EMMET COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, JULY 8, 2004 - 7:30 P.M.
COMMISSIONERS BOARD ROOM
EMMET COUNTY COURTHOUSE
200 DIVISION STREET
PETOSKEY, MI 49770

MINUTES


MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF: M. PUTTERS, J. SWINDLEHURST (Intern), T. DOERNENBURG


I Call to Order and Attendance
Chairman Eby called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. All members were present.

II Minutes of June 3, 2004
Alexander made a motion to approve the minutes of the June 3, 2004 meeting as prepared. Derrohn supported the motion which passed by unanimous voice vote.

III Cases
1. Case #11A-97 David Billideau for Scott Bolkema, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Land Development Standards, Corner of Pleasantview & Levering Roads, Section 1, Center Township

A request by David Billideau for Scott Bolkema for a Special Use Permit per Land Development Standards to create ten (10) lots on a property containing some 122 acres located at the southeast corner of Levering and Pleasantview Roads, Section 1, T37N-R5W, Center Township. The property is zoned FF-2 Farm Forest and is tax parcel number 24-04-09-01-100-013. The request is per Section 2102-14 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Putters explained the land division request on property located on the southeast corner of Pleasantview and Levering Roads. The request is to divide the land into minimum size lots meeting the 88,000 sq. ft. lot area requirement. Center Township minutes were distributed. They requested an alternate plan with one access road to the new lots. There are concerns with all of the lots fronting on two major roads. A concept drawing was displayed, which the Township preferred. The property is open with little natural character. The concept plan shows green space along the roadway and housing would be facing the interior road, providing safer options for families. The Ordinance does allow the Planning Commission to require reverse lot frontage.

Joe Bassett, representing the applicant, provided a copy of the Road Commission approval of accesses for the lots as proposed. He stated that the lots as proposed are lower priced lots. It is far away from the main part of the County and lots meet the standards of the Zoning Ordinance. The compliance letter stated that the access
from Levering Road is not usable for a commercial access.

Jones stated that the Zoning Ordinance allows for reverse lot frontage. Putters agreed and voiced concerns with driveways onto the roads. It is not good for the traffic to have nine new accesses onto the main roads. With the applicant’s proposed plan, when children play in their yards, the driveway points them to the county road. The residential lots would be better if turned in and allow residents to live on a residential street. Benefits of good design should be for all income levels. Private roads are often dusty or bumpy, with limited income to repair and maintain. It does not make good planning sense to enter onto the county roads from each individual drive.

Bassett stated that the lots are 2.75 acre lots and larger. Is it fair to require reverse lot frontage for this development? Sight distances are met.

Derrohn asked what the price would be for the second design? Bassett did not feel they’d sell. He thought the development would be cost prohibitive. Derrohn stated that the development as a whole needs to be evaluated. Simon agreed, it is better for the small community not to have all of the driveway cuts. In the long term, it is better for the community as a whole. The concept plan looks to the future and facilitates a good plan for the future. Scott added that the number of lots could be served with a straight line road, double loaded, with virtually no new driveways onto the main road, it would then comply with some requirements of reverse lot frontage. Eby suggested that there is some middle ground. Four lots require a road commission commercial driveway.

Simon and Derrohn thought that time should be given for the applicant to consider the township concerns.

Simon made a motion to require the applicant to return with a plan showing one driveway cut and a common road. The motion was not supported. Eby suggested less driveways, not necessarily one. Jones agreed. Simon thought that the applicant should be challenged to provide only one access. Scott thought it could be done, back-load the lots, a curb cut would be required, it would make a shorter road with five lots on one side and four on the other.

Laughbaum stated that the lots on Pleasantview Road have no natural screening. It would be better to face the road as there is a stop sign from the south to north and traffic does not move as fast as traffic on Levering Road. A building envelope could be made deeper and there could be shared driveways - creating three drives rather than six. Pleasantview Road is a scenic road. Scott suggested a road in the middle of the configuration. Keep the corner open for sight distance. Letzmann suggested a road from Levering Road could access the back of the lots on Pleasantview Road.

