

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF VAN BUREN
PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA
Wednesday, September 14th, 2022 – 5:30 PM
Van Buren Township Hall
46425 Tyler Road**

Per guidance provided by the Wayne County Local Public Health Department for meetings of governmental bodies held under public act 228 of 2020, effective January 1, 2022, the following Zoom link is provided to enable remote participation in a meeting of the public body by the general public:

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/86369165343>

Or One tap mobile :

US: +13126266799,,86369165343# or +16469313860,,86369165343#

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 312 626 6799 or +1 646 931 3860 or +1 929 436 2866 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 309 205 3325
or +1 346 248 7799 or +1 386 347 5053 or +1 564 217 2000 or +1 669 444 9171 or +1 669 900 6833 or
+1 719 359 4580 or +1 253 215 8782

Webinar ID: 863 6916 5343

International numbers available: <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/86369165343>

See the Van Buren Charter Township website for additional information regarding how to participate in a Zoom public meeting.

CALL TO ORDER:

ROLL CALL:

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

MINUTES: Approval of minutes from the regular meeting of August 24th, 2022.

CORRESPONDENCE:

PUBLIC HEARING:

OLD BUSINESS:

NEW BUSINESS:

ITEM # 1 Zoning Ordinance Discussion: Side entry garage and building separation requirements for residential developments

TITLE: The Planning Commission is requested to discuss zoning requirements for minimum percentage of side entry garages and building separation in residential developments.

ACTION ITEMS: A. Presentation from Staff
 B. Planning Commission discussion

C. Public Comment

D. Planning Commission considers continuation of research and discussion or scheduling of public hearing

GENERAL DISCUSSION AND UPDATES

ADJOURNMENT:

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF VAN BUREN
PLANNING COMMISSION
August 24, 2022
MINUTES - DRAFT**

Chairperson Kelley called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Atchinson, Barr, Grant, Jahr and Kelley.

Excused: Budd and Cullin.

Staff: Director Power and Secretary Harman.

Planning Representatives: McKenna Associate, Vidya Krishnan and Fishbeck Associate, Paul Kammer.

Applicant(s) in Attendance: Jeff Minter and Teresa Bruce of General Development Company, LLC, Corey Weaver of Night Hawk Properties, LLC and David Brewer of Vanston/O'Brien, Inc.

Audience: Five (5).

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Motion Jahr, Atchinson second to approve the agenda of August 24, 2022 as presented. **Motion Carried.**

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Motion Jahr, Barr second to approve the regular meeting minutes of August 10, 2022 as presented. **Motion Carried.**

NEW BUSINESS:

ITEM #1: 21-021 – GENERAL DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, LLC – FINAL SITE PLAN.

TITLE: THE REQUEST IS FOR TRUCK SALES AND REPAIR BY KENWORTH/CSM COMPANIES, INC. APPLICANT GENERAL DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, LLC ON BEHALF OF OWNER BELLEVILLE NORTH MARSH VENTURES, LLC AND LIVONIA PROPERTY LLC SEEKS TO CONSTRUCT A +/- 62,750 SQ. FT. BUILDING WITH RELATED SITE IMPROVEMENTS FOR OUTDOOR VEHICLE SALES AND VEHICLE SHOWROOM USES WITH ACCESSORY VEHICLE REPAIR AND SERVICE. THE SITE IS ZONED C-2 (EXTENSIVE HIGHWAY BUSINESS DISTRICT).

LOCATION: THE +/- 20.01-ACRE SITE IS LOCATED AT 44660 NORTH INTERSTATE 94 SERVICE DRIVE (PARCEL ID 83-060-99-0001-701), ON THE NORTH SIDE OF THE I-94 NORTH SERVICE DRIVE, BETWEEN DEWITT AND MORTON TAYLOR ROADS.

Director Power gave a brief presentation. The applicant, General Development Company, LLC, representing Kenworth, CSM Companies, Inc. is seeking to construct a 62,750 square foot building with related site improvements for outdoor vehicle sales and vehicle showroom uses with accessory vehicle repair and service. Since the Planning Commission granted preliminary site plan approval, there have been some minor changes to the overall layout including the number of service bays, overhead doors and building square footage. Director Power deferred to the Principal Planner and Township Engineer for presentation of their reviews.

