AGENDA
Planning Commission
Monday, September 19, 2022 – 7:00 p.m.

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

III. Pledge to the Flag

IV. Approval of the August 15, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

V. Correspondence

VI. Brief Public Comments & Questions (Limited to 3 minutes)

VII. New Business
   A. Site Plan Amendment – Clovernook Multifamily

VIII. Reports
   A. Staff Report
   B. Commissioner Comments

IX. Extended Public Comments & Questions (Limited to 4 minutes)

X. Adjournment

Persons wishing to speak at public hearings, on agenda items, or extended comments, must fill out a “Speakers Form” located on the counter. Completed forms must be submitted to Township Staff prior to the meeting.
MEETING MINUTES
GRAND HAVEN CHARTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
August 15, 2022

I. CALL TO ORDER
Wilson called the meeting of the Grand Haven Charter Township Planning Commission to order at 7:00pm.

II. ROLL CALL
Members present: Wilson, Reenders, Mesler, Wagenmaker, and Lemkuil
Members absent: Chalifoux, Hesselsweet, Cousins, and Taylor
Also present: Senior Planner Thibault and Associate Planner Hoisington

Without objection, Wilson instructed Hoisington to record the minutes.

III. PLEDGE TO THE FLAG

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Without objection, the minutes of the July 18, 2022 meeting were approved.

V. CORRESPONDENCE - None

VI. PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

VII. NEW BUSINESS
A. Preapplication – Beacon Roofing – 172nd Avenue
Thibault provided an overview through a memorandum dated August 11th.
Scott Rantala of JLL and Scott Dolata of Beacon Roofing were present to provide information:

• Beacon Roofing is an established business for building supplies in the West Michigan region, but is looking to have a local base out of Grand Haven to serve the lakeshore area.
• Would modify the existing building to have a showroom for customers to pick samples. An outdoor area is proposed for storage of building materials.

The Planning Commission noted the following points of discussion:
• Direction to use landscaping to screen more of the fencing as required in the US-31 Overlay Zone.
• The Commission was generally supportive of the project.

Thibault provided an overview through a memorandum dated August 11th.
David Stebbins, Vice President of Land Development for Redstone Homes, and Zach Voogt, Project Engineer, were present to provide information:

- Explained variety of housing types proposed on site.
- There is a priority in site design to preserve the existing wetlands and treat them as an asset to the site.
- Explained that they have entered into a purchase agreement for parcels directly adjacent to the site, and additional access would come from those parcels.
  - Stebbins clarified this was contingent on a change in the Future Land Use map as the area is not currently zoned for residential development.
- The project would be phased, and the site amenities are still to be determined.

The Planning Commission noted the following points of discussion:

- Commissioners were supportive of the housing development, felt it is an appropriate location to have a variety of housing types.
- Inquired about possible amenities on site.

VIII. REPORTS
A. Staff Report
   Thibault noted this would be Chalifoux’s last meeting, though he was unable to attend.
B. Commissioner Comments – None

IX. EXTENDED PUBLIC COMMENTS - None

X. ADJOURNMENT
   Without objection, the meeting adjourned at 8:01p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Cassandra Hoisington
Acting Recording Secretary
Swan Bravo First, LLC (i.e. Allen Edwin Homes), has constructed a quadplex residential development located on Clovernook Drive (Parcel # 70-03-27-452-045). They are seeking approval for an amended Landscape plan due to additional trees being cleared for a reserve septic system. This Site Plan Review application was previously approved by the Planning Commission on May 28, 2020. As a condition of the original approval, a change to the landscape plan requires the Planning Commission’s approval. This language is provided in the following pages. Changes to an approved landscape are typically done administratively. Consideration is given to ensure the result is equivalent or better than what was originally proposed and it meets the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

As shown on the approved Landscape Plan and aerial, a mature tree stand was intended to remain...
SITE PLAN REVIEW REQUIREMENTS

A tree inventory was required by Staff of the applicant in order to assess the location and condition of the trees determined as “existing” on the 07/12/2022 Landscape Plan. The tree inventory report has been provided in your packets. The table following summarizes the outstanding requirements per the Zoning Ordinance and identifies the level of compliance determined by staff:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*Access drive to site provided and approved by OCRC</td>
<td>*Meets standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All proposed planted species native to Michigan</td>
<td>Meets standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees identified in declining to good condition with 2” caliper or greater size (58 required)</td>
<td>Meets standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 new trees to be planted (1 tree provided per 500 sqft of non-paved surface)</td>
<td>Meets standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Dumpster enclosure details provided and constructed accordingly</td>
<td>*Meets standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*not in the scope of the site plan revision review by the Planning Commission but has been completed or is in the process

**PROJECT TIMELINE**

Following is timeline of the project from the original site plan approval to apprise the Planning Commission of the current status of the development.

