addresses numerous miscellaneous zoning issues, many of which are not specific to particular districts. Below is a summary of each Section in this Article with particular attention to how the subject matter relates to the current Ordinance in effect, including instances where substantive changes have been made.

Section 20.2 – Conditional Approvals, provides the basis for conditions that may be attached to certain approvals, and is largely an exact excerpt from the Zoning Enabling Act. It is included in this Article rather than duplicating the provisions throughout the ordinance such as in the case of site plan approval, special land use approval, and variances. The current Ordinance in effect authorizes conditional approvals but does not address the legal requirements of such conditions.

Section 20.3 – Moving Buildings, does not correspond to any provisions of the current Ordinance in effect. The current Ordinance is silent or otherwise vague regarding this matter.

Section 20.4 – Essential Services, corresponds to Sec. 2.1 of the current Ordinance in effect and provides for no substantive changes other than to further clarify and broaden the scope of facilities that are not exempt from review under draft Sec. 20.4 such as utility storage yards and substations.

Section 20.5 – One Dwelling Unit / Principal Use per Lot, clarifies that only one dwelling may be established on a lot unless the Ordinance expressly provides otherwise, and that only one principal use may be established on a lot except within a Commercial or Industrial District and where expressly authorized according to an approved site plan. The current Ordinance in effect does not clearly address these matters.

Section 20.6 – Single Family Dwelling Standards, carries forward the substance of Section 2.3.44 of the current Ordinance in effect.

Section 20.7 - Temporary Dwellings, authorizes temporary dwellings in association with new home construction and the repair of a damaged permanent dwelling, and carries forward the general intent of Sec. 7.8(B) of the current Ordinance in effect. This draft Section also provides greater clarification regarding the parking of a recreational vehicle on the same lot as a permanent dwelling for visitation purposes – a matter addressed under Sec. 7.8(C) of the current Ordinance. The draft provisions permit this latter condition to occur no greater than seven days in any 30-day period. The current Ordinance uses the same 7-day standard but does not clarify within what time frame the seven days is permitted.

Section 20.8, Accessory Buildings and Structures, carries forward the substantive provisions of Section 4.5.5 of the current Ordinance in addition to the inclusion of new provisions addressing the following:

1. Subsection (B) exempts the necessity for a permit for structures no more than 200 sq. ft. in area, in the interest of minimizing administration burdens for all parties, but such structure must still comply with the standards of Sec. 20.8.
2. Subsection (C)(1) introduces a new provision prohibiting an accessory structure in a front yard except in the case where the structure does not exceed 200 sq. ft. and is of open construction (gazebo). This provision applies to all Districts.
3. Subsection (C)(4) requires that accessory buildings and structures shall not interfere with utilities – a matter about which the current Ordinance is silent.
4. Subsection (D) permits accessory structures to be of the same maximum height as applicable to the principal building, a carry-over from the current Sec. 4.5.5.
5. Subsection (E) presents provisions addressing the total area of a lot that may be occupied by accessory structures – a matter about which the current Ordinance is silent.
6. Subsection (F) is a new provision that prohibits the use of an accessory building as a dwelling.
7. Subsection (G) is a new provision that prohibits the erection of accessory buildings and structures prior to the establishment of a principal structure except where certain minimum conditions are met including that the structure not exceed two-hundred (200) square feet in area and twelve (12) feet in height. In addition, in recognition of the many garages on separate lots across from the dwellings that they serve in the lake areas, subsection (G) also provides an exemption for this arrangement.

Section 20.9 – Home Occupations, is quite different than Sec. 7.16 of the current Ordinance in effect. The current Ordinance is vague as to whether a home occupation must be within a dwelling (versus an accessory building) and the Sec. 7.16 standards do not address a number of important issues regarding home occupations. In addition to expanding the scope of standards to address such matters as traffic and floor area, draft Sec. 20.9 establish two classes of home occupations. Class 1 home occupations are those in a dwelling. Class 2 occupations are those in an accessory building and are classified as a special land use.

