

# AG-1 Zone Questionnaire Results LOWELL CHARTER TOWNSHIP

**42 (23%) Questionnaires returned**

**Question 1: Should option 1, The Current AG-1 Zone Regulations be:**

- 20 (48%)** Kept as is but remove the definition of agriculture and non-agricultural dwellings
- 11 (27%)** Amended to allow more lots per quarter section to be created for new houses.

**Question 2: Would you be in favor of option 2 which is the sliding scale method?**

- 8 (20%)** Yes, I generally favor option 2, the sliding scale method
- 9 (22%)** Yes, but I would like to modify the sliding scale example to allow
  - 0** few
  - 8** more lot splits
- 19 (45%)** No, I do not favor the sliding scale method

**Question 3: Would you be in favor of option 3 which is the agricultural/cluster PUD method?**

- 15 (37%)** Yes, I would generally favor the PUD method but I need more information.
- 24 (57%)** No, I do not favor the PUD method

**Question 4: Please list the acreage, location and termination date of any property you own which is enrolled in PA 116**

1. Allowed our PA 116 to expire.
2. 60 Acres W1/2 SW 1/4 Sec. 20
3. Sec. 34, 10 acres (Not in PA 116)
4. Sec. 33, 22 acres
5. Sec. 23, 36.6 acres
6. 80 acres - 10015 Cascade (Nothing enrolled in PA 116)
7. 34 acres in PA 116 (13999 60th Street)
8. Sec. 23, 20 acres

**Comments:**

1. The Master Plan should recognize the impact of a new I-96 exit, if and when MDOT decides to build one. The likelihood of another exit between Alden Nash and 36th in Cascade Twp within the next 5 - 10 years is good.
2. There is enough land already put aside for the construction of single family homes, the preservation of farmland seems to be a thing of the past. We chose to live here for

the way it currently is.

3. I live on 52nd St SE. Due to all the housing in Ionia Co. on Portland Rd. the traffic has increased dramatically. The country setting in that area has all changed to housing on top of housing & subdivisions. Please protect this area on 52nd Street. Don't turn it into something you can't change back. Once lost - Lost forever.
4. Allow larger parcels to build on would keep rural character.
5. One new house should be allowed on parent parcels that are vacant without splitting. Maximum lot size should be eliminated - causes more splits than necessary.
6. Remove maximum lot size. Consider the use and quality of the land to determine lot size.
7. Maximum lot size of 4 acres does not seem feasible - I would like to see it increased to each individual properties.
8. I would go by "years" owned - 20-25 years or more to split land - so newcomers don't buy land with the purpose of splitting it and turning farmland into residential.
9. If option 1, Zoning regulations have already been violated. (2 lots per Sec.) Why can't a house be added to an existing lot? If lot size is legal.
10. Always want it to be AG-1.
11. Keep farmland, we will need all we can farm someday soon!
12. With all the houses, with or without acreage, that are for sale now, we should not have to destroy more ag. land for a few years.
13. Option 3 comment: Probably 80-90% green space
14. Option 3 comment: Is nothing more than a way for developers to make money but at the same time overload our schools, and put more septic systems on our AG land!
15. People should have more rights with their property - this is not a dictatorship! It has gotten out of hand and you need to make changes with property people pay taxes on and have very limited use of if you want to keep restricting, the township can start paying taxes on the property or purchase it!
16. In principal, allowing higher densities on smaller parcels is a positive direction. The enemy of rural development is sprawl. My answers above are meant to reflect this principal. Option 4: Multifamily dwellings on small parcels would be great, keeping lots of green space - so allow multifamily dwellings on 10% of available lot size.

17. If an AG-1 owner wants to sell 2 acre (min) to family or anyone else, he should be able to do it! Two acres or more, until he doesn't have any land left. Keep houses near (together).
18. The current AG-1 zoning regulations are too restrictive. A change is long overdue.
19. Why isn't there a fax option?
20. The current AG-1 zoning does not permit reasonable uses of the property & should be changed.
21. Option 3 would be a compromise for land owners and the desire to keep a rural look to community.
22. Why remove definition of ag & non-ag dwellings? More information on PUD would be needed for me.
23. It is only a matter of time before overly restrictive zoning sends developers to court to get approvals, and we don't want that. We are far better off managing development ourselves.
24. Option 3 sounds difficult to manage - How would land be prevented from splitting, selling, splitting? Is there a time limit before land would be able to be split again? If the land changed owners, could it be again split? Seems for the potential of loopholes and impossible to maintain. I don't believe option 3 would preserve any farmland.
25. Having minimum lot sizes seems counter-productive to saving farmland.
26. Question #2 comment: I would like to see the scale increased to allow one, and only one more split in each category -- i.e., 0-10 acres - 1 split, 10 - 20 acres, 2 splits, 20 - 40 acres, 3 splits etc.