**May 28, 2020**
- Township Planning Commission approves site plan review application.
  - Access to the site is proposed via an existing shared driveway.
- Property survey is completed.
  - This document notes a driveway encroachment from the southern property, but no shared driveway easement.
  - The survey is not provided to Township staff at this time.
- Conditions of approval are noted as such:
  - Shall provide revised landscaping plan if the septic tank is removed.
  - Shall provide required dumpster screening details.
- Report findings are as such:
  - Removal or alterations of significant natural features are restricted to those areas which are reasonably necessary to develop the site in accordance with the requirements of this Ordinance. The Planning Commission has required that landscaping, buffers, and/or greenbelts be preserved and/or provided to ensure that proposed uses will be adequately buffered from one another and from surrounding public and private property.
  - The site plans conform to all applicable requirements of County, State, Federal, and Township statutes and ordinances.

**September 9, 2020**
- Building permit application is received.
- Site plan shows shared driveway.

**October 28, 2020**
- Correspondence is received from the OCRC indicating that commercial driveway specifications would apply to the development if the existing driveway did not exist or if any work was done within the right-of-way, but will not enforce them based upon use of the existing shared driveway.

**March 11, 2021**
- Revised building permit application is submitted.

**March 25, 2021**
- Building permit is issued.
November 22, 2021
✓ Final inspection occurs.
✓ Inspector provides comments to applicant regarding non-compliance with approved driveway.

November 23, 2021
✓ Survey dated 5/28/2020 is provided to Township staff.

November 30, 2021
✓ Second final inspection occurs, leaving Fire/Rescue and Zoning approval as outstanding items.

January 14, 2022
✓ Staff provide the developer a Declaration of Restrictive Covenants that would allow the developer to receive final occupancy when certain conditions are met relating to conformance with the approved site plan.

May 17, 2022
✓ Developer provides Township with memo requesting Temporary Certificate of Occupancy, which had not been granted due to ongoing litigation between the applicant and the adjacent property owner regarding a grant of mutual easements for ingress/egress to the property.

May 25, 2022
✓ Staff provides the developer a response outlining the timeline of what has occurred, and reasoning for denying Certificate of Occupancy, and reaffirmed Declaration of Restrictive Covenant option.

May 26, 2022
✓ Developer submits FOIA request regarding all documents and plans associated with adjacent property owner

June 10, 2022
✓ Developer submits revised site and landscape plan

June 15, 2022
✓ Township reviews application and rejects submittal due to the following reasons:
  o Revised landscape plan noncompliant, due to removal of the trees
  o Access (grant of mutual easements) has not been signed
  o Dumpster enclosure not provided

July 10, 2022
✓ Township reaffirms the following requirements before a Certificate of Occupancy is granted:
  o driveway must be constructed in accordance with the approved site plan (noncompliant presently)
  o The site plan must be expanded to include the dumpster enclosure details.
  o The landscaping plan must accurately reflect the existing landscaping inventory.
  o The revised landscaping plan will be subject to review by the Planning Commission.
July 12, 2022
✓ Developer submits revised submittal material addressing access issues, landscaping, and the dumpster enclosure

July 21, 2022
✓ Township requests executable copy of grant of mutual easements and additional site details for dumpster enclosure.
✓ Township to verify landscaping on site matches drawing

August 1, 2022
✓ Township requests tree survey to be conducted due to discrepancy between site plan and as-built conditions

August 9, 2022
✓ Township allows driveway and dumpster enclosure work to proceed:
  o Because Township attorney confirmed grant of mutual easement was executable
  o Because Fire/Rescue confirmed proposed driveway width and design was adequate
  o Because Dumpster enclosure details were administratively approved by Township Staff
✓ Township notes the following requirements for Certificates of Occupancy:
  o Temporary Certificate of Occupancy
    ▪ The driveway is constructed according to the 07/12/22 plans
    ▪ The dumpster enclosure is constructed according to the documents provided on 07/12/22
    ▪ The landscape plan must accurately reflect the existing inventory
  o Final Certificate of Occupancy
    ▪ The driveway is constructed according to the 07/12/22 plans
    ▪ The dumpster enclosure is constructed according to the documents provided on 07/12/22
    ▪ The Zoning issues related to landscaping are approved by the Planning Commission and installed

