



**PLANNING BOARD MEETING AGENDA
March 12, 2026 – 7:00 P.M.**

CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL

PLEDGE OF ALEGIANCE TO THE FLAG

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes February 12, 2026

PRESENTATION

CITIZEN COMMENT (Agenda Items Only)

COMMUNICATIONS

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

PUBLIC HEARING

NEW BUSINESS

1. Consider Wade Trim Proposal – Zoning Audit
2. Consider City CIP

STAFF REPORTS

1. City Manager to provide verbal report to Planning Board on Streetscape Project and Progress.

EXETENDED CITIZEN COMMENT

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENTS

ADJOURNMENT

NEXT MEETING – April 9, 2026



**PLANNING BOARD MEETING
February 12, 2026 – 7:00 P.M.
MEETING MINUTES**

CALL TO ORDER – Chairman Ray Fost called meeting to Order at 7:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL – Present: Chairman Ray Foust, David Rosario, Nicole Rumbold, Ronald Campbell, Lori Machuk (ex-officio), and City Manager Joe Karlichek. **Absent:** Ashley Putnam, Warren Edwards, and Paul Wixson.

PLEDGE OF ALEGIANCE TO THE FLAG Chairman Ray Foust led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Approval of Meeting Minutes September 11, 2025

Action:

Motion: Rosario to approve Minutes

Second: Campbell

A – YES, Motion Carried.

PRESENTATION

Adam Young, AICP, Senior Project Manager – Wade Trim

A. Memorandum

B. Zoning Audit Findings

Action: Presentation made and discussed in depth. Wade Trim to provide city manager proposal on Zoning Audit and present it to the Board in March 2026.

CITIZEN COMMENT (Agenda Items Only)

None

COMMUNICATIONS

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

PUBLIC HEARING

NEW BUSINESS

1. Consider Selection of Officers (Chairperson, Vice-Chairperson, and Secretary).

Action:

Motion: Rosario to name Mr. Foust as Chairman

Second: Mr. Campbell

A – YES, Motion Carried.

Action:
Motion: Mr. Campbell nominate Mr. Wixson as Vice Chairman
Second: Rosario
A – YES, Motion Carried.

Action:
Motion: Mr. Rosario nominate self as Secretary
Second: Mr. Foust
A – YES, Motion Carried.

Action:
Motion:
Second:
A – YES, Motion Carried.

2. Consider Review of By-Laws
Action: Discussion. No changes requested.

STAFF REPORTS

1. City Manager to provide verbal report to Planning Board on Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), upcoming Budget FY26/27 planning and Planning Board next meeting in March 2026.
Action: City Manager provided report to Board.

EXETENDED CITIZEN COMMENT

None

PLANNING COMMISSION MEMBER COMMENTS

None

ADJOURNMENT – Adjourned 8:35 p.m.

Action:
Motion: Mr. Campbell
Second: Rosario
A – YES, Motion Carried.

NEXT MEETING – March 12, 2026.

1
/

CITY OF MONTROSE MEMORANDUM

Date: March 9, 2026

To: Chairman Foust and Planning Commission Members

From: Joe Karlichek, City Manager 

Subject: Consider Wade Trim Zoning Audit Proposal

Background: As you recall the Planning Commission received a thorough presentation from Adam Young, City Planner with Wade Trim at your February 2026 meeting. In that meeting Adam discussed numerous zoning ordinances that are either inconsistent with State Law or are outdated, confusing, contradicting or obsolete. Early in my arrival as the city manager the Planning Commission expressed the Zoning was very outdated as well.

Attached is the memorandum and proposal from Wade Trim identifying two (2) phases. One identified as “Administrative Revisions” and the second Phase as “Substantive Revisions” with each Phase as its own separate cost and timeframe. The process, in total, is expected to take up to 12 months in the amount of \$19,300.00 including two (2) in-person meetings for phase one and three (3) for phase 2. Any additional need for in-person attendance by Wade Trim would be billed at a \$500 flat rate.

Discussing this project with our Interim Treasurer and Finance Director, the city would budget this project to begin July 1, 2026 at the beginning of its new fiscal year.

City administration strongly encourages the Planning Commission to review the Wade Trim Proposal and discuss any additional questions at the scheduled meeting of March 13, 2026.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the Planning Commission approve the proposal from Wade Trim for Phase 1 & 2 in the amount of \$19,300 and direct city administration to forward the proposal to city council for final approval and include this in the FY26/27 Budget.



Wade Trim Associates, Inc.
500 Griswold Street, Suite 2500 • Detroit, MI 48226
313.961.3650 • www.wadetrim.com

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'A.', is located in the top right corner of the page.

MEMORANDUM

To: City of Montrose Township Planning Commission

From: Adam Young, AICP, Professional Planner

Date: February 4, 2026

Subject: Zoning Ordinance Audit

As requested by the City of Montrose, Wade Trim has conducted a detailed review (“audit”) of the City of Montrose Zoning Ordinance (Ord. No. 255, adopted June 13, 1995). As the City recently prepared a new Master Plan (adopted September 2024) and a Community Housing Study (adopted September 2025), this zoning ordinance audit sets the stage for the development and adoption of zoning ordinance amendments that are necessary to implement the key recommendations of each plan. Additionally, the zoning ordinance audit identifies changes needed to bring Montrose’s Zoning Ordinance into compliance with legal requirements and contemporary practice.

