

## Cleveland Township Planning Commission

DATE: July 27, 2007  
TO: Michael Kronk  
FR: TJ Ewing, Chair  
RE: Zoning Ordinance No. 2 of 2007, Residential District – Draft 4

---

Dear Michael,

Our commission has continued work on a draft ordinance to update our Residential District in accordance with our Master Plan.

At this time, we are seeking your input of the following in regard to our draft 4:

1. General Comments  
Could you please review this latest draft and offer comments and/or recommendations if you feel the language is insufficient or confusing?
2. Section 5.2.B  
In this section the term ‘main dwelling’ is used. Our ordinance has ‘dwelling’ defined in section 3.17, but not main dwelling. We are pondering whether to allow guest houses at all, but if we do we want to clarify that they are in addition to an already existing ‘main’ dwelling, not that a defined smaller guest house can be built first on an empty lot. We are seeking your opinion on the clarity of the terminology and whether the term ‘main dwelling’ should be defined, and if so how.
3. Section 5.2.F & a new Section 3.x under Amendment 4 (page 7 of 10)  
We provide for Residential Care Facilities as the law requires. However are the citations we provide in these two parts of our amendment in parallel and sufficient? In amendment 4 we attempt to define Residential Care Facilities by citing the relevant State laws defining them.
4. Section 5.4.C.g  
Can you recommend which entity, the Planning Commission or Township Board you would see as appropriate to review and approve proposed deed restrictions guaranteeing open space. What is common practice?

5. Amendment 3 (page 6 of 10) deals with non-conforming lots of record. Does this language sufficiently deal with any arising non-conforming lots?
6. A primary focus of this amendment change is moving to a 1 unit per 3 acres density in our Low Density Residential area, (up from 1 per 40,000 sq. ft.) The importance of the water shed and the build out analysis has shown we should reduce our overall density. In terms of research and findings of fact for public hearing, do you have recommendations on specific information we should have prepared to support our findings?
7. Independent of this new ordinance language draft, we would like an opinion on the language we currently have for our high density district (Residential III), which stays the same in our proposed language in the High Density District, versus the reality of the actual lots of record in this defined district. Currently to have a multi-family unit, a 40,000 sq. ft. lot is required, plus 10,000 additional sq. ft per unit in excess of 3 units. However what if all current lots of record in the high density district are below 40,000 sq. ft, so in essence no multi-family units could be built without combining lots? First is this any problem from your perspective? Is there any change in ordinance language you believe we should consider, and does our ordinance sufficiently provide a district where multi-family units are allowed?

Thank you,  
Sincerely,  
TJ Ewing