

**TORCH LAKE TOWNSHIP  
DRAFT ZONING ORDINANCE STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING  
March 16, 2022  
Community Services Building**

**Present:** L. Carleton, L. Andersen, B. Cook, M. Merchant, L. Scott

**Absent:** None

**Others:** S. Kopriva – Zoning Administrator/Consultant

**Recording Secretary –** Veronica Beitner

**Audience:** 0

**1. Call to Order** at 6:21 pm by B. Cook

**2. Public Comment** – None

**3. Approval of Agenda** – (M/S) B. Cook/L. Andersen motion to approve the agenda as presented.

**4. Approval of March 3, 2022 Minutes** – (M/S) B. Cook/M. Merchant motion to approve the minutes with one correction. No discussion. Passed 5-0.

**5. Zoning Articles to Review**

**a. Article 4 – Overlay Districts**

Wetland setbacks – no required regulations. Discussion ensued regarding setting a 50’ setback. Would this add too many restrictions for property owners. Identified as an area for concern for the Planning Commission to consider. High Water mark – 50’ back from established OHWM. Should be added to the definition section and dependent on decisions of the Planning Commission.

Discussion to use the word “Watercraft” versus motorized or nonmotorized vehicle (19:45)

Set back from Road – only change is that on water properties, the front of the home is on the water side NOT the road. The setback is reduced to 35’ in these properties. Discussion ensued.

Structured entryways – (21:55) Definition of “structure” will be key to wording of Ordinance. Discussion with examples provided.

Lake Access – shared waterfront restrictions and requirements reviewed. Number of watercrafts allowed reviewed.

Historical review of Ordinance provided by L. Scott. Simplifying definition suggested.

Shoreline Protection Strip – Recommendation to add vegetation for long term health of the water. This pertains to new construction and sea walls. Discussion included recognizing importance of Ordinance and difficulty enforcing. This will be referred to Planning Commission for review.

Beach areas – language to be added for pre-existing beach areas that erode.

Village Business Overlay Districts – S. Kopriva detailed plan to change all lots in this existing area to Village Residential with certain properties that will be allowed Special Uses with a permit. S. Kopriva will provide a map at next meeting to clarify to committee and further review.

**b. Article 9 – Planned Unit Development (PUD)**

B. Cook asked for clarification of what PUD’s would look like and approximate areas that might be of concern. S. Kopriva said this is about land development options. It would eliminate PRDs as everything would become a PUD. Site plans would need to serve as a master plan with intent established and reviewed during approval process. This would aid Zoning Administrator’s in maintaining consistency and intent of original application.

Suggestion to include additional uses that open creativity for development should be encouraged and could be referred back to the Master Plan.

Detailed explanation of PUDs provided by S. Kopriva with discussion.

L. Scott feels that these developments should include input and approvals from the Board. Stated previous experience working through A-Ga-Ming Development.

L. Carleton states this is an important issue (1:00)

L. Andersen feels if the Planning Commission is defined enough than it should be fine to stay at the Planning Commission level.

Discussion moved to how to test the process before applying to an actual case. Specific property that meets the size requirements and currently for sale used as an example. Currently zoned Agriculture so would this apply to a PUD or

Rezoned. If used as a PUD, it would require a Special Use Permit. Upon clarification, the Board would need to be involved in the approval process.

Specific aspects of Article reviewed for discussion to ensure appropriateness and compliance to Master Plan of Township and requirements of the County. Other areas spoke to consistency as related to Finding of Facts. Where is the safeguard for PUDs that are not completed? S. Kopriva referred back to section in Ordinance and will add language to address Township concern.

Regarding Site Plan concerns, Article 7 gives authority to the Zoning Administrator for defined minor issues.

Conservation Easements reviewed.

Condominium's subdivisions look like subdivisions as explained by S. Kopriva. The approval stops at the Planning Commission as it stands today. Discussion included when looking at significant character changes of the community they should be referred to the Board in the approval process.

6. Next Steps – Next meeting April 4, 2022, Article 6 and 3.

7. Public Comment – None

8. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 7:56 with (M/S) Motion by B. Cook/L. Andersen. B. Cook thanks the committee members for all their work. This is an important process that is very time consuming.