The findings of our zoning ordinance audit are detailed in the enclosed report, dated February 4, 2026. This report outlines and explains our various findings and recommendations, grouped by topic, including format and organization, definitions, zoning districts, general provisions, administration and enforcement, special situations or use types, and master plan/housing strategy recommendations.

We will be presenting this information during your February 12, 2026, Planning Commission meeting. We recommend that you familiarize yourself with the materials in advance of the meeting and be prepared to ask questions and share your thoughts.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 313.961.3650 or ayoung@wadetrim.com.

ACY:lkf
MTR 6100-25D, Task 100
20260204_Planning Commission Zoning Audit-Memo.docx

Enclosures: Zoning Ordinance Audit, dated February 4, 2026



Wade Trim Associates, Inc.
500 Griswold Street, Suite 2500 • Detroit, MI 48226
313.961.3650 • www.wadetrim.com

March 5, 2026

City of Montrose
139 S. Saginaw Street
Montrose, MI 48457

Attention: Joe Karlicheck
City Manager

Re: Professional Planning Services Proposal – Zoning Ordinance Updates

Dear Joe:

As requested, we are providing this scope of work and cost estimate to assist the City of Montrose in the development and adoption of amendments to the City of Montrose Zoning Ordinance. This effort is a follow-up to the recently finalized Zoning Ordinance Audit that we completed and presented to the Planning Commission in February.

SCOPE OF WORK

The enclosed Zoning Ordinance Audit, dated March 3, 2026, divides the recommended amendments into two categories of priority:

1. “Administrative” Revisions – These are relatively minor revisions that should require limited discussion. In many cases, they are mandated changes to ensure consistency with changes to Federal/State laws.
2. “Substantive” Revisions – These are more urgent changes that are likely to have a greater impact within the community. They are also more complex and considerable discussion is likely necessary to develop amendments.

Our proposed scope of work handles each category of amendments separately. (However, the city may consider proceeding with both sets of amendments simultaneously.) The proposed scope of work also complies with the procedural requirements for amending a zoning ordinance in accordance with the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act (Public Act 110 of 2006).

Phase 1: Administrative Revisions

Task 1A: Zoning Amendment Language Development

Wade Trim will develop draft zoning ordinance amendment language to address the **administrative revisions** as noted in the enclosed Zoning Ordinance Audit. After preparing draft language, we propose to send the language to the City Manager for review and facilitate a virtual meeting to discuss the draft and consider additions and revisions.

After a complete draft of proposed amendments has been prepared, we will meet with the Planning Commission to present and review the updated language. Further revisions to the language will be made based on comments received from the Planning Commission, as necessary.

Task 1B: Public Hearing and Adoption Process

Ultimately, the draft zoning ordinance amendment language must be presented for public review during a legally noticed public hearing held by the Planning Commission. Wade Trim will assist the

city in the preparation of the notices and will attend the public hearing. After the public hearing, the Planning Commission will forward the recommended changes to the City Council, who can then adopt the amendments.

Task 1C: Final Deliverables

After adoption, Wade Trim will provide the final adopted zoning ordinance amendment language to the city in Microsoft Word format. The city can then provide that language to Municode for incorporation into the online version of the city's code of ordinances. (The city would be responsible for any costs associated with the incorporation of the amendments into the city's online code of ordinances.)

Phase 2: Substantive Revisions

Task 2A: Zoning Amendment Language Development

Wade Trim will develop draft zoning ordinance amendment language to address the **substantive revisions** as noted in the enclosed Zoning Ordinance Audit. We will prepare the amendments in a logical manner and in groupings. After preparing draft language for each grouping, we will send the language to the City Manager for review and facilitate a virtual meeting to discuss the draft and consider additions and revisions. We will follow this process for each grouping until a complete draft is prepared. As noted in the Zoning Ordinance Audit, this task will also include a review and potential amendments to the City of Montrose Zoning Map.

We propose to meet with the Planning Commission on up to two (2) occasions during this process to present the draft zoning amendments. Further revisions to the proposed amendments will be made based on comments received, as necessary.

Task 2B: Public Hearing and Adoption Process

Ultimately, the draft zoning ordinance amendment language (and map amendments, if applicable) must be presented for public review during a legally noticed public hearing held by the Planning Commission. Wade Trim will assist the city in the preparation of the notices and will attend the public hearing. After the public hearing, the Planning Commission would forward the recommended changes to the City Council, who can then adopt the amendments.

Task 2C: Final Deliverables

After adoption, Wade Trim will provide the final adopted zoning ordinance amendment language to the city in Microsoft Word format. The city can then provide that language to Municode for incorporation into the online version of the city's code of ordinances. (The city would be responsible for any costs associated with the incorporation of the amendments into the city's online code of ordinances.) If changes to the zoning map are included as part of the amendments, Wade Trim will prepare the necessary revisions to the city's Zoning Map and provide the updated map to the city in Adobe PDF format.

