EMMET COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY FEBRUARY 3, 2011
7:30 P.M.
COMMISSIONER’S ROOM
EMMET COUNTY BUILDING
200 DIVISION STREET
PETOSKEY, MI 49770

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT: Paul Hramiec, Dan Plascencia, James Scott, Jack Jones, Kelly Alexander, Steve Neal, John Eby, David Laughbaum, Sue Anderson

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF: Brentt Michalek, Tammy Doernenburg, Monica Linehan

I Call to Order and Attendance
The meeting was called to order at 7:30 PM by Eby, all members were present.

II Minutes of January 6, 2011 meeting
Anderson made a motion, supported by Neal, to approve the minutes of the January 6, 2011 meeting as presented. The motion passed by a unanimous voice vote.

III Cases

1. Case #1-11 Boguslaw Gierek, REZONING-R-2B to B-1, W. Levering Road, Section 34, Cross Village Township

Legal Notice: A request by Boguslaw Gierek for rezoning on parcels located at 5959 W. Levering Road, 5885 W. Levering Road and the vacant parcel located between the two identified addresses all in Section 4 of Cross Village Township. The three parcels are zoned R-2B General Residential, include tax parcels numbered 24-05-04-34-151-042, 044 & 043, and encompass approximately 4.35 acres fronting W. Levering Road. The request is to rezone from R-2B General Residential to B-1 Local Tourist Business per Section 2408 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Packet Information: Request & location map, tax parcel map, application, 1/18/11 zoning map, 1/4/11 email from Gene Reck, 1/4/11 email from Jane Hausler, zoning evaluation

Passed out at meeting: 2/2/11 email from Madge Heinz, 2/1/11 email from Bill Glass, 1/31/11 email from Pamela S. Fochtman

Doernenburg presented this request and explained that there are three parcels located on the corner of N State and W Levering Roads. All three property owners have requested the rezoning. 4.35 acres are proposed to be rezoned from R-2B to B-1. There is a retail use on the first parcel, the middle parcel is vacant, and the third parcel has a residence on it. The surrounding zoning was shown. The Emmet County Master Plan shows mixed use for these properties. The Master Plan for Cross Village was adopted in 2005 and shows the central business district not to exceed W. Levering Road. Three letters of concern have been received. Cross Village Township has recommended denial. The applicant has requested that a decision be postponed for a month which is in line with Planning Commission policy for a rezoning. The list showing the comparison of uses were shown between R-2B and B-1 and the principle and special uses in each zone were pointed out. The commercial special uses in R-2B are principle uses in B-1; this would mean that notifications to the neighbors would not be required. This request goes against the Cross Village Master Plan. It is consistent with the Emmet County Master Plan; however the Master Plan also discusses infill development. There is a significant amount of vacant B1 and B2 parcels in Cross Village Township. The letter in the packet from Gene Reck stated that many of those parcels are difficult to develop.

The applicant, Boguslaw Gierek, stated that he is building a home here. He has a machine shop downstate.
but his business will be obsolete within a couple years and he would like to try another small business here such as a coffee/ice cream shop or café. As he will be living here, he could have a business that was open in the winter to extend the season. He stated that he approached a real estate agent looking for commercial property when he started but there was nothing available. This lot is semi-commercial. Gierek stated that the zoning on this parcel doesn’t allow him to do what he’d like to do. He stated that he was advised to work with other owners for this request. Gierek stated that his impression after attending the Cross Village meeting was that he is an outsider and that they are concerned with what type of business he may put on the property. He feels that if he is able to show them a proposal of what he wants to do to the township it would make a difference. He would like to try to go back to the township for their approval first. The other commercial lots in the area are small, hard to develop, and are in the center of the village. Gierek stated that if this parcel is developed, more people may come and possibly develop these other parcels. Gierek stated that this is the main road from Harbor Springs, it is a nice sized lot, and he would like to have a cozy café or other similar use.

Eby stated that he is in favor of sending the case back to the township; that stretch needs something there. Scott asked if a PUD would be a better option instead of a straight rezoning. Eby noted that there is no control over transition with a straight rezone like there would be with a PUD. There was a consensus with the board members that they would rather see a PUD than a straight rezone.

