

NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC MEETING

The Planning Commission of the City of Hastings will offer an electronic option for public participation for the meeting at **7:00 PM on Monday, April 5, 2021** in response to the concerns of COVID-19. This is a regular meeting. You can see the agenda and meeting packet at

<https://hastingsmi.org/departments/city-clerktreasurer/agenda-minutes-packets>

If public would like to participate in the meeting, please join:

Internet:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84705676531?pwd=dURoK2Y4SXBucE9tamZFaXMyOERaZz09>

Meeting ID: **847 0567 6531**

Password: **289425**

You can also dial in using your phone.

(312) 626-6799



HASTINGS PLANNING COMMISSION COMMUNICATION

DATE: March 30, 2021

TO: Members of the Planning Commission and Staff

FROM: Dan King

SUBJECT: Information – April 5, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting.

Items on the agenda for the regular meeting of the Planning Commission include:

Public Hearings:

- Item 6.A.** Public hearing to solicit comment regarding a text amendment to the B-1 Central Business District pertaining to the maximum building height.
- Item 6.B.** Public hearing to solicit comment regarding a text amendment change to the Keeping of Animals ordinance as it pertains to chickens.
- Item 6.C.** Public hearing to solicit comment regarding site plan review and a special use permit for transitional housing located at 2018 N. Michigan Ave. ***Applicant withdrew request for a public hearing*.**

Old Business:

- Item 7.D.** A progress update will be given regarding Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU).
- Item 7.E.** A progress update will be given regarding adding two-family dwelling units as a Permitted use in residential and apartment zoning districts.

New Business:

- Item 8.A.** Consider setting a public hearing for the May 3, 2021 meeting to consider a text amendment to Section 90-929 regarding the parking of semi-trucks, semi-trailers, or vehicles with two or more rear axles.

Item 8.B. Consider Ravenna Holdings, LLC exterior design for project located at 600 W. Woodlawn Ave.

This meeting will be held in a hybrid format. Planning Commission members are encouraged to attend the meeting in person but due to the recently declared State of Emergency by the Barry County Board of Commissioners, members are not required to attend the meeting in person. The Council Chambers will be arranged to meet social distancing requirements and facemasks are required.

Dan

HASTINGS PLANNING COMMISSION A G E N D A

Monday April 5, 2021

1. **Call to Order/Roll Call** (Regular meeting starts at 7:00 p.m.)
2. **Pledge of Allegiance**
3. **Approval / additions / deletions to agenda**
4. **Approval of Minutes** March 1, 2021 Regular Draft Meeting Minutes of the Planning Commission.*
5. **Informative Items: None**
6. **Public Hearings:**
 - A. Public hearing to solicit comment regarding a text amendment change to the B-1 Central Business District pertaining to the maximum building height. *
 - B. Public hearing to solicit comment regarding a text amendment change to the Keeping of Animals ordinance as it pertains to chickens. *
 - C. Public hearing to solicit comment regarding site plan review and a special use permit for transitional housing located at 2018 N. Michigan Ave. ***Applicant withdrew request for a public hearing***.
7. **Old Business:**
 - A. Receive JPA / JPC Update.
 - B. Consider Planning Commission 2021 General Work Task List. *
 - C. Report Regarding Tracking of Terms and Conditions Imposed by the Planning Commission. *
 - D. Update progress regarding Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU).
 - E. Update progress regarding adding two family dwelling units as a permitted use in residential and apartment zoning districts.
8. **New Business:**
 - A. Consider setting a public hearing for the May 3, 2021 meeting to consider a text amendment to Section 90-929 regarding the parking of semi-tractors, semi-trailers, or vehicles with two or more rear axles. *
 - B. Consider Ravenna Holdings, LLC exterior design for project at 600 W. Woodlawn Ave.
9. **Open public discussion and comments**
10. **Commission comments**
11. **Adjourn**

*Indicates attachment

CITY OF HASTINGS
DRAFT PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES
March 1, 2021

Members present: Bowers, Brehm, Czarnecki, Denton, Foster, Maurer, Resseguie, Tossava, Hatfield.

Members absent: None

Other staff present: King, Tate and Harvey.

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Hatfield.

Hatfield called the roll.

Hatfield asked for comment regarding the draft agenda for tonight's meeting.

Motion by Bowers, second by Maurer to approve the agenda for tonight's meeting as written.

Motion carried.

Hatfield asked for comment regarding the draft minutes of the February 1, 2021 regular meeting of the Hastings Planning Commission.