Bassett stated that it is all open field and front yards look better than the back yards.

Putters stated that the concept plan was created using an existing road. Open space concept could be incorporated and lots could be smaller.

Simon made a motion to defer the case until next month to give the applicant time to examine all plans with less drives. Derrohn supported the motion. All in favor by voice vote. Motion Passed.

2. Case #26-04 Tom Chastain, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Professional Offices, 2554 N US-31, Section 22, McKinley Township

A request by Tom Chastain for a Special Use Permit for a professional office building at 2554 N. US-31 Hwy, Section 22, T37N-R4W, McKinley Township. The property is zoned R-2B General Residential and is tax parcel number 24-10-22-100-021. The request is per Section 501-2b of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed business is an office for a taxi/limousine service.
Putters explained the request for a professional office on property zoned R-2B which, subject to Special Use Permit, does allow for certain business uses. The proposal is to have a drive on the north part of the property to provide access to a parking lot. A permit has been issued for a residence. The request is for an office for a taxi/transport business. The offices seem to be accessory to a business use, not a professional office. Washing vehicles there does not seem to fit the concept of a professional office.

Letzmann asked for an explanation of the proposed use. Tom Chastain stated that he is proposing a new professional office for Mackinaw Shuttle. He got a permit for a residence, hoping for approval of a professional office and built for a professional business. He has provided a site plan and drainage plan. The office is framed in. A photo of the site was shown. He plans to clean shuttles inside the building on the south side. There would be three offices, a kitchen and garage for cleaning vehicles. He has adequate parking at the airport for the vehicles. There is little office space at the new airport. Letzmann asked how the building would be used if he were not given permission from the planning commission? Chastain answered the it could be a handicap accessible home. He got permission for a home and built it for a commercial office.

Kelly Alexander stated that it is a beautiful facility. It was built to do what it is proposed to be. It was not the intention of the applicant to build a home.

Simon stated that it was built to accommodate the business. Doing so was at the applicant’s risk. The use is the question before the Planning Commission.

Jones felt that it is not correct to build a building before getting approval. The question must be: is the use appropriate for the area, whether the building is there or not?

Chastain distributed a letter of support from adjacent property owners.

Alexander, addressing concerns of a neighboring property owner, stated that the trees had been removed by a previous owner. Chastain added that a 35’ greenbelt will be maintained on both sides of the property.

Derrohn asked if items would be stored on the property? Chastain answered that there would be no storage on the property.

Simon observed that the R-2B Zoning District is supposed to be a transition zone. Motels, credit unions, fraternal halls are uses allowed and this proposed use is less intense than many listed in the Ordinance. Further, it seems appropriate because there are businesses in the area and it is convenient to the airport. Chastain stated that there is a motel next to his property. Derrohn added that there is no outside storage and low traffic. It is not a big business. Look at the use, is it appropriate? Simon stated that the only thing that may change the use from a professional office, is the work in the garage, but it is not disruptive. Is the use more disruptive than the existing uses or the uses allowed by Special Use?

Letzmann pointed to Page 10-1 of the Zoning Ordinance: General Business District allows uses similar in character to those listed. The residential district does not offer for uses similar, only specific listed uses. It is a residential area and deserves to have protection.

Putters stated that businesses grow, uses cannot be transposed. If the use is a business office it should be in the appropriate zone or require a PUD. Letzmann doesn’t think it fits as a professional office, rather, it’s a B-1 Local Tourist Business.

Eby asked who are the clients? Chastain answered, people from aircraft to Bay Harbor and to Mackinaw Island. They provide transportation year round. They have a small office at the airport. It is a professional office.
Laughbaum stated that there is no retail. He thinks it fits. Cleaning vehicles, if not overboard, is minor. It is good for the community.

Alexander observed that the business is a great business and may wish to grow and develop. The property could be cleared in the back for adding expansion of the business in the back. The business is viable and growing.