Michalek stated that option should be discussed with staff. Do the other two property owners want a PUD?

Eby opened the floor to public comment.

Frank Francis owns three lots abutting the Reck studio property. He stated that a lot of work was done on the Master Plan and it was determined that the downtown business area would be more than adequate for new businesses. This rezoning request does not fall within those boundaries. Francis stated that there are a number of his neighbors that oppose this request. There were no plans presented at the township meeting; there should be something more definitive than just a rezoning. If it’s too big of a project the township may still shoot it down.

Julie Miller owns the general store. She stated that he wants to build a café. Most people were against it. The village cannot sustain the business in the winter. Miller stated that he will take the property and ruin it because he will develop it and the business wouldn’t be sustained. Miller also stated that they had to pay commercial prices for their property and it is not fair for him to be able to pay residential prices and still get to have a commercial business. The general store and the Legs Inn already have what he may put in, it is redundant.

Gierek stated that he asked to buy the general store a year ago.

This case will be deferred back to the township for further review and heard again at the next regular meeting.

2. Case #34-10 Raymond Evans, SPECIAL USE PERMIT-Home Occupation, 1069 Old Tannery Creek Road, Section 33, Bear Creek Township

Legal Notice: A request by Raymond Evans for a Special Use Permit for a Home Occupation at 1069 Old Tannery Creek Road, Section 33, Bear Creek Township. The property is zoned R-1B One Family Residential and is tax parcel 24-01-16-33-202-044. The request is to allow sales, grinding and polishing of Petoskey Stones as a Home Occupation per Section 2102-12 of the Zoning Ordinance.
Michalek presented this case explaining it is a result of an enforcement issue. The applicant has been operating a Petoskey stone cutting & polishing business out of his home since the late 1990s. There is no record of zoning approval. The aerial of the property was shown. The current sign is in the road right-of-way and the Road Commission has stated that it needs to be removed. The sign is also too large for a home occupation and is lit from the ground which is not allowed. These issues would need to be resolved in order to comply with the sign standards for a home occupation if approved. There is limited parking and the applicant explained at the township meeting that there is not a lot of car traffic and is often bicycle traffic in the summer. There was a letter of concern received regarding cutting noise. The applicant does limited cutting and has agreed to limit the cutting hours to between 10am and 4pm if done outdoors. The township recommended approval with that condition as well as the sign coming into compliance.

The applicant, Raymond Evans stated that he has been in business since 1997. The outdoor cutting is on a large tile saw and is done maybe 15 hours per year and is usually 10 minutes at a time. He stated that he has his Veterans vendor license and business license. He operates mostly by word-of-mouth business. Various places such as the State park take cards to hand out during the summer. Most of his customers are from out of state and he often takes them to the beach to help them find stones. He has talked to the Road Commission and is going to their meeting to request permission to leave the sign on his mailbox as there is a cedar hedge and he is concerned that his sign won’t be seen if it is elsewhere.

Anderson asked about the lit sign. Doernenburg stated that the sign cannot be lit from the ground up. Alexander asked where the cutting and polishing is done. Evans stated that most of it is done inside his garage except for the large saw that is outside. Jones noted that the Bear Creek Township board also recommended approval.

Anderson made a motion to approve Case #34-10, Raymond Evans, Special Use Permit for a Home Occupation to operate a stone shop at 1069 Old Tannery Creek Road, Section 13, Bear Creek Township as outlined in the Home Occupation Use Plan and as shown on the site plan dated 12/16/10 because the use meets the standards of Section 2102-12, the occupant is the only employee, the use will not conflict with the residential character of the neighborhood, the use is across the street from a business use, and on condition that a sign 2 sq. ft. is permitted but must be located outside of the right-of-way outdoor cutting limited M-F 10a-4p. Jones supported the motion.