Motion by Tossava, second by Bowers to approve the draft minutes of the February 1, 2021 regular meeting of the Hastings Planning Commission as presented.

Motion carried.

Hatfield introduced the public hearing to solicit comment regarding a request for Special Use Permit and site plan approval for a new mixed-use commercial building at 128 N. Michigan Ave.

King gave summary. Harvey gave summary of her report, sharing the areas that need addressing.

Applicant gave information to address concerns, noted that the height of the building is planned for 4-stories, 52ft wall height with 3 ft above for mechanicals.

Bowers asked if there will be handicap accessible apartments, applicant stated there would.

Tossava asked if the alley to the south was owned by applicant, it is not so will not be utilized for access to building.

Hatfield open public hearing at 7:19pm.
Hatfield closed public hearing at 7:20pm

Maurer shared concerns with tenants especially commercial with limited parking.

Tossava, Resseguie, and Foster expressed support of project and good for downtown.

Hatfield asked if the Planning Commission could change the height requirement in the B-1 District. Harvey noted that the applicant could go for a variance or Planning Commission could address the height requirement as part of planning for future development in the downtown.

Motion by Tossava, second by Resseguie to approve special use permit for 128 N. Michigan Ave. and approve site plan with allowance for proposed parking plan, allowance for proposed increased density, and compliance with height requirements or relief with a variance.

In favor: Bowers, Brehm, Czarnecki, Denton, Foster, Maurer, Resseguie, Tossava, and Hatfield
Opposed: None

Motion carried.

Hatfield asked for a motion to have staff revise code for B-1 Central Business district to address height requirement and set a public hearing for April 5, 2021 at 7pm.

Motion by Brehm, second by Resseguie, to set public hearing for April 5, 2021 at 7pm.

In favor: Bowers, Brehm, Czarnecki, Denton, Foster, Maurer, Resseguie, Tossava, and Hatfield
Opposed: None

Motion carried.

Hatfield introduced the public hearing to solicit comment regarding a request for Special Use Permit and site plan approval for a commercial kennel at 1005 E. State St.

King gave summary. Harvey noted that there were no changes required for approval of the special use permit and listed a few design standards that needed to be addressed in her report.

Applicant gave information to address concerns.

Hatfield open public hearing at 7:55pm.
Hatfield closed public hearing at 7:56pm

Motion by Bowers, second by Brehm to approve special use permit for 1005 E. State St. and approve site plan as presented.

In favor: Bowers, Brehm, Czarnecki, Denton, Foster, Maurer, Resseguie, Tossava, and Hatfield
Opposed: None

Motion carried.

Hatfield introduced the public hearing to solicit comment regarding a text amendment to add Commercial Recreational Facilities.

King gave summary.

Hatfield open public hearing at 8:07pm.
Hatfield closed public hearing at 8:08pm

Motion by Brehm, second by Bowers to approve text amendment and recommend to City Council for consideration.

In favor: Bowers, Brehm, Czarnecki, Denton, Foster, Maurer, Resseguie, Tossava, and Hatfield
Opposed: None

Motion carried.

Hatfield asked for an update on JPA/JPC meetings. Czarnecki noted that JPA and JPC did not meet in February.

Hatfield asked members of the Planning Commission to review the Work Task List.

King gave an update on the tracking of the terms and conditions imposed by the Planning Commission.

Hatfield introduced discussion on ordinance regarding keeping of animals as it pertains to chickens. Harvey provided an updated ordinance with comments made by PC members.

Hatfield asked for a motion to direct staff to update ordinance with suggestions and set a public hearing for April 5, 2021 at 7pm to hear comment from the public.

Motion by Brehm, second by Foster, to set a public hearing for April 5, 2021 at 7pm.

In favor: Bowers, Brehm, Czarnecki, Denton, Foster, Maurer, Resseguie, Tossava, and Hatfield
Opposed: None

Motion carried.

Hatfield introduced a discussion on information provided by Harvey on Accessory Dwelling Units and Two-Family/Duplex units in residential districts.

Motion by Bowers, second by Resseguie, to table discussion of Accessory Dwelling Units to allow Commission members and opportunity to review provided information.

In favor: Bowers, Brehm, Czarnecki, Denton, Foster, Maurer, Resseguie, Tossava, and Hatfield
Opposed: None

Motion carried.

Motion by Bowers, second by Maurer, to table discussion of Two-Family/Duplex units in residential districts to allow Commission members and opportunity to review provided information.