COST ESTIMATE

Phase 1: Administrative Revisions

Wade Trim proposes to complete Phase 1 for a **Lump Sum Fee of \$6,900**. This fee is inclusive of all effort and expenses related to this Phase, including Wade Trim's attendance at two (2) in-person meetings with the Planning Commission (one of which is the public hearing). Additional in-person meetings requested by the city would be billed at a flat rate of \$500 per meeting.

Phase 2: Substantive Revisions

Wade Trim proposes to complete Phase 2 for a **Lump Sum Fee of \$12,400**. This fee is inclusive of all effort and expenses related to this Phase, including Wade Trim's attendance at three (3) in-person meetings with the Planning Commission (one of which is the public hearing). Additional in-person meetings requested by the city would be billed at a flat rate of \$500 per meeting.

Invoicing Procedures

All effort and cost will be invoiced monthly for our effort to date. Payment of invoices is expected within 30 days. Any disputes related to the invoice amount will immediately be brought to the attention of Wade Trim. Wade Trim reserves the right to stop work when accounts receivable exceeds 60 days. All deliverables are the property of Wade Trim until payment obligations are met.

PROJECT SCHEDULE

We anticipate that Phase 1: Administrative Revisions will take approximately five (5) months to complete, while Phase 2: Substantive Revisions will take approximately seven (7) months to complete.

We propose to perform the work under the terms of our existing as-needed services agreement with the City of Montrose. We look forward to partnering with the city on this important project. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 800.931.9135 or by email at ayoung@wadetrim.com.

Very truly yours,

Wade Trim Associates, Inc.



Adam Young, AICP
Senior Project Manager



Jason T. Smith, AICP
Vice President

ACY:JTS:ikf
AAA 8140-26
20260305_Montrose Zoning Updates Proposal-Ltr.docx
26-0196

Enclosure: Montrose Zoning Ordinance Audit, Finalized/Prioritized, dated March 3, 2026

City of Montrose Zoning Ordinance Audit

March 3, 2026 – Final / Prioritized

Prepared By:  WADE TRIM

As requested by the City of Montrose, Wade Trim conducted a detailed review of the City of Montrose Zoning Ordinance, Ord. No. 255, adopted June 13, 1995, as accessed from the Municode website on December 17, 2025. Our findings are outlined below.

For your reference, we have also established a prioritization of the recommended amendments, based on the following categories of priority:

- ***“Administrative” Revisions*** – These are relatively minor revisions that should require limited discussion. In many cases, they are mandated changes to ensure consistency with changes to Federal/State laws.
- ***“Substantive” Revisions*** – These are more urgent changes that are likely to have a greater impact within the community. They are also more complex and considerable discussion is likely necessary to develop amendments.

A – Zoning Ordinance Format and Organization

1. **Formatting.** The City’s zoning ordinance is currently maintained on Municode. As part of this review, the city may consider alternative formats, such as a stand-alone Word document, which can be maintained on the city website as an Adobe PDF document. Adobe PDF files can be built to offer ease of use and navigational enhancements such as bookmarks and hyperlinks.
2. **Title, Purposes, and Miscellaneous Provisions.** Several existing articles and/or sections can be merged into a single article at the beginning of the zoning ordinance named “Title, Purposes, and Miscellaneous Provisions.” These articles/sections include:
 - Article 0.1 (Title)
 - Article 0.2 (Authority)
 - Section 1.1 (Purpose)
 - Section 1.2 (Scope)
 - Section 1.3 (Repeal of prior ordinance)
 - Section 19.9 (Interpretation)
 - Section 19.10 (Vested right)
 - Section 19.12 (Validity and severability clause)
 - Section 19.13 (Savings)
 - Section 19.14 (Effective date)

3. **Schedule of Regulations.** Sections 3.6 through 3.9 (Schedule of regulations; Footnotes to the schedule of regulations; Lot size averaging; and, Single-family cluster housing option) are all included within Article 3 (Zoning Districts and Zoning Map). Typically, the schedule of regulations is a stand-alone article which follows the zoning district articles.
4. **Use Requirements.** We recommend the creation of a new article titled “Use Requirements,” which would be a holding place for all use-specific standards. This article could be further divided into sections such as residential use requirements, institutional use requirements, commercial use requirements, etc.
5. **Special Land Use Review.** Existing Article 11 (Special Land Uses) should be broken up. Use specific requirements should be moved to the new Use Requirements article. The special land use review procedures should be moved within or after Article 19 (Enforcement and Administration). By doing this, all “administrative procedures” articles and sections would be grouped in one location, toward the back of the zoning ordinance.
6. **Site Plan Review.** Existing Article 12 (Review and Approval Procedures for Site Plans and Condominium Development) should be moved within or after Article 19 (Enforcement and Administration). Additionally, the site plan review procedures should be separated from the condominium development review procedures. By doing this, all “administrative procedures” articles and sections would be grouped in one location, toward the back of the zoning ordinance.
7. **Parking Lot Landscaping.** Section 13.8 (Parking lot landscaping) should be moved to Article 16 (Landscaping Standards).
8. **General Provisions Sections to be Moved.** In our option, there are numerous sections within Article 15 (General Provisions) that a typical reader of the ordinance would expect to find in other locations. These include:
 - Section 15.5 (Regulations applicable to single-family dwellings) – Should be moved to the new Use Requirements article
 - Section 15.17 (Use variances) – Should be moved to Article 18 (Zoning Board of Appeals)
 - Section 15.28 (Timely completion of construction required) – Should be moved to Article 12 (Review and Approval Procedures for Site Plans and Condominium Development)
 - Section 15.29 (Withholding of approval) – Should be moved to Article 12 (Review and Approval Procedures for Site Plans and Condominium Development)
 - Section 15.30 (Change of tenancy or ownership [of nonconforming uses]) – Should be moved to Article 17 (Nonconforming Lots, Structures, and Uses of Land and Structures)
9. **Keeping of Animals / Chickens.** Presently, there is a separate section for the keeping of animals (Section 15.14) and a separate section for the keeping of chickens (Section 15.32). We suggest these two sections are merged.
10. **General Exceptions.** Several individual sections within Article 15 (General Provisions) could be grouped into a single section called “General Exceptions.” These include:
 - Section 15.2 (Projections into yards)
 - Section 15.3 (Building height exceptions)
 - Section 15.23 (Essential services and buildings)