August 11, 2022
✓ Developer submits revised landscape plan and tree survey/inventory

August 23, 2022
✓ Developer asserts driveway improvements have been made and dumpster enclosure to be completed

September 05, 2022
✓ Developer asserts dumpster enclosure is completed

September 08, 2022
✓ Staff finds enclosure to incomplete and dumpster enclosure drive width to be less than what was originally approved

September 09, 2022
✓ Developer provides updated site plan and assurance for construction of 15-feet driveway as shown
If the Planning Commission finds the application meets the standards, the following motion can be offered:

**Motion to conditionally approve** the Swan Bravo First, LLC Landscape Plan dated 08/11/2022 for a multi-family dwelling development located at Parcel # 70-03-27-452-045 based on it meeting the requirements set forth by the Grand Haven Charter Township Zoning Ordinance and the conditional approval on 05/28/2020.

1. All new planting and trees identified in the survey shall be properly maintained to ensure they remain in a healthy, growing condition at the beginning of the first summer of issuance of an occupancy permit.
2. Any trees that are dying or dead following the first year shall be replanted according to the Zoning Ordinance requirements.
3. If planting is not anticipated to occur until Spring 2023, a bond of adequate value shall be furnished by the developer to cover cost of plantings.

If the Planning Commission finds the application does not meet the applicable standards, the following motion can be offered:

**Motion to deny** the Swan Bravo First, LLC Landscape Plan and direct staff to draft a formal motion and report for those discussion points which will be reflected in the meeting minutes. This will be reviewed and considered for adoption at the next meeting.

If the Planning Commission finds the applicant must make revisions to the application, the following motion can be offered:

**Motion to table** the Swan Bravo First, LLC Site Plan Review application, and direct the applicant to make the following revisions:

1. *List the revisions.*

Please contact me prior to the meeting with questions or concerns.
ZONING CHARACTERISTICS

SECTION A: REQUIREMENTS
1. MIN 4 UNIT LOT SIZE: 13,000 SF
2. MIN LOT WIDTH F: 100'
3. MIN LOT WIDTH R: 40'
4. FRONT SETBACK: 50'
5. SIDE SETBACK: 15'
6. REAR SETBACK: 30'
7. ALLOWABLE DENSITY: 7 UNITS
8. MAX. IMPERVIOUS SURFACE: 40% OF 32,200 SF = 12,800 SF

SECTION B: PROPOSAL
1. LOT SIZE: 32,234 SF
2. LOT WIDTH F: 140'
3. LOT WIDTH R: 140'
4. FRONT SETBACK: 50'
5. SIDE SETBACK: 15'
6. REAR SETBACK: 30'
7. PROPOSED DENSITY: 4 UNITS
8. IMPERVIOUS SURFACE: 10,964 SF
LANDSCAPE CHARACTERISTICS

SECTION A: REQUIREMENTS
1. MIN 1 TREE / 500 SF NOT PAVED
2. NATIVE GRASS TURF
3. PLANT ONLY APPROVED NATIVE SPECIES

SECTION B: PROPOSAL
1. 31,840 SF TOTAL LOT AREA
   3,540 SF PAVEMENT NET:
   28,300 SF = 57 TREES REQ'D
   PRESERVE TREES TO MAX EXTENT POSSIBLE – MIN 54 TREES
   PLANT ADDITIONAL 3 TREES
2. GRASS TO BE NATIVE SPECIES
3. ALL PLANTINGS TO BE NATIVE SPECIES COMPLIANT WITH ZO SECTION 3.02

LEGEND

6’ WHITE PINE

2.5” RED OAK

1 GAL. NEW JERSEY TEA

1 GAL. BIG BLUESTEM

1 GAL. NEW ENGLAND ASTER
LANDSCAPE CHARACTERISTICS

SECTION A: REQUIREMENTS
1. MIN 1 TREE / 500 SF NOT PAVED
2. NATIVE GRASS TURF
3. PLANT ONLY APPROVED NATIVE SPECIES

SECTION B: PROPOSAL
1. 31,840 SF TOTAL LOT AREA
   3,540 SF PAVEMENT NET:
   28,300 SF = 57 TREES REQ’D
   PRESERVE TREES TO MAX EXTENT POSSIBLE – 52 TREES
   (2–3” CAL.)* REMAIN
   PLANT ADDITIONAL 5 TREES
   *REMAINING TREES FLAGGED IN PINK RIBBON
2. GRASS TO BE NATIVE SPECIES
3. ALL PLANTINGS TO BE NATIVE SPECIES PLANTED 12” ON CENTER COMPLIANT WITH ZO SECTION 3.02