In favor: Bowers, Brehm, Czarnecki, Denton, Foster, Maurer, Resseguie, Tossava, and Hatfield
Opposed: None

Motion carried.

Hatfield introduced the Planning Commission 2020 Year in Review.

Bowers commented that the Planning Commission was very busy.

Motion by Brehm, second by Bowers to forward review to City Council as required by City Ordinances.

In favor: Bowers, Brehm, Czarnecki, Denton, Foster, Maurer, Resseguie, Tossava, and Hatfield
Opposed: None

Motion carried.

Hatfield introduced discussion on setting a public hearing for 7:00pm on April 5, 2021 to consider a special use permit and site plan review for proposed transitional housing at 2018 N. Michigan.

Motion by Tossava, second by Resseguie, to set the public hearing for 7:00pm on April 5, 2021.

In favor: Bowers, Brehm, Czarnecki, Denton, Foster, Maurer, Resseguie, Tossava, and Hatfield.

Opposed: None

Motion carried.

Hatfield asked if there was any public discussion and comment.

Patty Woods noted that the meeting was very interesting.

Hatfield asked for any commission comment.

Resseguie stated that the Planning Commission has their work cut out for them this year.

Tossava thanked the entire Planning Commission for the work they did in a difficult year under the circumstances.

Motion by Bowers, second by Resseguie to adjourn at 8:51 p.m.

Motion carried.

Submitted by:

Jerry Czarnecki

Secretary

City of Hastings

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON ORDINANCE NO. 599

The Planning Commission will hold a Public Hearing for the purpose of hearing written and/or oral comments from the public concerning an amendment to Section 90-474 (c) of the Hastings Municipal Code to amend the maximum building height in the B-1 Central Business District. The public hearing will be held on Monday April 5, 2021 at 7:00 PM. Due to gathering limitations from the State of Michigan, public is asked to join the meeting virtually. Please check the City of Hastings website at www.hastingsmi.org or contact City Hall at 269-945-2468 for details.

All interested citizens are encouraged to attend and to submit comments.

A copy of this information is available for public inspection from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM Monday through Friday at the Office of the City Clerk, 201 East State Street, Hastings, Michigan 49058.

The City will provide necessary reasonable aids and services upon five days notice to Hastings City Clerk (telephone number 269-945-2468) or TDD call relay services 1-800-649-3777.

Jane M. Saurman
City Clerk



March 29, 2021

Planning Commission
City of Hastings
201 East State Street
Hastings, Michigan 49058

Subject: Text Amendment – *Building Height Standard in B-1 District*

This discussion and optional amendments of the building height standard in the B-1 District are intended to address/respond to questions recently raised by the Planning Commission regarding desired building heights within the downtown area.

Observations:

- The City has a mixture of 1, 2, and 3 story buildings downtown . . suggesting that a 'minimum building height standard' would not be desirable. Because there are a number of 1-story buildings, a 'minimum building height standard' of greater than 1-story would serve to render them 'nonconforming'. It could also be argued that a mixture of building heights is more authentic to the downtown than all 2- and 3-story buildings. **Consider not proposing a 'minimum building height standard'.**
- The City has several 3-story buildings downtown . . which appear to fall into the 40 ft - 45 ft height range. The general rule is commercial stories are in the 14 ft height range and residential stories are in the 10 ft height range . . so it depends on what the stories were built for and the overall building design, but this general rule supports the frequently used community standard of 'maximum 3-stories or 45 ft building height'.
- There is currently no limit on the number of stories in the B-1 District. This means building design is controlled entirely by the building height standard. This is reasonable because it allows for flexibility in design of story-height, which is recommended. **Consider making no change to the 'number of stories' standard.**

- To the question of a maximum building height standard:
 - the downtown's tallest buildings likely fall in the 40-45 ft height range . . **is there a building height that would seem out of character with the downtown?**
 - : the downtown's tallest buildings have 3-stories; the existing building height standard of 40 ft easily allows for a 3-story building . . and possibly a 4-story building if the stories were 11 ft in height; but I think generally the 40 ft building height standard is limiting commercial buildings to 3 stories. So although a # of stories standard is not desired, the question is . . **is there a number of stories that would seem out of character with the downtown?**
 - : aside from the issue of downtown character, a building height standard is a product of a city's fire-safety abilities . . **if the City's fire department has no concerns in this area, then the PC is free to consider only downtown character issues.**

Conclusion:

An increase in the building height standard from 40 ft to 55 ft - 60 ft would easily allow a 4-story commercial building (w/ 14 ft stories) or a 5-story building w/ a commercial/residential design mix.