- Section 15.26 (Porches)
 - Section 15.31 (Voting place)
11. **Requirements Hidden within a Definition.** Definitions should not contain “hidden” requirements. They should only define a term. Presently, the following definitions within Article 2 include hidden requirements – these requirements should be relocated to the new “Use Requirements” article:
 - Automobile service station
 - Temporary building and use
 - Travel trailer
 12. **Former Article 14 (Signs).** Article 14 is currently reserved. However, numerous other articles/sections make reference to sign standards that are included within Article 14. These references should either be deleted or updated to point to Chapter 52 of the Code of Ordinances, where the city’s sign requirements are currently located.
 13. **Lighting Requirements.** Lighting requirements are scattered in several locations in the zoning ordinance, including within Section 13.6 (Off-street parking space design standards) and Section 12.4 (Site plan review standards). We recommend the creation of a new section within Article 15 (General Provisions) containing all “Exterior Lighting” standards.
 14. **Required Road Frontage.** Section 15.7 (Frontage on a public street) and Section 15.20 (Street access) address the same topic and should be merged into one section.
 15. **Lot Area.** Section 15.1 (Required area or space) and Section 15.25 (Lot area) address the same topic and should be merged into one section.

B – Definitions

1. **Complete Review for Inconsistencies and Identify New Definitions.** Definitions are found in Article 2 of the zoning ordinance. It is not essential to provide a definition for all terms used within the zoning ordinance, but it is important that key terms are defined. This review should consist of the following:
 - Revising terms that are outdated and/or do not align with State laws. Examples include:
 - Adult foster care facility
 - Adult foster care family home
 - Adult foster care large group home
 - Adult foster care small group home
 - Child care facility
 - Congregate housing
 - Convalescent or nursing home
 - Family day care home
 - Family foster care home
 - Group day care home
 - Health care facility (separate from hospital)

- Hospital (separate from health care facility)
 - Kennel
 - State licensed residential facilities
- The various sign definitions are no longer necessary within the zoning ordinance, as sign definitions and requirements are now found within the Code of Ordinances, Chapter 52.
- Fixing terms that are inconsistently used within the zoning ordinance. Examples include:
 - Automobile service station vs. gasoline service station (both defined and used)
 - Automobile repair shop vs. automobile body and repair shops vs. service garage (all are used, one is defined)
 - Miniwarehouse vs. ministorage (both are used, one is defined)
 - Health care facility vs. medical clinic (both are used, one is defined)
 - Quarry excavation vs. excavation vs. extractive operations (all are used, two are defined)
 - Bed and breakfast inns vs. bed and breakfast facilities (both are used, one is defined)
 - Comprehensive plan vs. master plan (both are used, neither are defined)
- Adding new terms to better clarify meaning. Most importantly, certain uses are presently not defined but should be. Examples include:
 - Accessory dwelling units
 - Assisted living facility
 - Child care center
 - Child foster family group home
 - Clinic, veterinary
 - Commercial recreation, indoor
 - Commercial recreation, outdoor
 - Dwelling, three-family
 - Dwelling, townhouse
 - Front yard, corner lot
 - Front yard, interior lot
 - Housing for the elderly
 - Lodging facilities (hotels and motels)
 - Nonconforming lot
 - Place of worship
 - Recycling centers

- Salvage or junkyards
 - Sidewalk cafes
 - Wireless communication facility (and related definitions)
2. **New Illustrations.** There are several existing black and white illustrations provided to help explain key terms. These existing illustrations could be re-created (better quality and resolution) and new illustrations could be added, as appropriate, to help explain complex terms.