LEGEND

6’ WHITE PINE
2.5" RED OAK
1 GAL. NEW JERSEY TEA
1 GAL. BIG BLUESTEM
1 GAL. NEW ENGLAND ASTER
LANDSCAPE CHARACTERISTICS

SECTION A: REQUIREMENTS
1. MIN 1 TREE / 500 SF NOT PAVED
2. NATIVE GRASS TURF
3. PLANT ONLY APPROVED NATIVE SPECIES

SECTION B: PROPOSAL
1. 31,840 SF TOTAL LOT AREA
   3,230 SF PAVEMENT NET:
   28,610 SF = 58 TREES REQ’D
   PRESERVE TREES TO MAX EXTENT POSSIBLE – 48 TREES
   (2-3” CAL.)* REMAIN
   PLANT ADDITIONAL 10 TREES
   *SEE SUPPLEMENTAL TREE INVENTORY REPORT

2. GRASS TO BE NATIVE SPECIES

3. ALL PLANTINGS TO BE NATIVE SPECIES PLANTED 12” ON CENTER COMPLIANT WITH ZO SECTION 3.02

LEGEND

- 6’ WHITE PINE
- 2.5” RED OAK
- 2.5” SUGAR MAPLE
- 1 GAL. NEW JERSEY TEA
- 1 GAL. BIG BLUESTEM
- 1 GAL. NEW ENGLAND ASTER
Established Tree Inventory
15433 Clovernook Drive, Grand Haven, MI 49417
August 9, 2022

Thomas (Andy) Niemeyer
ISA Certified Arborist #MI-4216A
Oak Meadow Tree Service, Inc.
P.O. Box 255, Lowell, MI 49331
(616) 970-0048
andy@oakmeadowtreeservice.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag #</th>
<th>Species of Tree</th>
<th>Caliper (Inches)*</th>
<th>Condition (1-5)**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Pin cherry (<em>Prunus pensylvanica</em>)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Black cherry (<em>Prunus serotina</em>)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Black walnut (<em>Juglans nigra</em>)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Black walnut (<em>Juglans nigra</em>)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag #</td>
<td>Species of Tree</td>
<td>Caliper (Inches)*</td>
<td>Condition (1-5)**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Black walnut (<em>Juglans nigra</em>)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Black walnut (<em>Juglans nigra</em>)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Black walnut (<em>Juglans nigra</em>)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Black cherry (<em>Prunus serotina</em>)</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Black cherry (<em>Prunus serotina</em>)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>White mulberry (<em>Morus alba</em>)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Common sassafras (<em>Sassafras albidum</em>)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>White mulberry (<em>Morus alba</em>)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Caliper* is the diameter of the tree trunk, in inches, taken at approximately 6-12 inches above soil grade

**Condition** of the tree is based on the following scale:

1 – The tree is dead and should be removed

2 – The tree is declining with significant canopy dieback, structural issues or pest damage

3 – The tree is in fair condition with some canopy dieback, structural issues or pest damage

4 – The tree is in good condition with minimal canopy dieback, structural issues or pest damage

5 – The tree is in excellent condition with no canopy dieback, structural issues or pest damage

Lastly, it should be noted that there are a number of trees very close to the West property boundary that are not listed in this inventory. Based on the position of the corner property boundary stakes (and the lack of stakes in between), it was impossible to tell if the trees are located on the property in question or not – ergo they were left out of the inventory.
**ZONING CHARACTERISTICS**

**SECTION A: REQUIREMENTS**
1. **MIN 4 UNIT LOT SIZE:** 13,000 SF
2. **MIN LOT WIDTH F:** 100’
3. **MIN LOT WIDTH R:** 40’
4. **FRONT SETBACK:** 50’
5. **SIDE SETBACK:** 15’
6. **REAR SETBACK:** 30’
7. **ALLOWABLE DENSITY:** 7 UNITS
8. **MAX. IMPERVIOUS SURFACE:** 40% of 32,200 SF = 12,800 SF

**SECTION B: PROPOSAL**
1. **LOT SIZE:** 32,234 SF
2. **LOT WIDTH F:** 140’
3. **LOT WIDTH R:** 140’
4. **FRONT SETBACK:** 50’
5. **SIDE SETBACK:** 15’
6. **REAR SETBACK:** 30’
7. **PROPOSED DENSITY:** 4 UNITS
8. **IMPERVIOUS SURFACE:** 11,424 SF (35.7%)