The City may feel allowing buildings that are 15-20 ft taller (w/ 1-2 more stories) than what currently exists downtown is acceptable, and perhaps desirable. With that said, it may be that such acceptability/desirability is dependent on building location (ie. heights/orientations/situations of adjacent or nearby buildings).

Text Amendment Options:

Option 1:

Amend Sec 90-474 (c) and Sec 90-477 (b) to increase the building height standard from 40 ft to 60 ft (which will essentially allow 4- and 5-story buildings in the downtown)





Option 2:

Amend Sec 90-474 (c) and Section Sec 90-477 (b) to read:

Maximum building height: 40 feet; **the maximum building height may be increased where the Planning Commission determines the increased building height is in keeping with the character of the downtown and will not negatively impact adjacent properties or fire safety objectives. A front elevation drawing of the proposed building shall be provided superimposed on a drawing or photograph of the entire block showing the relation of the proposed building to other buildings along the block.**

**allowing a greater building height only with special approval guarantees the following:*

- *it can only happen w/ PC approval*
- *allows the PC to specifically consider how it will impact adjacent properties and the immediate area*
- *can apply to both residential and commercial buildings*
- *can be limited to the downtown (B-1 District)*
- *still allows flexibility in the design/dimension of stories*

Option 3:

Amend Sec 90-474 (c) and Section Sec 90-477 (b) to read:

Maximum building height: 40 feet; **a maximum building height of 60 feet is allowable as a special land use, subject to the specific requirements and standards of article XIII of this chapter.**

**allowing a greater building height only as a special land use guarantees the following:*

- *it only can happen w/ PC approval . . . determined in a public forum*
- *the PC will be guided by the specific impact-based special land use criteria (Sec 90-1049)*
- *allows the PC to specifically consider how it will impact adjacent properties and the immediate area*
- *can apply to both residential and commercial buildings*
- *can be limited to the downtown (B-1 District)*
- *still allows flexibility in the design/dimension of stories*



ORDINANCE NO. 599

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 90 OF THE HASTINGS CODE OF 1970, AS AMENDED, BY AMENDING THE FOLLOWING: ARTICLE 90 - VI, DIVISION 90 – VI – 12 B-1 CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT, BY **AMENDING SECTION 90-474 (c)**

THE CITY OF HASTINGS ORDAINS:

SECTION I.

Section 90-474 (c) is hereby amended to Chapter 90, Article 90 - VI, Division 90 – VI - 14 of the Hastings Code of 1970, as amended, to read as follows: Amendment in **BOLD**

Sec 90-474 District Regulations

Buildings and structures shall not be erected or enlarged in the B-1 zoning district unless the following requirements are met and maintained:

- a) No minimum lot area and width is required.
- b) A minimum and a maximum front building setback for lots in the B-1 zoning district is required in order to carry out one of the principal recommendations of the Hastings Comprehensive Community Plan which is to establish a "build to line" for new and expanding uses in the B-1 zoning district. The establishment of the following front setback requirements will preserve the downtown character of the city and provide flexibility for new buildings and expansions of existing buildings to closely match the existing building setback line. The required setbacks will vary by street segments as the location of existing buildings differs along certain streets. The required minimum and maximum build to line is intended to provide uniformity in the visual character along streets in the B-1 zoning district.
 - 1. The required setback from the right-of-way along the following street segments shall be a minimum of zero feet and a maximum of five feet from each right-of-way line abutting the lot; a minimum of 80 percent of the front wall of the building must be within the required setback, which is also called a build to line, along each street frontage. Street segments
 - State Street: Church Street to Boltwood Street both sides of street. - Jefferson Street: Center Street to Apple Street both sides of street. - Church Street: Center Street to Apple Street east side only. - Michigan Avenue: Center Street to Apple Street west side only. - East Court Street: Church Street to Michigan Avenue both sides of street.
 - 2. The required setback from the right-of-way along all other street segments for parcels in the B-1 zone shall be a minimum of zero feet and a maximum of 20

feet from each right-of-way line abutting the lot; a minimum of 60 percent of the front wall of the building must be within the required setback, which is also called a build-to line, along each street frontage. The planning commission may allow a greater building setback than permitted by this subsection 90-474(b)(2) above, if compliance with such setbacks creates a practical difficulty in the operation of the proposed use. In considering whether or not to permit a greater setback, the commission shall consider following criteria:

- a) Whether the proposed use is located on a parcel which has frontage on more than one street;
 - b) Whether the driveway(s) which are required to serve the site necessitate a greater building setback in order to safely accommodate on site maneuvering for vehicles and pedestrians;
 - c) Whether a greater setback is needed in order to locate parking spaces, access drives or sidewalks between the building and the front lot line in order to improve safety for customers accessing the building;
 - d) Whether the shape or size of the parcel or requirements of the zoning ordinance or other city ordinances create difficulties in complying with the required setback regulations.
3. No side yard is required; except where a property abuts a residentially zoned lot, a minimum ten-foot side yard shall be required.
 4. The rear yard shall be 12 feet.
 5. Any building which does not meet the front setback requirements of this section, but which existed before the effective date of this subsection 90-474(b), shall be allowed to expand provided the expansion will result in the building being within or closer to the setback or build to line required for the street on which the building fronts. Approval from the zoning board of appeals is not required for this type of expansion; however, all other requirements of this zoning ordinance shall apply.

c) **Amended text to be placed here.**

d) No maximum lot coverage requirement.

SECTION II.

If any article, section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this ordinance is, for any reason, held invalid or unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, such portion shall be deemed a separate, distinct, and independent provision, and such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance.

SECTION III.

This ordinance shall become effective upon its adoption and publication as provided by City Charter.

Moved by , with support by , that **Ordinance No. 599** be adopted as read.

YEAS:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

CITY OF HASTINGS

Adoption Date:

Effective Date:

First Reading:

Second Reading:

By: Jane M. Saurman
Hastings City Clerk

CERTIFICATE

The undersigned, being the duly qualified and acting Clerk of the City of Hastings, Michigan, does hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of an Ordinance adopted by the City Council of the City of Hastings, at a regular meeting of the City Council on the 2021, at which meeting a quorum was present and remained throughout, and that the original of said Ordinance is on file in the records of the City of Hastings. I further certify that the meeting was conducted and public notice was given pursuant to and in compliance with Act No. 267, Public Acts of Michigan of 1976, as amended, and that minutes were kept and will be or have been made available as required thereby.

Dated:

Jane M. Saurman
City Clerk

City of Hastings

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON ORDINANCE NO. 600

The Planning Commission will hold a Public Hearing for the purpose of hearing written and/or oral comments from the public concerning an amendment to Section 90-835 of the City of Hastings Municipal Code to add subsection (d) regarding keeping of chickens in residential zoning districts. The public hearing will be held **on Monday April 5, 2021 at 7:00 PM.**

Due to gathering limitations from the State of Michigan, public is asked to join the meeting virtually. Please check the City of Hastings website at www.hastingsmi.org or contact City Hall at 269-945-2468 for details.

All interested citizens are encouraged to attend and to submit comments.

A copy of this information is available for public inspection from 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM Monday through Friday at the Office of the City Clerk, 201 East State Street, Hastings, Michigan 49058.

The City will provide necessary reasonable aids and services upon five days notice to Hastings City Clerk (telephone number 269-945-2468) or TDD call relay services 1-800-649-3777.

Jane M. Saurman
City Clerk



MCKENNA

March 3, 2021

Planning Commission
City of Hastings
201 East State Street
Hastings, Michigan 49058

Subject: Text Amendment - *Keeping of Chickens*

On March 1, 2021, the Planning Commission reviewed Draft #3 of the proposed amendment to Section 90-835 – *Keeping of animals* to allow the ‘keeping of chickens’ in the City of Hastings. After further review and discussion, the Planning Commission reached consensus to schedule a public hearing on the proposed amendment, with the incorporation of a few final revisions, for the April meeting. The public hearing draft text follows:

Proposed Amendment:

Sec 90-835 – Keeping of animals

- (d) The keeping of chickens is allowed as an accessory use to an owner-occupied single-family dwelling in any residential district, except the R-R District where it is allowed by Sec 90-237 (b), subject to the following requirements:
1. The keeping of chickens shall be done on a noncommercial basis and be exclusively used by the people occupying the property as a locally grown food source for the consumption of eggs or meat.
 2. A maximum of four chickens are allowed per lot if the lot is ½ acre or less in area; a maximum of five chickens are allowed per lot if the lot is ½ to one acre in area; and, a maximum of six chickens are allowed per lot if the lot is over one acre in area. Roosters are prohibited.