C – Zoning Districts

1. **Zoning Map in Municode.** The “official zoning map” that is found within the Introduction section (Article 0.3) of the zoning ordinance on Municode is not the most recent version of the Zoning Map that we are familiar with. It is our understanding that the latest version of the City’s Zoning Map was prepared by Genesee County GIS and is dated March 2021. The outdated version on Municode should be replaced with the newer version.
2. **Reference to the R-1 District.** Section 3.5,(2) makes reference to a R-1 District, which does not exist. We presume this is intended to refer to the SF1, Single-Family Residential District.
3. **Home Occupations.** The city’s residential zoning districts require special land use review and approval for home occupations. To encourage home occupations within the city (home occupations provide essential employment and income for many residents), we recommend that the city establish an administrative review process for home occupations which does not require Planning Commission approval after a public hearing. Additionally, the city zoning ordinance contains no specific standards or requirements for home occupations. We suggest the city establish these requirements to ensure that home occupations are appropriately integrated within residential areas.
4. **Institutional Uses and Parks.** The city’s residential zoning districts require special land use review and approval for “public and semipublic institutional buildings, structures and uses, and public parks.” We suggest the city consider amendments to allow institutional uses and parks as a principal permitted use within the city’s residential districts.
5. **Churches/Places of Worship.** For religious uses, the terminology used within the zoning ordinance should be inclusive of all faiths. The term “church” should be replaced with “place of worship.” Please also note that the Federal Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA) indicates that religious assembly must be allowed in any district where secular assembly is allowed (i.e., clubs, assembly halls, theaters). Additionally, RLUIPA generally restricts a local municipality’s ability to prohibit or attach discretionary standards for places of worship. Given this, we recommend that places of worship are changed from a special land use within the city’s zoning districts to a principal permitted use.
6. **Schools.** School buildings are identified as special land uses within the city’s residential zoning districts. In a recent court case (Northville v. Northville Public Schools, 2001), it was concluded that the State superintendent of schools (not local zoning) has complete control over the review and approval of site plans for school buildings. For consistency with this court determination, we would suggest that the zoning ordinance is amended to allow schools as a principal permitted use within the residential zoning districts.
7. **Review and Revisions to Allow Contemporary Use Types.** We recommend that the city conduct a review of the uses allowed across the city’s zoning districts to ensure that the zoning ordinance allows contemporary use types, particularly for the non-residential zoning

districts. Examples include mixed-use buildings, “maker-spaces” for artists/craftspersons, pubs/brewpubs, business incubators, and alcohol manufacturing facilities (breweries, wineries, distilleries).

D – General Provisions

1. **Off-Street Parking – Reduction for Multiple Uses.** Section 13.2,(6) allows for a 10% reduction in total parking for parking lots which serve multiple uses and where operating hours of the uses do not overlap. We recommend that additional flexibility is provided to the Planning Commission to allow an even greater reduction based on the unique characteristics of the uses in question.
2. **Off-Street Parking – Reduction Based on Availability of Public Parking.** Per Section 13.4, uses within the downtown district (bordered by Hickory Street to the north, Maple Street to the south, State Street between the east side of Saginaw Street and extending to the west side of Genesee Street) are exempt from the need to provide parking. The city may also consider allowing for reductions in required parking for areas outside of the downtown where public parking is readily available (including on-street parking).
3. **Off-Street Parking – Contemporary Standards and Flexibility.** Off-street parking standards are outlined in Section 13.4. Based on our review of this section, it is our opinion that some of the parking formulas are overly restrictive and not in line with contemporary standards. An example is the parking requirement for multiple-family dwellings, where 2 parking spaces per dwelling unit are required, in addition to 0.25 spaces per unit for visitor parking. (Many communities require 1 or 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit; for smaller complexes, visitor parking may not be needed.) We recommend a full review of the off-street parking formulas and implementation of changes, as necessary. Finally, we recommend that flexibility is added to the off-street parking and loading requirements, allowing the Planning Commission to modify requirements based on evidence provided by the applicant and/or other considerations.
4. **Off-Street Parking – Surface Materials.** Section 13.7 does not explicitly state that parking lots must feature hard surfacing (asphalt or concrete). The city should consider adding a new provision requiring hard surfacing for parking lots. However, the city should also allow for alternative hard surface types such as pervious pavers.
5. **Electric Vehicle Parking.** We suggest that Article 13 (Parking and Loading) is amended to ensure that property owners are not penalized for providing electric vehicle (EV) parking spaces. Language should be added indicating that EV parking may count toward the required number of parking spaces for that use.
6. **Keeping of Animals.** Section 15.14 (Keeping of animals) allows no more than a total of six cats or dogs over six months of age. This contradicts the current definition of “kennel” which indicates that the keeping of more than 3 cats or dogs is considered a kennel. (Kennels are only allowed in the IND District.) This discrepancy should be corrected.
7. **Private Swimming Pool Requirements.** Section 15.16,(1) indicates that any swimming pool must comply with Appendix G of the Michigan Residential Building Code. The section then includes the entirety of this code (Appendix G). With the reference already indicated, there is no need to include the Michigan Residential Building Code language in this section. Also, this causes an issue if the Michigan Residential Building Code is amended, which would require the city zoning ordinance to be amended.