There was discussion as to whether the motion should state that if the Road Commission approved the location of the sign if it could stay there. Jones pointed out that the streets are very narrow in that area. Eby stated that if the motion states this it should stipulate that it is because of the uniqueness of the roads and because of existing setback encroachments that it is approved in the right-of-way. Anderson stated that the township thought the sign should be on the building.

Anderson amended her motion to state that the 2 sq. ft. sign is permitted and can be located in the right-of-way with Road Commission approval. There was no support for the amended motion.

Doernenburg stated that the ordinance states that signs should not be placed in the right-of-way unless permitted by the road agency having jurisdiction. They have stated that the sign should be removed. If the sign is allowed by the Road Commission then it would be allowed according to the ordinance.

Anderson then retracted her amendment and revised her original motion as follows:
Anderson made a motion to approve Case #34-10, Raymond Evans, Special Use Permit for a Home Occupation to operate a stone shop at 1069 Old Tannery Creek Road, Section 13, Bear Creek Township as outlined in the Home Occupation Use Plan and as shown on the site plan dated 12/16/10 because the use meets the standards of Section 2102-12, the occupant is the only employee, the use will not conflict with the residential character of the neighborhood, the use is across the street from a business use, and on condition that outdoor cutting is limited M-F 10a-4p and a sign 2 sq. ft. is permitted as it complies with the zoning ordinance. Jones supported the revised motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes: Eby, Neal, Jones, Scott, Hramiec, Laughbaum, Anderson, Plasencia, Alexander. No: None.

3. Case #124K-94 North Country Mental Health, PUD-1 Amendment (perimeter setback, parking-number & size), 1420 Plaza Drive, Section 7, Bear Creek Township

Legal Notice: A request by North Country Community Mental Health for a Planned Unit Development-1 (PUD-1) amendment at 1420 Plaza Drive, Section 7, Bear Creek Township. The property is tax parcel 24-01-19-07-380-102 and is zoned R-2B General Residential with a PUD-1 overlay. The property is owned by Valentino Development Co. and is part of the RG Properties PUD. The request is to modify the PUD perimeter setback from 100 feet to 20 feet, to modify the parking requirements so that more than 5 per 1,000 square feet may be installed; and to modify the parking space sizes so that 9.5’ wide parking spaces may be permitted on the subject parcel.

Packet Information: Request & location map, tax parcel map, application, 1/10 email between Bo Gunlock & Val Trabuchi, impact statement, 1/18/11 memo to PC regarding drainage, 1/18/11 email between Benchmark Engineering & Tammy Doernenburg regarding drainage costs, zoning evaluation, 1/10/11 drainage plan, 1/7/11 PUD Site Plan, 1/20/11 drainage calculations.

Passed out at meeting: 1/26/11 Bear Creek Township minutes

Doernenburg presented this case. She explained that the applicant would like only the PUD request reviewed at this point and would like to come back for the site plan review. The building currently houses a sleep center, Sylvan learning center, and medical offices. The original PUD in 1994 required a 100’ setback from the north property line. There have been modifications to side yard setbacks in the vicinity where non-commercial uses were adjacent to each other. The parking currently permitted is 4-5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of floor area and the number of spaces is limited to 70 based on the building size. This request is to modify the PUD standards to allow a 20 foot perimeter setback on the north side of the property to allow for parking, to allow more parking than permitted-up to 100 spaces, and to modify the size standards to 9.5’ parking spaces. Doernenburg pointed out that the minutes from 1995 meeting were passed out tonight. Many lots in this PUD have the reduced size parking spaces and there have been perimeter setback modifications as well. Bear Creek Township recommended approval on condition that the trees are of a 4.5-6” caliper because with the increased parking and its extension into the northern setback they felt the tree size should be increased to make up for the increase in pavement and loss of green space. There is a site plan included but they may be making some changes and asked that the Board of Commissioners look at the PUD amendment only first.

Alexis Kaczynski, the director of North Community Mental Health stated that they currently occupy the Lockwood building and have been asked to vacate. They have 70 staff in 15,000 square feet of that building. This new building would work for them but the parking is not sufficient. They would be able to add the needed spaces into the utility easement with the requested modification. Kaczynski stated that the site plan may be changed and would like to be able to get the plan together first to present.