-
3. Chickens shall be provided with a covered enclosure (coop) and must be kept in the coop or an adjoining fenced enclosure (run) at all times. The coop and run are not subject to the accessory building standards established by Sec 90-831 but shall meet the following requirements:
 - a. The coop and run shall be located in the rear yard and shall be located no closer than 10 feet to any property line and no closer than 40 feet to any residential dwelling on an adjacent property.
 - b. The coop and run shall not exceed 8 feet in height or 100 square feet in total area.
 - c. The coop shall be constructed in such a way as to prevent rats, mice, or other rodents or vermin from being harbored underneath or within the walls of the enclosure.
 - d. The coop and run shall be completely enclosed with a top and/or cover and shall be constructed in a workmanlike manner. The use of tarps, fabric, rubber, paper, cardboard, or similar materials is prohibited.
 4. All feed and other items associated with the keeping of chickens likely to attract rats, mice, or other rodents or vermin shall be secured and protected in sealed containers.
 5. The enclosed areas where the chickens are kept shall be maintained in a clean and neat manner at all times. The keeping of chickens is subject to the City of Hastings Code of Ordinances pertaining to noise, odors, dust, fumes, sanitation and health or other comparable nuisances to ensure the public health, safety and welfare.
 6. The outdoor slaughtering of chickens is prohibited.
 7. Any person who keeps chickens in the City of Hastings shall obtain a permit from the City prior to acquiring the chickens. Application shall be made to the City Clerk and the fee for the permit shall be as determined by Council resolution.





Prior to the issuance of a permit, there shall be an inspection of the proposed site by the City to determine compliance with the requirements of this Ordinance. A permit shall not be issued until all requirements are met.

Permits expire and become invalid five (5) years after the date of issuance. A person who wishes to continue keeping chickens shall have obtained a new permit on or before the expiration date of the previous permit. Application for a new permit shall be pursuant to the procedures and requirements that are applicable at the time the person applies for a new permit.

If the above requirements are not complied with, the City may revoke any permit granted under this section and/or initiate prosecution for a civil infraction violation.



Apr. 3. 24. 2021 D. King

I think it would
be great to have
Chickens in the City of
Hastings -

No Roosters plus a
limited # of chickens 3-4

Sincerely
Arlene Almsford
319 W. South St.

City of Hastings
COUNTY OF BARRY, STATE OF MICHIGAN

ORDINANCE NO. 600

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 90 OF THE HASTINGS CODE OF 1970, AS AMENDED, BY AMENDING THE FOLLOWING: ARTICLE 90 - IX, DIVISION 90 – IX-3 ACCESSORY BUILDINGS AND USES SECTION 90-835 KEEPING OF ANIMALS TO ADD SUBSECTION (D).

THE CITY OF HASTINGS ORDAINS:

SECTION I.

Section 90-835 is hereby amended to Chapter 90 - IX, Article 90 - IX, Division-90- IX-3 of the Hastings Code of 1970, as amended, to read as follows: (Additions in **bold**, existing text in *italics*).

Sec 90-835 Keeping Of Animals

- a) *The keeping of household pets, including dogs, cats, fish, birds, hamsters, nonpoisonous spiders, snakes and reptiles and other animals generally regarded as household pets is permitted as an accessory use in any district.*
- b) *No more than three dogs or three cats or any combination thereof totaling three that are six months of age or older shall be kept in a dwelling unit in any residential district.*
- c) *The keeping or sale of pigeons having free access outside their cages, the keeping of poultry, pigs, hogs, wild animals, horses, donkeys, mules, other species of equine, cows, oxen, and other species of bovine, sheep, goats, geese, turkeys and other species of fowl is prohibited in all districts except for farm animals as may be permitted in the rural residential district.*
- d) **The keeping of chickens is allowed as an accessory use to an owner-occupied single-family dwelling in any residential district, except the R-R District where it is allowed by Sec 90-237 (b), subject to the following requirements:**

1. The keeping of chickens shall be done on a noncommercial basis and be exclusively used by the people occupying the property as a locally grown food source for the consumption of eggs or meat.

2. A maximum of four chickens are allowed per lot if the lot is ½ acre or less in area; a maximum of five chickens are allowed per lot if the lot is ½ to one acre in area; and, a maximum of six chickens are allowed per lot if the lot is over one acre in area. Roosters are prohibited.

3. Chickens shall be provided with a covered enclosure (coop) and must be kept in the coop or an adjoining fenced enclosure (run) at all times. The coop and run are not subject to the accessory building standards established by Sec 90-831 but shall meet the following requirements:

- a. The coop and run shall be located in the rear yard and shall be located no closer than 10 feet to any property line and no closer than 40 feet to any residential dwelling on an adjacent property.
- b. The coop and run shall not exceed 8 feet in height or 100 square feet in total area.
- c. The coop shall be constructed in such a way as to prevent rats, mice, or other rodents or vermin from being harbored underneath or within the walls of the enclosure.
- d. The coop and run shall be completely enclosed with a top and/or cover and shall be constructed in a workmanlike manner. The use of tarps, fabric, rubber, paper, cardboard, or similar materials is prohibited.