8. **Sidewalk Sales – Expand to Include Sidewalk Cafes.** Section 15.19 allows sidewalk sales in the CBD after obtaining a permit. The city may consider expanding this allowance to other business districts. Additionally, we recommend that this section is expanded to also allow sidewalk cafes within the CBD. Presently sidewalk cafes are not addressed in the zoning ordinance.
9. **Flexibility in the Application of Landscaping Requirements.** Landscaping requirements are outlined in Article 16. We suggest that a new section is added which gives the authority to the Planning Commission to waive or modify landscaping requirements based on specific standards. Flexibility is particularly important where an existing site is proposed to be redeveloped; often, existing site conditions make it difficult to achieve full compliance with the landscaping requirements.
10. **Additional Landscaping Standards.** Article 16 could be improved by outlining new standards that are not currently addressed. These include:
 - Required front yard landscaping
 - Required plantings along buildings/foundations
 - Installation and maintenance standards
11. **Abandonment of a Nonconforming Use.** Section 17.4,(3) indicates that a nonconforming use is no longer valid and cannot be reestablished if it ceases for a period of more than 1 year. This provision is no longer appropriate, as courts have utilized a higher standard of “abandonment” which must be proven with greater evidence through a formal procedure. We recommend this section is expanded to outline various factors that the city can cite as proof of abandonment. Examples include disconnected utilities, for sale signs, and similar actions by the owner. Similar amendments should occur within Section 17.5,(4).
12. **Nonconforming Improvements.** Article 17 (Nonconforming Lots, Structures, and Uses of Land and Structures) does not presently address nonconforming improvements, such as parking lots and landscaping. We recommend a new section that outlines standards for how nonconforming improvements will be brought into compliance with ordinance standards over time.
13. **Building Design Standards.** The zoning ordinance does not presently contain any requirements pertaining to the design of buildings. As a means to improve the overall appearance of buildings, we recommend the creation of a new section that outlines basic/modest design standards. The following topics may be addressed:
 - Allowed building material types
 - Not-allowed building material types
 - Colors/compatibility
 - Mechanical equipment screening (roof mounted and ground mounted)

E – Administration and Enforcement

1. **Application Deadlines.** Section 11.3,(1), Section 12.2, and Section 12.8,(4) specify a 30-day deadline to submit special land use, site plan, and/or condominium project applications before they can be placed on the next Planning Commission agenda. The zoning ordinance does not need to specify the deadlines – the deadlines can be established by the city as policy, and the deadlines can vary by type of application.

2. **Special Land Use – Amendments.** We recommend that the city revise Article 11 (Special Land Uses) to clarify what changes might constitute (“trigger”) an amendment to a previously approved special land use. This is important, as an amendment to a special land use would require re-review and approval by the Planning Commission.
3. **Site Plan Approval Validity – Time Limit / Extensions.** Section 12.6 indicates that site plans are only valid for 6 months and further that the Planning Commission may grant no more than one extension for a 6 month period. We believe these time limitations are very stringent. We suggest that site plan approval should be valid for 1 year and extensions (including multiple extensions) may be granted for up to 1 year.
4. **Planning Commission Approval.** Section 19.8 (Planning commission approval) contains language that is redundant with other sections (for example, Section 12.5, Required site plan review). It is unnecessary and should be deleted.
5. **Site Plans – Expanded Administrative Review Authority.** We are glad to see that Section 12.1 establishes an administrative site plan review process for certain projects. Presently, the zoning administrator may administratively review minor building additions and re-occupancy of existing buildings. We suggest that the administrative review eligibility is expanded to include minor projects such as: new accessory buildings on existing sites; minor expansions or reconfiguration of off-street parking lots; and, the construction of new site improvements on existing sites such as landscaping, lighting, etc.
6. **Rezoning Criteria.** Presently, no criteria are outlined in the zoning ordinance which can be used as a guide by the Planning Commission and City Council when evaluating a rezoning request. We recommend that rezoning criteria are crafted and included within Section 19.5 (Zoning ordinance amendments).
7. **Zoning Board of Appeals – Deadline to Meet.** Section 18.3,(1) and Section 18.6,(5) outlines a deadline for when the ZBA must meet after receiving an application. These deadlines are not mandated by State law and may cause hardship for the city based on scheduling and/or lack of a quorum. We suggest that they are deleted.
8. **Zoning Board of Appeals – Approval Criteria.** Section 18.6,(6) outlines approval criteria for the ZBA to use when reviewing variance requests. Because State law establishes unique standards for the approval of use variances (unnecessary hardship) and dimensional variances (practical difficulty), we recommend that two unique sets of review criteria are established.

F – Special Situations or Use Types

1. **Planning Commission vs. Planning Board.** Throughout the zoning ordinance, the term Planning Commission is always followed by a reference to “Planning Board” established by City Charter section 5-201. However, City Charter Chapter 103, Article II, which was adopted in 2008, establishes a Planning Commission. We believe all references to Planning Board within the zoning ordinance should be deleted and only the term Planning Commission should be used.
2. **Wireless Communication Facilities.** The zoning ordinance does not presently address wireless communication facilities. A new section should be added pertaining to wireless communication facilities that is consistent with recent changes to the Zoning Enabling Act. The Act stipulates which type of wireless communication projects can and cannot be subject to special land use approval. Generally, new towers can be subject to special land use approval, while certain tower modifications and most antenna co-location projects cannot be

subject to special land use approval. Additionally, the Act stipulates “shot-clock” provisions for the timeframe that the city has to make a decision on wireless communication requests.

G – Master Plan / Housing Strategy Recommendations

The City of Montrose adopted a new Master Plan in 2024 and a Community Housing Study in 2025. Both plans outlined specific zoning ordinance amendments that were deemed necessary to implement the recommendations of each plan. We have reviewed these two documents and note the following that should be considered as part of this zoning ordinance update process.