Doernenburg stated that there is a utility easement underground for utility power. It was recommended that the applicant check with the utility company to get their approval to place parking over that easement or to move the parking so that it was not overtop of the easement. They elected to move it and request the 20’ setback modification.
Eby opened the floor to public comment.

Fred Leiderbach stated that this is an extremely important facility and that they are under tremendous pressure to relocate.

Plasencia made a motion to recommend (to the Board of Commissioners) approval of Case #124K-94, North Country Community Mental Health to amend the Preliminary and Final Mixed Use Planned Unit Development-1 (PUD-1) for only parcel 24-01-19-07-380-102, 1420 Plaza Drive, Section 7, Bear Creek Township, as follows:

1. Modify the perimeter setback from 100’ to 20’ to allow for parking,
2. Modify the parking standards to permit up to 100 parking spaces,
3. Modify the parking space standards to permit 9.5’ wide parking spaces,
4. Amend the PUD agreement, subject to Civil Counsel review, to reflect the modifications,

Approval is recommended for the following reasons: 1) the use is consistent with the approved uses for the property, 2) the parking lot would not adversely impact adjacent properties 3), the property is adjacent to a non-residential use, 3) the parking space size is consistent with other developments in the vicinity and on the condition that 4-6” caliper trees be placed where indicated on plan. The motion was supported by Anderson and passed on the following roll call vote: Yes: Eby, Neal, Jones, Scott, Hramiec, Laughbaum, Anderson, Plasencia, Alexander. No: None.

There was unanimous approval to defer the site plan review portion of this case to allow the applicant time to finalize their site plan.

4. Case #28-10 Joe Blachy, REZONING-R-2B & R-2C to B-1, US 131, Section 7, Bear Creek Township

Legal Notice: A request by Joe Blachy on behalf of the property owners of certain properties identified herein and a request by Judy & Mike Hills for a rezoning of the following properties: 1) from R-2B General Residential to B-1 Local Tourist Business: parcels 24-01-19-07-150-016 (vacant), 24-01-19-07-150-018 (vacant), 24-01-19-07-300-030 (1523 US 131 Hwy), 24-01-19-07-300-035 (1601 US 131 Hwy), 24-01-19-07-300-036 (1633 US 131 Hwy), 24-01-19-07-300-010 (1689, 1691, & 1693 US 131 Hwy); and from R-2C General Residential to B-1 Local Tourist Business: parcels 24-01-19-07-300-050 (vacant) & 24-01-19-07-300-051 (1859 US 131 Hwy) all within Section 7 of Bear Creek Township. The rezoning request includes some 13.35 acres on the east side of US 131 Hwy north of Lears Road and South of Kilborn Drive. The request is per Section 2408 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Packet Information: Request & location map, tax parcel map, application, zoning evaluation, 1/18/11 re-zoning map

Passed out at meeting: 1/26/11 email from Denny Keiser regarding voice mail from Fred Liederbach, 1/26/11 Bear Creek Township minutes, letter from Margaret Brazones received 2/2/11, letter from Kurt Schindler

Steve Neal advised everyone that Joe Blachy is listing his house and the question of whether he should be present during this case was asked. Neal stated that he did not feel that he would have a conflict of interest. No one else had an issue with it either.