The Planning Commission must decide on the specific use. If a change is desired, then it requires additional review.

Jones has a problem with circumventing due process. Laughbaum disagreed, he felt the applicant took a creative approach. Letzmann stated that the building began prior to the permit being issued.

Chastain stated that he has eleven employees. The drivers will park at the airport. They have 7 assigned parking spots there. All vehicles will stay on site at the airport. There would not be anything parked outside at the professional office building and it is a daytime operation. Only office staff will park at the site, a business manager and office employees only.

There was some discussion regarding limiting the sign size. Laughbaum felt that the size allowed in the zoning district should be allowed. Chastain agreed that a two square ft. (1'x2') sign is adequate.

Simon made a motion to approve Case #26-04, Tom Chastain, Special Use Permit, Professional Office at 2554 N US-31, Section 22, McKinley Township, under the following conditions: 1) parking spaces may not be increased over the current site plan (five), 2) no outdoor storage of limousines, buses or airport related transportation, 3) no business activity prior to 7 am and after 7:30 pm, 4) parking is for office staff only, 5) the sign is limited to two (2) sq. ft. and 6) lighting to follow the guidelines of the sign & lighting committee. Derrohn supported the motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Simon, Laughbaum, Behan, Derrohn, Alexander. No; Jones, Scott, Letzmann.

3. Case #19-04 Traver Wood for Wellness Enterprises, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Credit Union, US-131 South, Section 7, Bear Creek Township

A request by Traver Wood for Wellness Enterprises, LLC for a Special Use Permit to construct a Credit Union on property located 500' south of the east-west quarter line, within the NE 1/4 of the SW 1/4 of Section 7, on the east side of US-131 Hwy located some 1,320 feet south of Kilborn Drive. The property is zoned R-2B General Residential and is tax parcel number 24-01-19-07-300-036. The request is per Section 501-2 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Putters explained the request for a credit union on US-131. The Township discussion focused on stormwater runoff. They suggested possibly reserving the lot to the north for stormwater management. The site plan has been revised and a sealed drainage plan was submitted tonight. The Township would like an independent study. A profile view and a cut section of the in-ground drainage system was displayed. Performance Engineering redesigned the stormwater plan. The discharge rate is reduced on the new plan. The concept is the same, but the plan is different. It releases water through time. Traver Wood explained the drainage system. The collectors are designed to handle the water runoff. There was discussion regarding maintenance and effectiveness of the system.

Jones stated that because the township has asked and because the drainage plan was submitted tonight, he would like to have the drainage plan checked by another engineer. There have been problems in the neighborhood with drainage on another site, which also had a sealed drainage plan. Jones would like the County to submit the plan to an engineer. A second opinion would give added protection.
The case was deferred for one month to allow the Township the opportunity to review the drainage plan and to obtain a review of the proposed drainage plan.

Laughbaum asked about the Township request for an independent study of the plan. Jones stated that it has been a problem area relative to drainage.

Pat Cormican stated that he was involved with the Brazones property. That property has problems with highway flow. The property is down slope from the hill and the highway stormwater enters into the drive of the Brazones property. It has created a problem. This site is up gradient from that entrance. The drainage is simpler than what was confronted on the Brazones property.

Wood asked, other than the drainage, is the site plan all right? The revised site plan appears to meet all standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

4. Case #25-04

John McCloskey for Boyne River Homes, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Outdoor Display sales lot, US-131 South, Section 7, Bear Creek Township

A request by John T. McCloskey for Boyne River Homes for a Special Use Permit to allow outdoor display and sales of modular homes on property located at 2124 US-131, Section 18, T34N-R5W, Bear Creek Township. The property is zoned B-2 General Business and is tax parcel number 24-01-19-18-100-010. The request is per Section 1001-4 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Putters explained that the request has been revised. The plan now includes display and sales of four (4) modular homes, six (6) were originally proposed. The displays will be set once and remain for about a year. The site plan was ok, but a sealed engineered drainage plan has not been submitted.