1. **Mixed Residential District.** The city should examine the possibility of revising certain provisions of the SF2 District or creating a new Mixed Residential District to conform with the proposed Mixed Residential future land use classification within the Master Plan.
2. **Missing-Middle Housing Types / Senior Care Facilities.** The city should conduct a review of all residential zoning districts to ensure that “missing-middle” housing types are defined, allowed, and regulated, as appropriate. A similar review should occur to ensure that residential care facilities (senior housing, assisted living, etc.) are defined, allowed, and regulated, as appropriate.
3. **Mixed Use District.** The city should examine the possibility creating a new Mixed Use District to conform with the proposed Mixed Use future land use classification within the Master Plan.
4. **Natural Features Buffers.** The zoning ordinance does not presently contain any requirements related to the preservation of natural features, such as setbacks from water bodies and wetlands, or tree preservation requirements. The city should consider creating a new section to guide the design of new developments on sites with significant natural features.
5. **Accessory Dwelling Units.** The city should consider defining, allowing, and regulating accessory dwelling units in the single-family residential districts.
6. **Minimum Dwelling Unit Size.** Currently, the minimum floor area per dwelling unit in the SF1 and SF2 Districts is 1,050 square feet. In the context of a historic and urban community like Montrose, this minimum dwelling unit size is excessive and does not support the development of smaller, more affordable housing types. The city should also examine the current minimum sizes for multiple-family dwelling units found in Section 3.7,(G) and consider potential reductions in line with contemporary standards and to support housing affordability.
7. **Zoning Map Review.** The city should compare the Future Land Use Map from the Master Plan with the currently adopted Zoning Map and consider whether any changes are necessary to bring the Zoning Map into better alignment with the Master Plan. (However, the Planning Commission is not obligated to amend the Zoning Map and may instead choose to allow private property owners, over time, to petition the city for zoning district changes which the Planning Commission may approve if such changes are consistent with the Master Plan.)

CITY OF MONTROSE

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 9, 2026

To: Chairman Foust and Planning Commission Members

From: Joe Karlichek, City Manager 

Subject: Consider Capital Improvement Project Schedule

Background: The Planning Commission plays an integral role in the city's Capital Improvement Plan or CIP.

Accompanying this memorandum is a multi-year CIP (identified as Appendix C provided by the contracted firm Bendzinski & Co. who conducted a thorough water/sewer study which city council approved an increase in rates at their January 2026 meeting. Those rates will take effect July 1, 2026. The Planning Commission should know the CIP was prepared by the city engineering firm Fleis & Vanderbrink (F&V).

The CIP attached primarily deals with water main projects over the course of ten (10) years and prioritizes which areas of the city needs the most attention.

The city is also finalizing its construction of a broader CIP where equipment, local and major roads, building and grounds, etc. are being budgeted over the course of the next four (4) years. The Planning Commission has a DRAFT attached with this memorandum and welcomes any feedback.

The city council has a scheduled Budget Workshop April 8 where the CIP will be included in their packet for discussion and consideration ahead of the May 26, 2026 Budget Approval.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the Planning Commission approve the CIP with Water Main Projects and recommend changes, if any, to the four (4) year CIP and forward to city council.

Appendix C:
Schedule of Capital Improvements

CITY OF MONTROSE
COUNTY OF GENESEE, STATE OF MICHIGAN
Schedule of Estimated Capital Improvements - Water

Project	2026/27	2027/28	2028/29	2029/30	2030/31	2031/32	2032/33	2033/34	2034/35	2035/36	Total
Water Main - RUTH-02			\$250,000								\$250,000
Water Main - OAK-BEECH-LOOP			318,750								318,750
Water Main - PERRY-05			39,490								39,490
Water Main - PERRY-06			82,500								82,500
Water Main - GENESEE-01					\$76,940						76,940
Water Main - HICKORY-04					363,100						363,100
Water Main - OAK-03					280,700						280,700
Water Main - PARKWAY-01					204,360						204,360
Water Main - WASHINGTON-05						\$183,950					183,950
Water Main - CLARK-STATE-LOOP						461,250					461,250
Water Main - STATE-01						213,420					213,420
Lead (Galvanized) Service Line Replacements	\$60,000	\$60,000	60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	600,000
Subtotal	-	\$60,000	\$750,740	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$985,100	\$60,000	\$60,000	\$918,620	\$60,000	\$3,074,460
Plus 5% Yearly Inflation	-	6,150	118,335	12,930	16,577	335,028	24,426	28,647	506,461	37,734	1,086,289
Total Estimated Capital Improvements	-	\$66,150	\$869,075	\$72,930	\$76,577	\$1,320,128	\$84,426	\$88,647	\$1,425,081	\$97,734	\$4,160,749
Cash-Funded:	-	\$66,150	\$69,458	\$72,930	\$76,577	\$80,406	\$84,426	\$88,647	\$93,080	\$97,734	\$729,407
Debt-Funded:	-	-	\$799,618	-	-	\$1,239,722	-	-	\$1,332,001	-	\$3,371,342
Project	2036/37	2037/38	2038/39	2039/40	2040/41	2041/42	2042/43	2043/44	2044/45	Total	
Water Main - MAPLE-08		\$211,930								\$211,930	
Water Main - MAPLE-09		47,150								47,150	
Water Main - GOLD-01		134,430								134,430	
Water Main - STATE-04		253,056								253,056	
Water Main - STATE-03		76,000								76,000	
Water Main - ELIZABETH-01					\$122,880					122,880	
Water Main - ELIZABETH-02					177,480					177,480	
Water Main - ELIZABETH-03					94,020					94,020	
Water Main - GROVER-01					117,320					117,320	
Water Main - GROVER-02					368,530					368,530	
Water Main - SAGINAW-05						\$152,660				152,660	
Water Main - SAGINAW-06						283,890				283,890	
Water Main - SAGINAW-07						84,920				84,920	
Lead (Galvanized) Service Line Replacements	\$60,000	60,000	\$60,000	-	-	-	-	-	-	180,000	
Subtotal	\$60,000	\$782,566	\$60,000	-	\$880,230	-	-	-	\$521,470	\$2,304,266	
Plus 5% Yearly Inflation	42,620	622,810	53,139	-	949,705	-	-	-	796,259	2,464,533	
Total Estimated Capital Improvements	\$102,620	\$1,405,376	\$113,139	-	\$1,829,935	-	-	-	\$1,317,729	\$4,768,799	
Cash-Funded:	\$102,620	\$107,751	\$113,139	-	-	-	-	-	-	\$323,511	
Debt-Funded:	-	\$1,297,625	-	-	\$1,829,935	-	-	-	\$1,317,729	\$4,445,288	