Vidya Krishnan of McKenna Associates presented her review letter dated 8-3-22. Most of the conditions of preliminary plan approval have been addressed at this time, with the exception of the sign base and fence/gate height. Therefore, McKenna Associates recommends the Planning Commission grant final site plan approval for the proposed Kenworth facility to be located on the I-94 North Service Drive, subject to the following conditions:

1. Reduction in the height of the gate in the front yard to no more than 2.5 feet.
2. Correction to the notation of the building square footage.
3. Township Engineer approval.
4. Administrative approval of a full 24" masonry sign base to match the preliminary building material.

Paul Kammer of Fishbeck Associates presented his review letter dated 8-5-22, recommending the Planning Commission grant the Kenworth sales facility project engineering and final site plan approval, subject to the comments listed in the review letter and the pending Wayne County review and approval. If changes occur due to the requirements from the County, the Township reserves the right to require the applicant to resubmit and reapply for review of the site. Prior to the project continuing to the preconstruction phase, the applicant will be required to address all the comments in an issued for construction plan set and submit for approval.

Director Power presented the Van Buren Fire Department review letter dated 7-21-22. The plans as submitted are approved with the following exception:

- The plans show the Knox gate switch on the inside of the fence. The switch needs to be on the outside of the fence.

Director Power presented his staff review dated 8-13-22. The Quirk Drain is a significant physical constraint on the western edge of the property, the water main and sidewalk have to be designed and Wayne County no longer allows for the building sidewalks over a culvert. A bridge or a different approach that would allow the sidewalk to be pushed toward the roadway with railing can be used. Staff supports a gradual approach to constructing the sidewalk over the portion of the site's frontage that crosses the Quirk Drain on its west end. Township staff also supports foregoing construction of water main access across the Quirk Drain at this time. Director Power recommends final site plan approval for the project, subject to the following conditions being met through any necessary agreements being made with the Township Board and staff:

- The applicant must submit a deposit of \$28,225 subject to final approval by the Township and the DDA, which is an estimated cost to account for the installation of approximately 130' of sidewalk, grading and right-of-way improvements over the Quirk Drain along the property's entire frontage within three (3) years of occupancy, subject to approval by Wayne County.
- Placement of an easement and reserving for a future capital project or construction by another entity must be accepted by the Township in lieu of the completion of 12" water main over Quirk Drain.
- The requested variance for the stormwater pond design must be obtained or the pond must be redesigned with a 4-foot permanent pool depth and approved by the Township Engineer.

Jeff Minter of General Development Company, LLC thanked everyone for their time and acknowledged there has been a lot of back and forth during the review process. Mr. Minter was available to answer any questions.

Commissioners had the following questions and comments:

- Regarding the sidewalk delay of construction, is the deposit a bond and does it require DDA approval? Director Power informed that the deposit would act as a bond and DDA approval is required as it is part of the sidewalk fund.
- The proposal is to be completed in 3 years, why is it subject to Wayne County approval? Director Power informed that there has been some feedback from Wayne County indicating there were challenges in approving the sidewalk as presented. The applicant will have to find a solution that works with Wayne County as it is located in their right-of-way.
- The ordinance states that you have to put in a sidewalk, what happens in 3 years if it is not complete, is the applicant responsible for any overage. Director Power informed that the bond represents the current cost estimate, there is not language for the overage. The Commission can decide to add language.
- The sidewalk distance, what is the frontage of the entire lot? Director Power informed that the frontage is 800' minus the 130' gap.
- Regarding the push towards the main road, Commissioner is partial to staying away from the main road, what about using a bridge? Director Power informed that a bridge has different constraints, a much higher cost and would require approval from EGLE and the Wayne County Drain Office. Vidya Krishnan of McKenna Associates informed that the cost is about five (5) times higher than the current cost. Paul Kammer of Fishbeck Associates informed that they looked into a bridge and it is a significant undertaking, there are a lot of factors that go into it and the cost is approximately \$150,000-\$300,000 without installation. Vidya Krishnan also informed that with a bridge you would typically want to keep it all on one property and there is not enough room to work fully within the property of the Kenworth site.
- The deposit amount, is that a cost that could be put in today? Director Power informed it's the cost of the grading, concrete and railing to be built today.
- The 5' sidewalk, is that 2" or 4" concrete depth? Director Power informed it should be 4" depth.
- Really need sidewalks along the N. I-94 Service Drive, this is the only chance during site plan review to make that happen. Commissioner understands the applicant needing more time to work with the County and Township staff.
- Commissioner asked Paul Kammer, if the technical design of the pond doesn't match and the applicant is requesting a variance, is our technical manual in need of updating? Paul Kammer of Fishbeck Associates informed that the Township Engineering Manual has not been updated since 2014. There are changes in the Wayne County stormwater plan requirements and there have been discussions over the last year or two that the manual needs to be updated. The requirement for a permanent pool was a requirement at the time, there is now a push to not have them. As long as we are following County and Township standards a variance can be granted.
- Commissioners agree the applicant needs to be responsible for overage on the sidewalk. If there is no cap, would rather have the applicant do the sidewalk right now.