Section 20.10 – Prohibited Vehicles in Residential Districts, addresses the same issue as Sec. 7.3.3 of the current Ordinance in effect, but provides greater clarification of prohibited and permitted vehicles. Like the current Sec. 7.3.3, draft Sec.20.10 does not apply to the Agricultural District.

Section 20.11 – Residential Outdoor Living Areas (Terraces, Patios, and Decks), addresses setback provisions for decks, patios, and similar features. The current Ordinance in effect is silent on this matter or otherwise unclear.

Section 20.12 – Keeping of Animals as Accessory Residential Use, presents provisions addressing the keeping of animals as accessory residential uses and does NOT apply to farms. The current Ordinance in effect is silent on this matter aside from a brief Sec. 4.6. Unlike the existing Sec. 4.6, the provisions of draft Sec. 20.12 permit the keeping of a wider scope of livestock and present a wider scope of standards to minimize conflicts.

Section 20.13 – Roadside Stands, requires that roadside stands comply with the most current Generally Accepted Agricultural Management Practices (GAAMPs) as published by the Michigan Agriculture Commission. The current Ordinance does not establish specific standards for roadside stands and draft Sec. 20.14 carries forward this same condition. The Right to Farm Act provides that a local unit of government shall not enact, maintain, or enforce an ordinance, regulation, or resolution that conflicts in any manner with any GAAMPs unless first approved by the state. However, the township does have the authority to regulate matters pertaining to setbacks, signage, driveways and parking, if so desired.

Section 20.14 – Fences and Walls, addresses residential and non-residential fences and walls. The Section carries forward the substance of Sections 7.18 – 7.20 of the current Ordinance in effect. The draft Sec. 20.14 introduces a single new provision regarding residential fences – that in the case of a fence within twenty (20) feet of a dwelling on an abutting lot, the finished side of the fence shall face the abutting lot

Section 20.15 – Outdoor Residential Swimming Pools, presents expanded provisions about outdoor swimming pools as compared to Sec. 7.21 of the current Ordinance in effect, which only provides that such pools must comply with the state construction code.

Section 20.16, – Outdoor Display, Sales, and Storage, does not directly correspond to any section in the current Ordinance. This Section prohibits outdoor display, sales and storage in association with a commercial or industrial use except where expressly authorized by the site plan approving body and provided adequate screening is installed to mitigate negative impacts on surrounding land uses.

Section 20.17 – Site Condominiums, is intended to ensure site condominiums are subject to the same standards and procedures as more traditional platted subdivisions. The current Ordinance in effect is largely silent or otherwise vague on this matter.

Section 20.18 – Storage of Recreational Vehicles, regulates the storage of recreational vehicles and permits the cumulative storage of up to 28 linear feet of recreational vehicle length, and permits the cumulative storage of up to 28 linear feet of motorized watercraft length, provided the total number of all motorized watercraft and other recreational vehicles does not exceed four. The current ordinance (Sec. 7.23) permits unlimited personal vehicles and four additional vehicles/watercraft unless a greater number is approved by special land use approval.

Section 20.19 – Outdoor Boilers, does not correspond to any area of regulation in the current Ordinance in effect, but does take into consideration the draft regulations previously prepared by the township (but never adopted). The principal points of divergence from the previous township-prepared regulations are:

- a. The draft Section 20.19 provisions do not permit a reduction of the chimney height to less than 10', as allowed by the previous township-prepared draft provisions. In recognition that a boiler needs to be only 200' from a dwelling on an adjacent lot, a minimum 10' height is considered very lenient. Many communities require that a chimney be at least 2' higher than the roof peak of any dwelling with 200' (sometimes more) of the boiler. It is impossible for a Building Inspector to predict whether a lesser height will or will not result in a nuisance as there are a multitude of factors that come into play on any given day including wind speed, wind direction, humidity, wood dryness, and topography.
- b. The draft Section 20.20 provisions do not prohibit boilers that generate particulates into the air, as do the previously prepared provisions. All burning of wood generate particulates. However, as in the previous draft provisions, the provisions below require compliance with the EPA's Phase 2 boiler standards for emissions.