Capital Improvement Plan

4.1 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP)

Capital improvements are larger, one-time expenses that are separate from ongoing operations and maintenance expenses. It is beneficial to plan for these potential costs in advance and develop a detailed capital improvement plan. Starting in fiscal year 2027/28 and ending in fiscal year 2038/39, the City plans on cash-funding \$60,000 (plus inflation) on Lead Service Line replacements. In fiscal year 2028/29, the City anticipates debt-funding around \$800,000 of water main replacements. The goal is to debt-fund a couple water main replacement projects every 3-4 fiscal years. The City's complete capital improvement schedule is included in Appendix C of this report

TABLE 4-1: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN SUMMARY

Year	Cash-Funded Capital Improvements	Debt-Funded Capital Improvements	Total
2025/26	-	-	-
2026/27	-	-	-
2027/28	\$66,150	-	\$66,150
2028/29	69,458	\$799,618	869,075
2029/30	72,930	-	72,930
2030/31	76,577	-	76,577
Total	\$285,115	\$799,618	\$1,084,733

CITY OF MONTROSE CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN SUMMARY WORKSHEET

DRAFT - PROPOSAL

Dept.	Project Descriptions	2026	2027	2028	2029	Place Holder
Sewer	No Projects by City - County Schedule					
Water	Hickory Street			\$250,000		
Water	East end Oak Street			\$318,750		
Water	Maple Street			\$39,490		
Water	State @ Perry north of Maple			\$82,500		
Water	Galvanized Line Replacement		\$60,000	\$60,000	\$60,000	
City Hall	City Hall Maintenance (Exterior)	\$1,000				
City Hall	General Maintenance (Interior)	\$500				
City Hall	Server				\$15,000	
City Hall	Generator		\$10,000			
City Hall	Furniture	\$1,500				
City Hall	City Parking Lot South (Maple St) Sealing	\$4,417				
City Hall	Parking Lot Sealing	\$4,694				
Depot	Property Management	\$1,500				
Depot	Painting/General Maintenance	\$1,000				
Depot	Parking Lot Sealing	\$4,905				
DPW	DPW Garage Concrete Floor		\$22,000			
DPW	Kubota Tractor				\$35,000	
DPW	Skid Steer Broom	\$1,500				
DPW	Tires	\$6,500				
DPW	Exmark Turn Mower		\$17,000			
DPW	Garage Lights	\$1,000				
CDBG	CDBG Funds / Sidewalks/Ramps	\$26,000		\$26,000		
Police	OPEN					
Fire	OPEN					
Motor Pool	Street Sweeper					\$400,000

Motor Pool	DPW Truck				\$35,000		
Motor Pool	OPEN						
Parks	Lions Park Tree Removal(s)	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000	\$6,000		
Parks	Eight (8) Picnic Tables	\$11,200					
Parks	Five (5) Garbage Cans	\$1,200					
Parks	Blueberry Playscape						\$500,000
Parks	Mulch	\$2,500					
Parks	OPEN						
Parks	OPEN						
Planning	Zoning	\$20,000					
DDA	Property Acquisition						\$25,000
DDA	Banners/Flags	\$5,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000		
DDA	Community Events/Marketing	\$10,000					
DDA	Decorations	\$10,000					
DDA	Pocket Park						\$150,000
DDA	Streetscape & Depot Restoration Proj						\$1,740,000
DDA	Wayfinding Signs		\$10,000				
Local Streets	Sidewalk Replacement	\$3,000					
Local Streets	City Wide Crosswalk Painting	\$1,000					
Local Streets	Street Signs	\$1,000					
Major Streets	Nanita (TIP)					\$30,000	
Major Streets	Hickory Street (TIP)						\$1,500,000
Total		\$125,416	\$163,000	\$785,740	\$149,000		\$4,315,000