The case was deferred until the next regular meeting.

5. Case #138B-93

Frank Gotts, SITE PLAN REVIEW - Change of Use, Restaurant, 1823 US-31, Section 26, Bear Creek Township

A request by Frank Gotts for Site Plan Review and Change of Use on property located at 1823 US-31, Section 26, T35N-R5W, Bear Creek Township. The property is zoned B-2 General Business and is tax parcel number 24-01-16-26-300-019. The request is per Section 1000-6 of the Zoning Ordinance. The lot does not conform to the 100' lot width requirement for a property zoned B-2 and was granted a variance for the previous/current use. The current use is a florist business (Plain Jane’s) and the proposed use is a sit down/take out restaurant serving lunch and breakfast.

Putters explained the request on a site plan that meets all the Zoning Ordinance standards. A sealed drainage plan was submitted tonight. The plan has not changed, however, the original plan was not sealed. There is turn around potential on the site and deliveries will be made before business hours.

Frank Gotts added that a concern regarding the access through a neighboring property (Richard’s Tire), has been resolved. The neighbor will allow access if the parking lot is paved. Gotts intends to pave the parking lot. Previously, the gravel parking lot and driveway was a problem.

Alexander asked about the 100' lot width, is it transferable? It is a recorded lot.

Letzmann made a motion to approve Case #138-93, Frank Gotts, Change of Use to a restaurant at 1823 US-31, Section 26, Bear Creek Township because the Township recommended approval, a sealed drainage plan has been provided as requested and it meets the requirements of the Ordinance and the driveway is to be paved up to the property line which adjoins Richard’s Tire. Simon supported the motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Simon, Jones, Scott, Letzmann, Laughbaum, Behan, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none.
Laughbaum asked about setback for the drive, does it require a setback variance? Putters stated that the side setback for a shared drive can be waived upon mutual agreement by the property owners.

6. **Case #56A-97 Wallace Weburg, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Land Development, Anderson Road & US-131, Section 18, Bear Creek Township**

A request by Wallace Weburg for a Special Use Permit per Land Development Standards to create five residential building sites on property located between Anderson Road and US-131, 2404 US-131, Section 18, T34N-R5W, Bear Creek Township. The property is tax parcel number 24-01-19-18-100-042 and is zoned FF-1 Farm Forest. The request is per Section 2102-14 and may be reviewed as an Open Space Plan, as an option, per Section 1901 of the Zoning Ordinance.

The case was postponed, at the applicant’s request, until the next regular meeting.

7. **Case #57A-03 Doug Boor, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Land Development, Click Road, Section 23, Bear Creek Township**

A request by Doug Boor for a Special Use Permit per Land Development Standards to create one (1) additional parcel on property located at 3460 Click Road, Section 23, T34N-R5W, Bear Creek Township. The property is zoned FF-1 Farm Forest and is tax parcel number 24-01-19-23-100-001. The request is per Section 2102-14 of the Zoning Ordinance. The reason for the review is that ten parcels have been created within a ten (10) year period.

Putters used a site plan to show the request for one additional lot on an 80 acre parcel. The additional lot creates over five (5) lots within a ten year period, therefore requires review. Bear Creek Township recommended approval.

Doug Boor explained that his original residence is on the proposed lot and he has built a new home. The previously proposed development and these properties are separated by a steep slope. They wish to sell the property to the current renters of the original residence. The adjacent land owners support to the lot split.

Letzmann made a motion to approve Case #57A-03, because it meets the Standards of the Ordinance and Bear Creek Township recommended approval. Jones supported the motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Simon, Jones, Scott, Letzmann, Laughbaum, Behan, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none.