Section 20.20 – Temporary Non-Residential Buildings and Uses, does not correspond to any area of regulation in the current Ordinance in effect.

Section 20.21 – Medical Marihuana, does not correspond to any area of regulation in the current Ordinance in effect.

## Article 21, Definitions

Article 21 includes important terms and definitions. The vast majority of the definitions in the current Columbia Township Zoning Ordinance in effect, and draft Article 21, are similar in substance but not identical in wording. The wording has been revised throughout in an effort to present the terms in a clearer manner, provide important clarifications of the definitions, address contemporary issues and matters of law, and maintain consistent wording throughout the body of the Ordinance.

1. Omitted Terms: There are terms included in the current Ordinance in effect that have not been included in draft Article 21. They have been omitted because the same terminology is not used in the draft Ordinance, or the terms are adequately described in the body of the Ordinance so that a separate definition in Article 21 is not necessary, or the specific term in the current Ordinance in effect is not actually used in the balance of the current Ordinance in any regulatory manner. Examples of omitted terms include block, bulk, coin operated device, conditional use, contractible and conversion condominium, dwelling area, floor area ratio, greenbelt, office park, quarry, screen, and specially designated distributor's/merchant's establishment.

Please note that the lengthy list of definitions regarding sexually oriented businesses (adult entertainment) will be presented in Article 7 in which the specific topic will be addressed.

Please also note that the term "farm" has been replaced with "agriculture" because "agriculture" is more descriptive of the use itself. In addition, all terms associated with concentrated livestock operations (animal feed lots, piggeries, etc.) have been deleted. This has been done in recognition that since the Michigan Commission of Agriculture adopted Generally Accepted Agricultural Management Practices for Concentrated Livestock Operations, classifying such uses as a "conditional use" or "special land use" in a district that permits agriculture will not likely withstand a legal challenge.

2. New Terms: Numerous terms in draft Article 21 are "new" in that they are not included in the definitions section of the current Ordinance in effect including, but not limited to:

<i>Abutting</i>	<i>Erected</i>	<i>Public facility</i>
<i>Adjacent</i>	<i>Hospital</i>	<i>Recycling center</i>
<i>Assisted living facilities</i>	<i>Landscaping services</i>	<i>Restaurant, Class 1 &amp; 2 Road</i>
<i>Berm</i>	<i>Livestock</i>	<i>Private road</i>
<i>Building code</i>	<i>Lot lines</i>	<i>Sawmill</i>
<i>Building permit</i>	<i>Manufactured housing</i>	<i>Shooting Range</i>
<i>Cemetery</i>	<i>Marina</i>	<i>Special land use</i>
<i>Certificate of Occupancy</i>	<i>Medical Clinic</i>	<i>Stable (commercial/private)</i>
<i>Church</i>	<i>Mini-storage</i>	<i>Swimming pool</i>
<i>Club</i>	<i>Ordinary high water mark</i>	<i>Tavern</i>
<i>Convalescent home</i>	<i>Plot plan</i>	<i>Truck terminal</i>
<i>Day care center</i>	<i>Principal building/use</i>	<i>Vehicle/Car Wash</i>
<i>Driveway</i>	<i>Private Landing Strip</i>	<i>Veterinary Clinic</i>

3. Substantive Modifications: In some cases, substantive changes have been made to the definitions included in the current Ordinance in effect. For example:
  - a. The definition of "bed and breakfast" was substantially revised to clarify that it includes a structure that was originally constructed for single family residential purposes.
  - b. The definitions of "condominium" terms were expanded considerably to add important clarification.
  - c. The definition of "family" was substantially revised and expanded in recognition of case law.
  - d. The draft definition of "lot area" allows the inclusion of the road right-of-way/easement area in the lot area computation where the required lot area must be a minimum of 10 acres. This is common practice but typically not expressly clarified (nor required).

- e. The definition of “roadside stand” was simplified to maintain compatibility with the Generally Accepted Agricultural Management Practices for Farm Markets adopted by the Michigan Commission of Agriculture.
- f. Unlike the current Ordinance in effect, the definitions of draft Article 21 do not mix standards and regulations in a definition. Mixing regulations with a definition is discouraged as it leads to variable interpretation, undermining of administration efforts, and conflicting provisions. Standards and regulations applicable to specific uses will be addressed in Article 7 (yet to be submitted).