4. All feed and other items associated with the keeping of chickens likely to attract rats, mice, or other rodents or vermin shall be secured and protected in sealed containers.

5. The enclosed areas where the chickens are kept shall be maintained in a clean and neat manner at all times. The keeping of chickens is subject to the City of Hastings Code of Ordinances pertaining to noise, odors, dust, fumes, sanitation and health or other comparable nuisances to ensure the public health, safety and welfare.

6. The outdoor slaughtering of chickens is prohibited.

7. Any person who keeps chickens in the City of Hastings shall obtain a permit from the City prior to acquiring the chickens. Application shall be made to the City Clerk and the fee for the permit shall be as determined by Council resolution.

Prior to the issuance of a permit, there shall be an inspection of the proposed site by the City to determine compliance with the requirements of this Ordinance. A permit shall not be issued until all requirements are met.

Permits expire and become invalid five (5) years after the date of issuance. A person who wishes to continue keeping chickens shall have obtained a new permit on or before the expiration date of the previous permit. Application for a new permit shall be pursuant to the procedures and requirements that are applicable at the time the person applies for a new permit.

If the above requirements are not complied with, the City may revoke any permit granted under this section and/or initiate prosecution for a civil infraction violation.

SECTION II.

If any article, section, subsection, sentence, clause, phrase, or portion of this ordinance is, for any reason, held invalid or unconstitutional by any court of competent jurisdiction, such portion shall be deemed a separate, distinct, and independent provision, and such holding shall not affect the validity of the remaining portions of this ordinance.

SECTION III.

This ordinance shall become effective upon its adoption and publication as provided by City Charter.

Moved by , with support by , that **Ordinance No. 600** be adopted as read.

YEAS: None
NAYS: None.
ABSENT: None.

CITY OF HASTINGS

Adoption Date:
Effective Date:
First Reading:
Second Reading:

By: Jane M. Saurman
Hastings City Clerk

CERTIFICATE

The undersigned, being the duly qualified and acting Clerk of the City of Hastings, Michigan, does hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of an Ordinance adopted by the City Council of the City of Hastings, at a regular meeting of the City Council on the day of 2020, at which meeting a quorum was present and remained throughout, and that the original of said Ordinance is on file in the records of the City of Hastings. I further certify that the meeting was conducted and public notice was given pursuant to and in compliance with Act No. 267, Public Acts of Michigan of 1976, as amended, and that minutes were kept and will be or have been made available as required thereby.

Dated:

Jane M. Saurman
City Clerk

City of Hastings
Planning Commission
Work Tasks for 2021
STATUS REPORT FOR APRIL 2021

1. Continue to work with Hastings Charter Township, Rutland Charter Township and others in regional growth planning and management efforts.
2. Review the Court Street PUD using hypothetical build out scenarios.
3. Consider comprehensive review and adoption of new zoning districts to accomplish specific desired outcomes, as prescribed in the CCP, within commercial and residential zoning districts.

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Identify candidate streets for traffic calming○ Consider options for increasing density in existing residential zones○ Establish policies for street and infrastructure system master plan in developing areas○ Consider options to encourage high quality construction for new residential development (not simply the cheapest option) |
|---|

4. Consider zoning amendments related to the M-37 Access Management Plan.
5. Monitor plan to construct sidewalks and trail system throughout the City of Hastings.
 - ***Ongoing. City seeking funding where available.***
6. Consider changes to the infrastructure requirements to accommodate denser or more traditional residential development.
 - ***Established R-1A Zone for this purpose.***
 - ***Additional analysis by PC required (see Item 3 above).***
7. Consider development of “Complete Streets” ordinance or policy.
8. Consider adding work tasks to the PC’s list to improve the Community’s Promoting Active Communities score.