No questions or comments from the audience.

Motion Jahr, Atchinson second to grant the applicant General Development Company, LLC, on behalf of owner Belleville North Marsh Ventures, LLC final site plan approval to construct a 62,750 square foot building with related site improvements for outdoor vehicle sales and vehicle showroom uses with accessory vehicle repair and service, located on 20.01-acre at 44660 N. I-94 Service Drive, parcel ID number 83-060-99-0001-701, based on the analysis and subject to the conditions in the McKenna Associates review letter dated 8-3-22, Fishbeck Associates review letter dated 8-5-22, Van Buren Fire Department review letter dated 7-21-22, staff review letter dated 8-18-22 with the understanding that the applicant will be responsible for reasonable overages should the township have to seize the bond, with the understanding that and the Commission is not requesting the applicant to build a bridge.

Roll Call:

Yeas: Barr, Grant, Atchinson, Jahr and Kelley.

Nays: None.

Excused: Budd and Cullin.

Motion Carried.

ITEM #2: 22-044 – ZIPPY AUTO WASH – REVIEW AND COMMENT ON PROPOSED VARIANCE IN ASSOCIATION WITH SITE PLAN.

TITLE: THE APPLICANT, DAVID BREWER OF VANSTON/O'BRIEN, INC. ON BEHALF OF OWNER NIGHT HAWK PROPERTIES, LLC, IS REQUESTING REVIEW AND COMMENT ON A REQUESTED VARIANCE FOR RELIEF FROM MINIMAL GLASS REQUIREMENTS ON A FRONT BUILDING FAÇADE PER SEC. 6.309.C.3.C OF THE VAN BUREN TOWNSHIP ZONING ORDINANCE, IN ASSOCIATION WITH A PRELIMINARY SITE PLAN AND SPECIAL LAND USE PERMIT APPLICATION FOR A CAR WASH IN THE BELLEVILLE ROAD OVERLAY DISTRICT (BROD).

LOCATION: 11650 BELLEVILLE ROAD (PARCEL ID NUMBER 83-081-99-0004-709). THE PROPERTY IS LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF BELLEVILLE ROAD BETWEEN SUNRISE ROAD AND VENETIAN ROAD. THE PROPERTY IS ZONED C-2 – EXTENSIVE HIGHWAY BUSINESS DISTRICT.

Director Power gave a brief presentation. The Planning Commission has a role under the Zoning Ordinance to review anything under site plan review that proposes a variance. The Belleville Road Overlay District (BROD) has a minimum requirement of 50% glass on a front building façade. The applicant is requesting to deviate slightly on one angle 46% and more significantly on another angle at 23%. The applicant has restraints with how much glass there can be and would like the Planning Commission to weigh in prior to meeting with the Board of Zoning Appeals (BZA).

Vidya Krishnan of McKenna Associates informed that the applicant has been working with the Township for quite a while and the subject site is located along the south end of the BROD. The BROD has very specific requirements, wanting to see what goes on inside a building and this is not a type of business that you want to look into. The applicant has made efforts to make changes

including many architectural details and has reasoning as to why they cannot meet the requirements of the BROD.

Corey Weaver of Nighthawk Properties, LLC gave a presentation. Zippy Auto Wash has been in business for over a decade with four (4) new sites operating in Ann Arbor, Ypsilanti and Saline and four (4) new sites in planning phase in Van Buren, Canton and Scio Townships. The applicant uses environmentally friendly site designs. The proposed building is 4,900 square feet, with 20 stacking spaces and two EV charging stations. The variance request for 23% glass with the remaining balance being premium masonry and architectural elements. The building will not be occupied by customers and the 12 foot building height requires significantly more glass. Experience has shown they are at the maximum window width that can be supported by a pre-cast concrete lintel, a larger width would require steel lintels which corrode and result in rust staining on the inside and outside of the building creating an undesirable look. The proposed glass ratio provides an optimal balance of curb appeal, natural lighting, customer experience, wash visibility and equipment screening while ensuring the long term aesthetically pleasing appearance of the site.