8. **Case #74A-03 Far Coast Seafood, LLC, SITE PLAN REVIEW - CHANGE OF USE, 1075 US-31 N, Section 33, Bear Creek Township**

A request by Far Coast Seafood, LLC (Chris Stahl) for Site Plan Review and Change of Use on property located at 1075 US-31 N, Section 33, T35N-R5W, Bear Creek Township. The property is tax parcels numbered 24-01-16-33-202-049, zoned P-T Parking Transition & 24-01-16-33-202-052, zoned B-2 General Business. The property is located at the corners of US-31 N, Hampton Avenue and Old Tannery Creek Road. The request is to allow a retail market per Sections 1000-1 (See Section 900-4) and Section 1200.

Putters explained that this request has been reviewed previously. The proposed market reduces accesses from the current, four to two on two roads. The Site Plan meets all requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Bear Creek Township recommended approval.

Jones made a motion to approve Case #74A-03, Far Coast Seafood, LLC, Site Plan (dated 5/14/04PZ), for a Change of Use to allow a retail market because it meets the Standards of the Ordinance and the Township recommended approval. Simon supported the motion which passed by the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Simon, Jones, Scott, Letzmann, Laughbaum, Behan, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none.
9. Case #28-04  Traver Wood for Bay Winds Federal Credit Union, SITE PLAN REVIEW, Amendment, 2215 E. Mitchell Rd, Section 4, Bear Creek Township

A request by Traver Wood for Bay Winds Federal Credit Union for Site Plan Review amendment to expand the parking lot at the current site of the Credit Union at 2215 E. Mitchell Road, Section 4, T34N-R5W, Bear Creek Township. The property is zoned B-1 Local Tourist Business and is tax parcel number 24-01-19-04-201-002. The request is per Sections 2202 & 2405 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Putters stated that a sealed drainage plan has been provided. Road Commission approval of the design will be necessary. The proposed change of the site plan is to add parking spaces, with an in-ground drainage system.

Traver Wood stated that the same plan was approved by the Road Commission three years ago. He requested approval on condition that the Road Commission provide written approval. Jones stated that he talked to the Road Commission. They have not approved of the proposed plan, but he would favor conditional approval.

Jones then made a motion to approve Case #28-04, Bay Winds Credit Union, Site Plan amendment for 2215 E. Mitchell Road, Section 4, Bear Creek Township, on condition that a letter from Road Commission, stating approval of stormwater discharge as shown on the plan (dated 7/8/04PZ). Alexander supported the motion which passed by the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Simon, Jones, Scott, Letzmann, Laughbaum, Behan, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none.

10. Case #32-04  Paul Tourney, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Height Modification, 3236 Five Mile Creek Rd, Section 20, Friendship Township

A request by Paul Tourney for a Special Use Permit for a height modification to apply to a residence proposed for 3236 Five Mile Creek Road, Section 20, T36N-R6W, Friendship Township. The property is zoned FF-2 Farm Forest and is a new five acre parcel split from tax parcel number 24-06-12-20-100-006. The request is per Section 1900, note g) for an increased average height of 1.5', the average proposed height is 31.5' and range from 26.75' to 35'.

Putters used an elevation plan, showing all four side elevations, to explain the request for a height modification. The plan submitted calculates an average height of 31.5'. The Zoning Ordinance allows for 30'. The house would have to be lowered 3' to meet the 30' height standard. The applicant has been asked, by Friendship Township, to investigate changing the roof pitch and to make accommodations to meet the 30' height. The Township recommendation, to deny, was read. Putters stated that comments made are not necessarily targeted toward a single family home. It is hard to say that a single family home would provide more open space.

Paul Tourney stated that the home is not a big home. The total living area is 2,600 sq. ft. It is a home for himself and his wife. He understands that there has been precedent in the Township set before. Variations have been granted. His request is relatively insignificant. The proposed height modification is 17". The home is set back into the woods 300' from Five Mile Creek Road. It will not be able to be seen. There are trees surrounding the home which are 30' to 40' above the home. It will not obstruct any views. The house sits on a lower part of the property. The site plan is accurate. The drawing shows the finished grade, perhaps the grades are not that way now. There is very little grade change on the front or rear facade.