# Article 3

## Summary Comparison of the Existing Zoning Districts and Draft Ordinance Districts

The information presented in this Summary Comparison strives to highlight zoning district differences between the current Ordinance in effect and draft Article 3 (dated December 21, 2015). A clear and comprehensive comparison is challenging due to the vagueness (in instances) of the current Ordinance and the differing wording used by the two documents. Still, this summary reasonably captures principle departures from the current Ordinance in effect.

Article 3 presents the principal provisions pertaining to the districts including the purpose of each district, the uses permitted in each district, and the basic site development standards for each district. Most of the provisions are presented in tabular form.

1. Table 3-1 identifies the purpose of each proposed District.
2. Table 3-2 and 3-3 identify the principal uses permitted in each District. A community can exercise considerable discretion regarding what uses should be permitted in each District and which should be permitted “by right” (subject to plot plan/site plan approval) versus by “special land use.” The two tables are based on a number of factors including the current Zoning Ordinance, the Master Plan and the discretion of the Planning Commission.
3. Table 3-4 identifies the basic site development requirements for each District (lot area, width, etc.). The overall structure for the Districts is generally based on the current Ordinance’s provisions, along with the addition of several new districts.

There are two new districts being proposed:

1. The RR Rural Residential District (minimum 20,000 sq. ft., 30,000 without sewer) is being established to provide a “transition” district between the AG District (minimum 1-acre) and the RS District (minimum 10,000 sq. ft.).
2. The RU Urban Residential District (minimum 5,000 sq. ft.) is being established in recognition that the MF Multiple Family District will no longer permit single family dwellings and as such, a new district is necessary to accommodate small-lot subdivisions.

### Article 3 Summary – Part 1

#### Relationship Between Draft Article 3 Districts and Current Ordinance Districts

Districts in Draft Article 3	General Relationship to Districts in Current Zoning Ordinance in Effect
AG Agricultural →	Replaces current AG-1 Agricultural
RR Residential Rural →	<i>New District / No similar district</i>
RS Residential Suburban →	Replaces current RS-1 Single Family Suburban Residential
RLS Residential Lake Suburban →	Replaces current RLS-1 Lake Residential
RU Residential Urban →	<i>New District / No similar district</i>
R-MF Residential Multiple Family →	Replaces current RM-1 Multiple Family
R-MHC Manufactured Housing Community →	Replaces current MH-1 Mobile Home District
GO General Office →	<i>New District / No similar district</i>
C-1 Commercial Local →	Replaces C-1 Local Commercial District
C-2 Commercial General →	Replaces C-2 General Commercial
C-3 Commercial Highway Service →	Replaces C-3 Highway Service Commercial
I-1 Industrial Light →	Replaces I-1 Light Industrial
I-2 Industrial General →	Replaces I-2 General Industrial
PUD Planned Unit Development →	Replaces Planned Residential District, Planned Commercial District and Planned Industrial District

The draft district boundaries for the new Zoning Map generally correspond to the existing district boundaries, with the most substantial changes being:

1. The RS-1 zoned land located in Sec. 26 and Sec. 35, which lies north of Cement Rd., east of Hewitt Rd., and south of Turk Rd., is to be changed to AG-1.
2. The RL-1 and RS-1 zoned land located west of Vineyard Lake in Sec. 29 and Sec. 32, that is not comprised of small-lot subdivisions along the local roads such as Spicer, Bellflower, Alameda, Ventura and Laguna (by example only), is to be changed to AG-1. The land being changed is comprised of large acreage parcels (more than several acres) including the far southern limits of the lake.
3. The RS-1 land located along Hyde Road in Sec. 7 and Sec. 8, which lies between N. Lake Road and Reed Road, is to be changed to AG-1.
4. The RS-1 land along the south side of Reed Road in Sec. 7 is to be changed to AG-1.
5. The large RS-1 parcel (approximately 80 acres) along the east side of Hayes Road in Sec. 33 is to be changed to AG-1.
6. The RS-1 land between Clark Lake and Jefferson Road to the south, between S. Woodlands Dr. and Ocean Beach Road, is to be changed to AG-1, except any existing RS-1 zoning along Jefferson Road up to a distance of approximately 200' north of the road right-of-way is to remain as RS-1.
7. The RS-1 zoned land south of North Lake Road, between North Lake Road to the west (where it travels north-south) and York Drive to the east, in Sec. 16 and Sec. 17, is to be changed to AG-1, except any existing RS-1 zoning along the north side of North Shore Drive and the approximately five small lots along the east side of Pleasant View Drive extending from North Shore Drive are to remain RS-1.
8. The large I-1 zoned area along US-127, just northwest of Clark Lake, is to extend 1,320' (1/4 mile) east only, with the balance to be changed to AG-1.
9. The C-1 zoned triangular area that is bounded by US-127 to the west, Jefferson Road to the south, and the Grand River to the north, is to be changed to AG-1.
10. The RM-1 zoned area along US-127, south of Jefferson Road, is to be changed to AG-1, and the adjacent C-3 zoning is to be extended further south along US-127 to include the next parcel just south of the gas station).

*Balance of Page Blank*

**Article 3 Summary – Part 2**  
**Principal Changes in Permitted Uses**

The following table strives to highlight differences between the current Ordinance in effect and the attached draft Article 3 (dated September 23, 2013) regarding the uses permitted in each district. **Column A** identifies uses authorized in each district of draft Article 3 that are treated in a manner differently than under the current Ordinance in effect. **Column B** identifies the manner in which the current Ordinance treats the specified use in the particular district. **Column C** identifies the manner in which the draft Article 3 treats the same specified use.

“SLU” = special land use

<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>
<b>Draft Ordinance Districts and Specified Uses</b>	<b>How Current Ordinance Treats Specified Use</b>	<b>How Draft Article 3 Treats This Specified Use</b>
<b>All Districts</b>		
Government Facilities	Varies with district.	Township facilities permitted By Right. Other gov't facilities treated as SLU.
Large buildings	No special provisions	Any use of 10,000 sq. ft. in gross floor area is SLU (excluding agri. / residential uses).
Quarry / Extraction operations	Permitted in AG-1 only, by SLU	Permitted as SLU in all districts (PA 113 of 2011).
<b>AG Agricultural</b> (replaces current AG-1 District)		
Kennels	Permitted By Right	Permitted as SLU
Animal feed lots	Permitted as SLU	Permitted By Right as part of “Agriculture”
Two family dwellings	Permitted as SLU	Permitted By Right
Landscaping services	Prohibited	Permitted By Right
Banquet hall	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Lumber mills	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Day care center	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
<b>RR Residential Rural</b> (new district)	<b><i>New District – Comparison Not Possible</i></b>	
<b>RS Residential Suburban</b> (replaces current RS-1 District)		
Two family dwellings	Permitted as SLU	Permitted By Right
Conservation areas	Prohibited	Permitted by Right
Assisted living facilities	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Day care center	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
<b>RLS Lake Suburban Res.</b> (replaces current RL-1 District)		
Two family dwellings	Permitted as SLU	Prohibited
Marinas	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Conservation areas	Prohibited	Permitted by Right
<b>RU Urban Residential</b> (new district)	<b><i>New District – Comparison Not Possible</i></b>	
<b>R-MHC Manufactured Housing Community</b> (replaces MH-1 District)		
Public schools	Permitted By Right	Permitted as SLU

(table continued next page)

Part 2 Table continued:

“SLU” = special land use

A Draft Ordinance Districts and Specified Uses	B How <u>Current Ordinance</u> Treats Specified Use	C How <u>Draft Article 3</u> Treats This Specified Use
<b>R-MF Multiple Family</b> (replaces current RM-1 District)		
Single family dwellings	Permitted as SLU	Prohibited
Funeral homes	Permitted as SLU	Prohibited
Offices	Permitted as SLU	Prohibited
Hospitals	Permitted as SLU	Prohibited
Assisted living facilities	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Day care center	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
<b>C-1 Commercial Local</b> (replaces current C-1 District)		
Boarding house	Permitted by Right	Prohibited
Movie theaters	Permitted as SLU	Prohibited
Banquet halls	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Marinas	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Funeral homes	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Medical clinics	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Health clubs	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Showrooms (plumbers, etc.)	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Veterinarian clinic	Prohibited	Permitted by Right
Day care center	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
<b>C-2 Commercial General</b> (replaces current C-2 District)		
Service stations	Permitted by Right	Permitted as SLU
Vehicle repair shop	Permitted by Right	Permitted as SLU
Indoor recreation/theaters	Permitted by Right	Permitted as SLU
Taverns	Permitted by Right	Permitted as SLU
Funeral homes	Permitted by Right	Permitted as SLU
Bed and Breakfasts	Permitted by Right	Prohibited
Boarding house	Permitted by Right	Prohibited
Depots/warehouses	Permitted by Right	Prohibited
Veterinarian clinic	Permitted as SLU	Permitted by Right
Landscaping services	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Agricult. service establishments	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Day care center	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Banquet halls	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Marinas	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Building materials sales	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Contractor's Yard	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Monument production	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Medical clinics	Prohibited	Permitted by Right
Health clubs	Prohibited	Permitted by Right

(table continued next page)

Part 2 Table continued:

“SLU” = special land use

A Draft Ordinance Districts and Specific Uses	B How Current Ordinance Treats This Specific Use	C How Draft Article 3 Treats This Specific Use
<b>C-3 Commercial Highway</b> (replaces current C-3 District)		
Outdoor recreation	Permitted by Right	Permitted as SLU
Service stations	Permitted by Right	Permitted as SLU
Vehicle repair shop	Permitted by Right	Permitted as SLU
Taverns	Permitted by Right	Permitted as SLU
Building materials sales	Permitted by Right	Permitted as SLU
Veterinarian clinic	Permitted as SLU	Permitted by Right
Clubs	Permitted by Right	Prohibited
Arcades	Permitted by Right	Prohibited
Health clubs	Prohibited	Permitted by Right
Agricult. service establishments	Prohibited	Permitted by Right
Medical clinics	Prohibited	Permitted by Right
Watercraft storage	Prohibited	Permitted by Right
Bed and breakfasts	Prohibited	Permitted by SLU
Research and testing	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
RV storage	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Landscaping services	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Contractor’s Yard	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Wholesale merchandising	Prohibited	Permitted by SLU
<b>GO Office General</b> (new district)	<b><i>New District – Comparison Not Possible</i></b>	
<b>I-1 Light Industrial</b> (replaces current I-1 District)		
Landscaping services	Prohibited	Permitted by Right
Monument stone production	Prohibited	Permitted by Right
Plastic molding and extrusion	Prohibited	Permitted by Right
Recycling center	Prohibited	Permitted by Right
Crematoriums	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
RV storage	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
<b>I-2 Industrial General</b> (replaces current I-2 District)		
Crematoriums	Prohibited	Permitted by Right
Landscaping services	Prohibited	Permitted by Right
Monument stone production	Prohibited	Permitted by Right
Plastic molding and extrusion	Prohibited	Permitted by Right
RV storage	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU
Recycling center	Prohibited	Permitted as SLU

### Article 3 Summary – Part 3

#### Principal Changes in Site Development Standards

The principal changes in site development standards between the current Zoning Ordinance in effect and Table 3-4 of draft Article 3 are summarized below. **Column A** identifies the site development standards in each district of draft Article 3 that are treated in a manner differently than under the current Ordinance in effect. **Column B** identifies the manner in which the current Ordinance treats the specified site development standard in the particular district. **Column C** identifies the manner in which the draft Article 3 treats the same specified site development standard.