- Offer incentives or expedited approvals for the following active living principals:
 - Locate new development adjacent to existing infrastructure
 - Create a mixed-use community
 - Build pedestrian amenities (sidewalks, lights, benches, etc) on both side of the streets
 - Create a grid street design
 - Provide public facilities for physical activity such as shared-use paths or trails
 - Create bike lanes and bike parking
 - Create opportunities for resident interaction
 - Build high density residence units
 - Create short blocks
 - Build narrow streets for slower traffic speeds

9. Continue Master Plan 2018 update.

10. Review Sec. 90-835 – Keeping of Animals

11. **Deal with outdated language in ordinances. (Example from 90-1)**

Service station or *filling station* means a place where gasoline or other motor fuel or lubricating oil or grease for operating motor vehicles is offered for sale at retail to the public, including sale of accessories, oiling and light motor service on the premises, but in no case to include major automotive repairs.

12. Review Sec. 90-973 Signs in the B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, and B-6 districts (as related to portable sidewalk ground signs).

13. Consider development of a Planned Residential District zoning classification to allow for higher density housing through smaller lot sizes and smaller dwelling square footage requirements.

14. Consider accessory use buildings in residential neighborhoods for additional residential housing alternatives.

15. Consider two family dwellings as a permitted use in the R-1, R-2, R-R, R-S, and R1-A Residential Zoning Districts.

Date	Project Name	Description	Conditions of Approval	Compliance Date	
2.4.19	Ravenna Holdings, LLC	Townhouse Construction	Max 35 ft. building height		
			Exterior masonry material		
			3 BF parking spaces		
			Extension of sidewalk int./ext		
			Front yard and pk lot landscape		
			1 Year Site Plan Extension	1/6/2020	XXXX
			Building Permit Issued	1/29/2021	XXXX
2.4.19	Spectrum Health Pennock Hosp.	Surgical Center Expansion	30% lot coverage compliance		
			Off street parking compliance	5/28/2019	XXXX
			Proposed lighting fixtures		
			Boundary vegetation		
			Lot and front yd. landscaping		
			Side yard setback	2/19/2019 ZBA app	XXXX
4.1.19	Todd Porritt	Building Expansion	Applicable setback requirements		
			Building design standard compliance		
			Second floor egress		
			1 Year Site Plan Extension	3/2/2020	XXXX
9.3.19	Royal Coach Apartments	Planned Unit Development	Density		
			Setbacks		
12.2.19	Julie Fox	Site Plan and Special Use Permit	First Floor Elevations (Glamping)		
			Setbacks (Glamping)		
			Parking to be reviewed in 1 year		
			1 Year Site Plan Extension	11/2/2020	XXXX
3.2.20	Meadowstone MH Park	Final Site Plan Approval	PED X Insulation from roadway		
			Natural Feature Buffer		



March 29, 2021

Planning Commission
City of Hastings
201 East State Street
Hastings, Michigan 49058

Subject: Text Amendment – Outdoor Parking or Storage of Semi-Tractors . .

Existing Text

- Section 90-929 (d) prohibits ‘the outdoor parking or storage of semi-tractors, semi-trailers, or vehicles with 2 or more axles’ in all residential areas.
- Section 90-929 (e) prohibits ‘the outdoor parking or storage of semi-tractors, semi-trailers, or vehicles with 2 or more axles’ on any streets, alleys or public ways within the City, except when actively loading or unloading.
- Section 90-929 (e) also prohibits ‘the outdoor parking or storage of semi-tractors, semi-trailers, or vehicles with 2 or more axles’ in any other area except:
 - Where such parking is necessary in connection with construction activity actually occurring on the property pursuant to a valid and current building permit.
 - For a period of up to 3 hours, or longer as permitted by the Chief of Police, for the purpose of loading or unloading materials, supplies, or inventory to be used in connection with the business activity occurring on the property. Such vehicles and attachments may not be parked for the purpose of storing such materials, supplies, or inventory.
 - Where such vehicles are being offered for sale by a licensed dealership.
 - Where such vehicles are customarily used in connection with the business where the vehicles are parked.
- In essence, there is currently no zoning district or site/use condition in the City that allows for the overnight (or short-term) ‘outdoor parking or storage of semi-tractors, semi-trailers, or vehicles with 2 or more axles’.



Suggested Amendment

- In recognition of an identified need within the City for designated areas where individually-owned semi-tractors or semi-trailers can be lawfully parked overnight or stored on a short-term basis, the following addition of Section 90.930 is proposed:

Section 90-930 – Supplemental Parking Requirements in Non-Residential Zones

An off-street parking lot for the outdoor parking or storage of semi-tractors, semi-trailers, or vehicles with two or more rear axles not in connection with a/the business may be established in a non-residential zoning district if approved by the planning commission as a special land use in accordance with the requirements of article XIII of this chapter, and subject to the parking lot requirements of section 90-920.

