

East Manchester Township
PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES
ORDINANCE REVIEW ONLY
February 25, 2014

At a regular meeting held at the Township Building, the following members were present: Blaine Rentzel, Robert Nace, Edward Hewitt, Mike McCowan, and Mike Scarborough. Also present: Engineer Laymon Mortorff, Zoning Officer Jon Beck, Recording Secretary, and no citizens.

Chairman Rentzel called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of January 28, 2014, were approved with no formal motion or second.

SALDO/Zoning Ordinance review

The Planning Commission members reviewed the proposed changes to the sections on Domestic Pets, Livestock, and Beekeeping. Discussion was held on birds, peacocks. Mr. Beck made the previously requested changes to the chart. One correction: C, Beekeeping, under e – a hive shall not be positioned ... (correct from no).

Childcare and early learning section: as requested, Mr. Beck added “single-family detached dwellings” under subsection d.

In-law quarters: discussion on separate kitchen and separate ingress/egress. A separate kitchen designates a separate, second dwelling unit. Mr. Beck is getting Attorney Miller’s input on this issue, particularly with reference to the time at which the family member is no longer living there. The risk is that the homeowners use that property as a rental unit. Mr. Scarborough feels that a separate entrance and separate kitchen makes that eventual situation more probable. A separate kitchen needs to have a range/stove to be considered an official kitchen. Mr. Beck referred the Planning Commission members to the requirements regarding the Certificate of Use and Occupancy. His view of an in-law quarters includes the freedom of the in-law to come and go without interrupting the main family. A child moving back into the family home or an aging parent moving into a bedroom would not be considered an in-law quarters situation.

Discussion was held on the language “may or may not include a separate kitchen facility.” Mr. Rentzel asked what about someone sleeping in the basement; is another method of egress required? Mr. Beck thinks it’s not required under the UCC. Can the Township require a separate entrance in that instance? If the in-law quarters are in the basement with a bedroom, a separate means of egress should be required. This could be done in conjunction with the issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy so that Mr. Beck can monitor that situation. What if an outside door cannot be accomplished? By the UCC, an emergency egress window will do. So they must have an adequate method of egress according to the UCC. Practically speaking, an aging person would likely not be interested in having a bedroom in the basement and having to go upstairs to use the bathroom and kitchen areas anyway.

Should the ZHB continue in the manner under which it is currently operating? If the Planning Commission members feel that no changes are necessary, that is fine.

What about parking? Adding people usually adds vehicles; what to do with the extras? Right now, the applicants must prove that they can meet the parking requirements. Mr. Beck will include that. He’ll have another draft for next month’s meeting.

Mr. Scarborough feels that if the applicant is adding a kitchen facility, he/she should be required to get a permit and jump through all the hoops to give Mr. Beck the opportunity to make sure everything's on the up and up.

How about adding that the in-law quarters shall not be for profit, to deter rental situations? Township staff's opinion is that a family wanting to add an in-law quarters to a single-family dwelling should not require the homeowner to appear before the ZHB; therefore the in-law quarters should be an accessory use permitted by right. Usually, an in-law quarters situation arises because of economic or medical reasons.

Plans

Nothing at this time.

Additional New Business

Nothing at this time.

The next meeting will be on March 25, starting with the Ordinance Review at 6 p.m., and the regular meeting following. There are a few plans in the pipeline.

Motion by McCowan, second by Hewitt, to adjourn. All members voted aye; motion carried.
The meeting adjourned at 7:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Julie B. Maher,
Recording Secretary