Commissioners had the following questions and comments:

- Director Power informed that Commissioner Budd asked to share her comment, to consider the safety aspect and the uniqueness of the business.
- Is the premium masonry was block, will it appear as brick as opposed to block and is all of the masonry structural block? David Brewer of Vanston/O'Brien, Inc. informed that masonry will appear as brick, the premium masonry the color is within not painted on and all of the masonry is block.
- Which of the walls face the road? The entrance and the wall with windows and a glass door. Director Power informed that in the variance request the applicant is accounting for both of the angled walls including the door, as they both sort of abut the road view.
- Beautiful car wash, can understand the argument to not have the 50% glass. The BZA has to have a finding of practical difficulty, the criteria outlined in Section 12.403(c) of the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant may want to consider how they will address the Zoning Board.
- Commissioner asked Director Power to repeat Commissioner Budd's comments. Director Power informed there are advantages to having less windows, the inside may not be what they want to see and it adds security by concealing the equipment. Commissioner inquired about having faux windows like what Aldi was required to have on the west side of the store. Vidya Krishnan commented that they have previously recommend the faux windows for retail, she is not sure that will work for this type of use and the balance of the material is very important.
- Does the curb start right before the party store? Yes, it would that block the wall behind the party store and cleanup the BROD.
- Is the original design turned forward? Yes, by changing the orientation and door location it helps to conceal the true nature of the building.

No questions or comments from the audience.

ITEM #3: ZONING ORDINANCE DISCUSSION: SIDE ENTRY GARAGE AND BUILDING SEPARATION REQUIREMENTS FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS.

TITLE: THE PLANNING COMMISSION IS REQUESTED TO DISCUSS ZONING REQUIREMENTS FOR MINIMUM PERCENTAGE OF SIDE ENTRY GARAGES AND BUILDING SEPARATION IN RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS.

Director Power gave a brief presentation. Commissioners at the 8-10-22 Planning Commission meeting asked staff to further explore the following: adding a cap on garage door surface area-to-front façade surface area, adding limits on garages extending further than 50% of their total length in front of a principal dwelling and including landscaping (in addition to fences, other structures, etc.) in the exclusions between buildings that are less than 20 feet apart. The Planning Commission additionally requested examples of projects that have detached single family units that are less than 20 feet apart. The ordinance hasn't been updated since the last meeting, however a series of photos of homes with less than 20 feet separation have been provided by Vidya Krishnan of McKenna Associates.

Vidya Krishnan of McKenna Associates gave a brief presentation and discussed the photos of examples from other communities including Plymouth, Northville, Canton and Ypsilanti. Some of the examples did not account for drainage, had no limitations on landscaping, had projections such as AC units, no access or passage between homes and in rear entry the side yards were concrete.

Commissioners had the following questions and comments:

- Commissioner would like to continue looking at this to get us closer to what other communities like Canton have. Agrees that too much concrete is not attractive and no fences. Would like the opportunity for builders and developers to come to Van Buren Township.
- Moving the homes closer together creates higher density. The images where they are 10 feet apart, is that on one side or on both? Vidya Krishnan informed they are 10 feet on both sides. Commissioner inquired if we change to the 10 foot separation are we still keeping the side entry garage? Director Power informed that the separation requirements and side entry garages are two separate items. Commissioner suggested maybe 10 feet on one side and a certain percentage higher on the other.
- The 10 feet without landscaping looks super tight, the pictures are not what we would see. Talked about more affordable homes, maybe have smaller square footage homes.
- Regarding placing homes together for increasing density, the PRD has provisions, can place closer together and increase the open space areas. The PRD may not allow to increase the density. Just grass in between homes with the 10 foot separation is not attractive, maybe one side can have landscape and the neighbor has to be barrier free on that side. Vidya Krishnan informed that could tie into a PRD landscape plan.
- Would like to have language for rainwater management and grass. Director Power informed that we do have minimum grading standards.
- Commissioner really likes the garage door language, in Section 5.115, item #6 principal dwelling it references the front of the lot, should it be the rear of the lot? Director Power

will clarify. Commissioner likes the relaxation of the 30% side entry garage door requirement.

- Vidya Krishnan will put language in for drainage, landscaping and design architecture and bring back to the Commission.
- Commissioner likes the overall structure, maybe add something to encourage of setting windows. Vidya Krishnan will check with the Building Officials regarding the windows.
- Commissioner inquired what the current requirement was for spacing. The current requirement is a 20 foot separation.
- If no one else has these requirements, can we bend the requirements of the PRD? Have the Zoning Ordinance, if we are letting bend under certain circumstances, are we maybe were trying to regulate too many things? Vidya Krishnan informed that standards can be added, however we want to make sure the standards that apply to developers remain consistent.