A	B	C
Draft Ordinance Districts and Specific Development Standard	How <u>Current Ordinance</u> Treats This Specific Development Standard	How <u>Draft Article 3</u> Treats This Specific Development Standard
<b>All Districts</b>		
Minimum Lot Width	Must be met only at front yard	Must be met over 70% of lot's area, beginning at frontage and extending toward rear lot line. See Footnote 2 of Table 3-4.
Maximum Building Height Exemptions	Structures may exceed height standard if setback <u>1'</u> for each additional 1' in structure height.	Structures may exceed height standard if setback <u>2'</u> for each additional 1' in structure height.
Setbacks for waterfront lots	50' rear yard setback in RS, RL, and RM Districts	50' for all waterfront yards in all districts, or the average of adjacent dwelling setbacks if less than 50'.
<b>A-1 Agricultural</b> (replaces current A-1 District)		
Side yard setback for corner lot.	Must be same as front yard setback.	Must be same as front yard setback, but exemption provided to ensure lot is buildable. See Footnote 6 of Table 3-4.
<b>RR Residential Rural</b> (new district)	<b><i>New District – Comparison Not Possible</i></b>	
<b>RS Residential Suburban</b> (replaces current RS-1 District)		
Side yard setback for corner lot.	Must be same as front yard setback.	Must be same as front yard setback, but exemption provided to ensure lot is buildable. See Footnote 6.
<b>RLS Residential Lakefront Suburban</b> (replaces current RL-1 District)		
Side yard setback.	10'	10', except 5' if the lot is 50' less in width.
Side yard setback for corner lot.	Must be same as front yard setback.	Must be same as front yard setback, but exemption provided to ensure lot is buildable. See Footnote 6.
<b>RU Residential Urban</b> (new district)	<b><i>New District – Comparison Not Possible</i></b>	
<b>R-MF Residential Multiple Family</b>	<b>No Substantive Changes</b>	

Table continued on next page.

A Draft Ordinance Districts and Specified Development Standard	B How <u>Current Ordinance</u> Treats This Specified Development Standard	C How <u>Draft Article 4</u> Treats This Specified Development Standard
<b>R-MHC Manufactured Housing Community</b>		
Miscellaneous site development standards	Establishes specific standards, many contrary to Rules of Mobile Home Commission	Defers site development standards to Rules of Mobile Home Commission. See Section 3.7.
<b>C-1 Commercial Local</b> (replaces current C-1 District)		
Maximum lot coverage	25%	50%
Front yard setback	35'	35', with opportunity for modification by site plan approving body. (see Footnote 7 of Table 3-4)
Side yard setback	15' with buffer fence, otherwise 25'	15' (includes required buffer area), but 25' when adjacent to Agricultural or Residential District. (see Footnote 8 of Table 3-4)
<b>C-2 Commercial General</b> (replaces current C-2 District)		
Minimum lot width	100'	200'
Maximum lot coverage	25%	50%
Front yard setback	35'	35', with opportunity for modification by site plan approving body. (see Footnote 7 of Table 3-4).
Side yard setback	15' with buffer fence, otherwise 25'	15' (includes required buffer area), but 50' when adjacent to Agricultural or Residential District (see Footnote 8 of Table 3-4).
<b>C-3 Commercial Highway</b> (replaces current C-3 District)		
Minimum lot area	15,000 sq. ft.	30,000 sq. ft.
Minimum lot width	100'	200'
Maximum lot coverage	25%	50%
Side yard setback	15' with buffer fence, otherwise 25'	15' (includes required buffer area), but 50' when adjacent to Agricultural or Residential District. (see Footnote 8 of Table 3-4).
<b>I-1 Industrial Light</b>		
<b><i>New District – Comparison Not Possible</i></b>		
Minimum lot area	20,000 sq. ft.	20,000 sq. ft. in office park, otherwise 1 acre. (se Footnote 9 of Table 3-4)
Minimum lot width	150'	200'
Maximum lot coverage	25%	50%
Side yard setback	15' with buffer fence, otherwise 25'	15' (includes required buffer area), but 50' when adjacent to Agricultural or Residential District. (see Footnote 8 of Table 3-4).
<b>I-2 Industrial General</b>	<b><i>Current Zoning Ordinance includes no standards for this District.</i></b>	

**End of Summary Comparison**