Alexander, asked if it would be difficult to reduce the height of the house? Tourney answered that he could make the changes, but he would prefer not to. Tourney added that 17" would not be able to be seen on the site.

Dale Scott, Friendship Township Supervisor, stated that the concerns are that the contours on the map are not necessarily the contours of the property. The variation in the height may be different. The primary issues were that several residents were concerned with allowing it and it would set a precedent for allowing height increases. There is the potential for five to ten more houses to be built in the area.
Jim Scott asked if a retaining wall and level grade were carried out, would it be enough to modify the height? He added that the number is arbitrary. The building is not sitting higher off of the ground than a house of the same size on the flat site, but because of the grade difference, the applicant is penalized. They could re-grade the site to make it work.

Jones stated that the house will not interfere with views of any adjacent property owners.

Simon stated that she would hate to grant a height exception on a newly split parcel.

Putters stated that height modifications do not go to the Board of Appeals, because it is not a hardship situation.

After some additional discussion, Letzmann made a motion to deny Case #32-04, a request by Paul Tourney for a height modification because the Township requested denial, it does not meet the Zoning Ordinance height standards and other feasible alternatives exist. Simon supported the motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Simon, Letzmann, Behan, Derrohn, Alexander. No; Jones, Scott, Laughbaum.

11. Case #31-04 Chris Willford, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Accessory Building as a Main Use, 1545 North Ayr Road, Section 7, Maple River Township

A request by Chris Willford for a Special Use Permit for an accessory building as a main use at 1545 North Ayr Road, Section 7, T36N-R4W, Maple River Township. The property is zoned FF-2 Farm Forest and is tax parcel number 24-09-14-07-300-001. The request is per Section 2201-2 of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed accessory building is 24'x28', 672 sq. ft. and is for personal storage.

Putters explained the request for an accessory building as a main use and read Maple River Township’s recommendation for approval. The proposed structure has deep setbacks, the property is on a seasonal road and is heavily wooded. The applicant has submitted an affidavit of use, recorded with the Register of Deeds office.

Simon made a motion to approve Case #31-04, Chris Willford, Special Use Permit for a 672 sq. ft. Accessory building as a Main Use, at 1545 North Ayr Road, Section 7, Maple River Township, because an affidavit of use stating that the building will be for personal use only has been submitted. Behan supported the motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Simon, Jones, Scott, Letzmann, Laughbaum, Behan, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none.

12. Case #33-04 Steven Carter, for Brutus Congregation of Jehovah’s Witnesses, SITE PLAN REVIEW, Religious Institution, 3069 Jackie Lane, Section 22, Maple River Township

A request by Brutus Congregation of Jehovah’s Witnesses for Site Plan Review for a religious facility at 3069 Jackie Lane, Section 22, T36N-R4W, Maple River Township. The property is zoned FF-1 Farm Forest and is part of tax parcel number 24-09-14-22-100-014. The request is per Section 800-9 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Putters stated that the site plan is complete, except that the parking lot needs to be screened relative to the north and south property lines, six trees are required, Sign & Lighting Committee will need to review outdoor lighting and signs. A sealed drainage plan has been provided. No Road Commission review is required because it is accessed from a Private Road.
Laughbaum thought churches were not subject to lighting. Simon stated that Stutzmanville Chapel has good lighting, which does not negatively impact neighbors. They are required to meet the conditions of the Ordinance.

Steven Carter asked what screening is necessary? 4-6 ft. screening is required along the side property lines to screen the parking lot. Carter realizes lighting will need to be reviewed by the Sign & Lighting Committee. Lights will be on timers and will be directed downward. Entrance and exit lights will only be on when meeting. Trees are required at a rate of 1 canopy tree for every 10 parking spaces and must be placed near the parking lot. Six (6) trees are required in this instance, a minimum of 2.5" caliper deciduous trees.