No comments from the audience.

ITEM #4: DISCUSSION. CASE 22-008 / VAN BUREN TOWNSHIP COMMUNITY CENTER ADDITION: POND DESIGN UPDATE.

STAFF WILL PROVIDE UPDATED INFORMATION REGARDING THE PROPOSED DESIGN OF THE EXPANDED VAN BUREN TOWNSHIP STORMWATER DETENTION BASIN LOCATED AT 46425 TYLER ROAD (PARCEL ID NUMBER 83-061-99-0006-000).

Director Power suggested to move Item #4 to a future meeting agenda where there is more time for the Township Engineer to provide a presentation. Commissioners were asked to take a look at the letter provided and give comments at a future meeting. Commissioners and staff agreed to remove Item #4 from the agenda.

GENERAL DISCUSSION:

Director Power informed that there will be a meeting on September 14, 2022 and discussed upcoming training opportunities for Commissioners members including: Citizen Planner, Land Use Case Law Legislative Update (webinar) and Exclusive to Inclusive training. Planning Commission members are required to attend two (2) training sessions per year. Commissioners were asked notify Director Power of any training sessions that they would like to attend.

ADJOURNMENT:

Motion Jahr, Barr second to adjourn the meeting at 7:53 p.m. Motion Carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Christina Harman
Recording Secretary



MCKENNA

September 9, 2022

Planning Commission
Charter Township of Van Buren
46425 Tyler Road
Belleville, Michigan 48111

Subject: Building Separations Standards and Side Entry Garages

Dear Commissioners:

The Planning Commission at its meeting held on July 27 and August 24, 2022 discussed the issue relating to building separation requirements in the PRD Ordinances and side entry garage requirements mandated for single family detached dwellings in the Township.

The issue has come up in recent discussions with prospective developers regarding completion of long-incomplete residential PRD's and new proposals. The Township's PRD Ordinance was written a long time ago and no PRD projects have been reviewed in the past decade. Home building and residential development patterns have gone through various market driven changes in this duration. As a result, some of the current regulations make proposed new attainable housing projects located on smaller lots

After a comparison of zoning ordinances in other municipalities and based on the feedback received from the Planning Commission we have prepared a draft text amendment of the changes to Section 6.207 of the PRD Ordinance's Design requirements which include building separation standards, and also changes to Section 5.115 addressing garage orientation.

Since the last meeting, we have made the following changes:

1. Removed a detailed itemized list and replaced it with a succinct description of standards that need to be met in order to get flexibility from building separation requirement.
2. Allowed for landscaping between units that remains low-profile or placed in a manner not to impede access.
3. Added clarification for 'garage door orientation' definition.
4. Added garage door-to-front façade maximum area ratio as another tradeable benefit for the 30% side entry requirement.

The item has been extensively discussed at the Planning Commission and at this time we recommend the Planning Commission's schedule a public hearing on the amendment. We will be present at the Planning Commission meeting to answer any questions and concerns.

Respectfully,
McKENNA

Vidya Krishnan
Senior Principal Planner

Cc: Dan Power, Director of Planning and Economic Development

HEADQUARTERS

235 East Main Street
Suite 105
Northville, Michigan 48167

☎ 248.596.0920
F 248.596.0930
MCKA.COM

Communities for real life.

Section 6.207. Design

A PRD shall comply with the following standards:

(B) **Building Setbacks.** Buildings in a PRD shall comply with the following building setback requirements:

- (3) Notwithstanding Section 6.207(B)(1) and Section 6.207(B)(2) above, the minimum side and rear yards for all buildings in a PRD shall be the same as in the zoning district in which the PRD is located. The Township Board, upon recommendation from the Planning Commission, may modify the minimum side and rear yard setback requirements based on sound planning and design principles, taking into account the degree of compatibility between adjoining uses, sensitivity to the characteristics of the site, the need for free access for emergency vehicles, the need for adequate amounts of light and air between buildings and the need for proper amounts of open space for the exclusive use of residents of the PRD.