Simon asked about lot coverage. The property will have 39% lot coverage, including the parking lot. Putters responded that lot coverage does not include the parking lot, only buildings. Simon stated that because the parking lot is adjacent to a recreation trail, it is important to screen it from the trail as well as the side lots. Eby stated that the Township does not wish to screen the trail.

Scott made a motion to approve Case #33-04, a request by Brutus Congregation of Jehovah’s Witnesses for Site Plan Review because it meets the conditions of the Ordinance, it’s been recommended for approval by the Township, on condition that screening be provided on the north and south side of the parking lot and the 6 trees for the parking spaces be included (as required). Jones supported the motion which passed by the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Jones, Scott, Letzmann, Laughbaum, Behan, Derrohn, Alexander. No; Simon.

13. Case #35-04 Robert Humphrey, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Exception to Section 2201-Accessory Buildings, 3110 Leeward Drive, Section 20, Littlefield Township
A request by Robert Humphrey for a Special Use Permit for exceptions to the standards of Section 2201, Accessory Buildings at 3110 Leeward Drive, Section 17, T35N-R4W, Littlefield Township. The property is zoned RR-1 Recreation Residential and is tax parcel number 24-07-17-20-326-033. The request is to allow for more than one accessory building on a zoning lot of five acres or less and a larger than allowed accessory building per Section 2201-8 of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed accessory building is 30’x60’ (1,800 sq. ft.). The standards allow up to a 1,200 sq. ft. accessory building.

Putters explained the request to construct an accessory building on a parcel with three platted lots which include a residence, boat house and an existing garage. The applicant could connect the house and accessory building with a breezeway and could put a 1,200 sq. ft. accessory building behind the house, closer to the lake. A 1,000 sq. ft. building could be placed at the proposed location. The applicant would like to place the 1,200 sq. ft. building in a clearing on the property. A septic system is located on the lot between the house and garage.

Because the Township is planning a site walk, the case was deferred until the next regular meeting.

14. Case #36-04 Bear River Electric, SITE PLAN REVIEW, Electrician Office, 352 Creekside Drive, Section 4, Bear Creek Township
A request by Bear River Electric for Site Plan Review for an electrical contractor’s office and warehouse at 352 Creekside Drive located within Section 4, T34N-R5W, Bear Creek Township. The property is zoned B-1 Local Tourist Business and is tax parcel number 24-01-19-04-231-109. The development is reviewed as a pre-existing PUD, which was established under the jurisdiction of Bear Creek Township through the standards of the Bear Creek Township Interim Zoning Ordinance.

Putters explained the request in the Creekside Development for an electrical contractor’s office and warehouse. The development, approved by Bear Creek Township, was accepted as an existing non-conforming situation. The uses in line with other uses in the development. A drainage plan has been submitted for the entire development. Review by the Sign & Lighting Committee will be necessary.
Jones made a motion to approve Case #36-04 a request by Bear River Electric for Site Plan Review (site plan dated 6/16/04PZ) because the Township recommended approval and it meets the standards of the Ordinance. Behan supported the motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Simon, Jones, Scott, Letzmann, Laughbaum, Behan, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none.

IV Public Comments

V Other Business

• Case #54C-01 West Traverse Township - Zoning Coordinating Committee - Text Amendment
Putters explained the proposed outdoor lighting amendment. Derrohn made a motion to approve the suggested comments, Letzmann supported the motion which passed by unanimous voice vote. Simon commented that the standards include all lighting.

• Sign & Lighting Committee - review by-laws
Jones made a motion to approve the Sign & Lighting Committee by-laws as amended, Derrohn supported the motion which passed by unanimous voice vote.

• Enforcement Report
Enforcement reports will be provided monthly.

• Committee for Better Development Design
Informational handout. Discussion followed. No action.

• FR - Forest Recreation
To be discussed at the Public Hearing set for July 22, 2004.

• Public Hearing set
Putters stated that a grant application for the Nolan property is being prepared. A Public Hearing was set for July 22, 2004, at 7:30 pm.

VI Adjournment
Chairman Eby declared the meeting adjourned at 10:08 p.m.