(C) **Building Separation.** Buildings in a PRD shall comply with the following building separation requirements:

- (1) Any detached single-family principal or accessory structure in a PRD shall be located at least five (5) feet from any side lot line. Any detached single-family principal or accessory structure in a PRD shall be located at least twenty (20) feet from any other detached single-family principal or accessory structure, except that The Township Board, upon recommendation from the Planning Commission, may modify the this requirement based on sound planning and design principles, taking into account the degree of compatibility between adjoining uses, sensitivity to the characteristics of the site, the need for free access for emergency vehicles, the need for adequate amounts of light and air between buildings. In justifying a recommended modification from the minimum 20' building separation requirement, the Planning Commission must find that protections will be in place to ensure the adequate drainage of stormwater between two buildings and to exclude fences, appurtenances, and vertical landscaping between two dwellings where necessary to ensure the compatibility between adjoining uses and the adequacy of light, air and access between buildings.
- (2) Any building in a PRD containing more than one (1) dwelling unit (i.e., apartments, townhouses, attached dwellings) shall be located at least ten (10) feet from any side lot line and at least twenty (20) feet from any other similar structure, as well as at least thirty (30) feet from any detached single-family principal or accessory structure, except that The Township Board, upon recommendation from the Planning Commission, may modify the this requirement based on sound planning and design principles, taking into account the degree of compatibility between adjoining uses, sensitivity to the characteristics of the site, the need for free access for emergency vehicles, the need for adequate amounts of light and air between buildings, and securing the following commitments as part of the PRD Agreement and PRD Plan approval:
 - (a) All structures including fences will be prohibited between two buildings containing more than one (1) dwelling unit that are separated by less than twenty (20) feet and there will be no less than ten (10) feet of unobstructed access (including permitted projections) adjacent to one such building or between two such buildings.

- (b) Between two buildings containing more than one (1) dwelling unit separated by less than twenty (20) feet, a swale must be constructed along the property line and positive drainage to the front or rear yard toward a designated stormwater drain or drainage course must be established between two such buildings, and all grading must be performed consistent with the Township’s most current adopted Engineering Standards. Grading between two such buildings separated by less than twenty (20) feet must be validated by the submittal of a final grading certification prior to building occupancy.
- (c) Prior to any construction in side or rear yards of two separately owned buildings containing more than one (1) dwelling unit which are separated by less than twenty (20) feet, a construction easement which contains terms for complete site restoration must be executed between the affected property owners.

Section 5.115 Dwelling, Single-Family Residential (All Site Condominiums and Subdivisions)

(B) Application of standards.

(6) Definitions.

- (b) **“Substantially different”** means that a structure, when compared to another structure, differs from that structure as measured by ~~three (3)~~ four (4) or more of the following ~~five (5)~~ six (6) criteria:
 - (i) Roof style. Roof style is determined by location and orientation of the principal ridge line and adjacent sloping sections. Different roof styles include but are not limited to gable, reverse gable, Cape Cod, gambrel, hip, mansard and flat, etc.
 - (ii) Roof pitch. Roof pitch is determined by measuring the ratio of vertical to horizontal units in the sloping segments of the principal section of the roof of a structure. Different roof pitches are three (3) or more vertical units in twelve (12) from each other including, for example, 6:12 and 9:12 or 8:12 and 11:12, etc.
 - (iii) Exterior Material. Exterior material describes the material present area of structure. Different exterior materials include but are not limited to horizontal siding, vertical siding, shingles/shakes, brick, stone and stucco, etc.
 - (iv) Location of Major Design Features Relative to Main Mass. Major design features include but are not limited to attached garages, porches, porticos, breeze-ways, gables, dormers and/or similar major features. Different locations of major design features relative to the main mass of a structure include but are not limited to in front of, beside, on top of, and/or in some other location relative to the main mass of the structure.
 - (v) Location of Windows Doors Relative to Main Mass. Windows and doors on a structure can take on various configurations. Different location of windows and doors relative to the main mass of a structure include but are not limited to center door, off-center door and no door, with windows on either or both sides of and/or above the door.
 - (vi) **Garage door orientation.** The garage door on a principal dwelling which is oriented toward the side, rear, or front of the lot, in contrast to the garage door’s orientation on the neighboring property.

- (8) **Garage Door Orientation.** In addition to the requirement that a structure be found to be substantially different as defined herein, at least thirty percent (30%) of all structures within a proposed residential plat or site condominium project shall have the garage door oriented other than to the front of the lot (i.e., oriented to the side or rear of the lot). A deviation from the 30% requirement can be granted by the Board upon recommendation from the Planning Commission if the negative impacts of front garage door orientation are offset by recessing the garage door a minimum of five (5) feet from the front face of the dwelling, garage door to front façade ratio which minimizes the garage’s frontage, use of architectural enhanced garage doors, expanded brick on the front façade, or other enhancements deemed acceptable by the Planning Commission.