Michalek presented this case. He noted that a letter of withdrawal had been received from Dr. Margaret Brazones. There are seven parcels involved in this request which are either zoned R-2B or R-2C. All parcels are proposed to be rezoned to B-1. Two of these parcels are vacant; all others have businesses on them. The uses on the parcels were pointed out. Michalek noted that the Holiday Inn Express properties are not included in this request. The surrounding parcels’ zoning was shown. Several property owners on Kilborn Drive have expressed concerns and opposition with a straight rezoning due to the potential uses that would allow. The comparison of uses list was shown. Michalek noted that these were read aloud at the Bear Creek Township meeting. The township has requested postponement as they would like to have
Chip Ironside of Progressive Associates stated that those involved are mostly small business owners. The area in question has changed in the past 15 years. The proposed zoning change could contribute to the longevity of this strip. A lot of time has been spent to join these together and besides the Holiday Inn Express property whom they were unable to contact, they have got a cohesive strip that matches the future land use in the Master Plan. This area has been designated in the Master Plan as a commercial strip. It is time to change this area’s zoning. There are several uses in B-1 that aren’t included in the current zoning district. Changing this zoning will help those owners. Ironside stated that he understands that the Master Plan is a guideline, but it is a current guideline. B-1 is a modest and incremental change as opposed to B-2. There are only a few more primary uses; the rest of the uses are a special use which would allow for review and approval or denial of a plan. B-1 zoning would provide a consistent transition between properties and zoning districts. Ironside explained that due to the economy they are under additional pressure to maintain the vitality of their properties. Property values have plummeted and this is concerning. There has been an identified public and economic need. The change is in the best interest of the community. Ironside stated that there were a lot of concerns identified at the township meeting from the residential neighbors. He stated that they are not blind to their concerns and would like to stay compatible with the residential uses. Ironside noted that when the Master Plan was being written in 2009 these properties were marked for commercial. This residential neighborhood will still be there throughout the life of the Master Plan. There were many opportunities to discuss what the future use of property was. This is a viable request.

Mike Brown, another representative of the property owners group stated that he was at the township meeting. There were legitimate concerns brought up. Brown stated that the neighbors’ concerns are appreciated and maintaining the residential area is important. Brown stated that they would be willing to amend their application to address some of these issues. Dr. Brazones’ letter stated that she doesn’t support the rezoning request as it was presented last week. Brown stated that they would offer deed restrictions to the abutting property owners on Kilborn Drive. This would limit the uses on those properties and would not allow for the special uses in B-1 or restaurants. This would leave those properties for retail use. Brown stated that Doernenburg had said at the township meeting that she was not comfortable with deed restrictions; that they were not enforceable. The state zoning act addresses conditional zoning however the County has elected not to utilize this procedure and they don’t have to. Brown stated that they are here to work with the County and the neighbors and are willing to restrict the uses. He asked that conditional rezoning be pursued which would rezone three properties with restrictions and the other five as B-1.

Joe Blachy stated that Dr. Brazones called him after her letter was sent and advised that she would be in support of the possible changes and would send a letter stating this when she returns from out of town.

Anderson asked if this would not be acceptable as a PUD due to the ‘leapfrog’ of parcels involved. Michalek stated that would be based on the applicants’ desire to do so. Contract zoning is illegal and conditional zoning shouldn’t be tried unless it is clearly outlined in the zoning ordinance—which it isn’t. Michalek stated that the County has chosen to change the ordinance when there is an issue rather than work with conditional zoning. Eby noted that we don’t need conditional zoning because we have the PUD option in the ordinance. Michalek added that the Master Plan is a long range, 20 year, future plan. There is language in the Plan that directly refers to the former Rotary Park property. The future use maps intentionally used wavy lines so as not to limit boundaries on specific property lines which allow residential uses to be taken into account. Doernenburg pointed out that there was a statement handed out from Kurt Schindler, MSU Extension, addressing conditional zoning. His statement says that if it is used, it needs to be outlined in the zoning ordinance and legal counsel would need to review. Alexander asked if there is any indication of how the owner of the Holiday Inn Express feels about this proposal. They have
not been able to contact the owner.

Eby opened the floor to public comment.

Curt Harwood (1510 Kilborn Dr.) stated that his property abuts Dr. Brazones parcel. They have had many drainage problems and it was admitted at a public meeting that the engineers made a mistake with the drainage. He is still dealing with this issue. Harwood stated that the proposed plan is not a compatible change and would request that it be denied. He and many of his neighbors have kids and grandkids and this change would negatively impact them and property values. Harwood stated that the applicant’s have talked about the economy, but he has suffered too and would probably be denied if he came in with this plan. If needed, Harwood asked all of the members to take a drive through his neighborhood on Kilborn Drive and see how some of the potential uses would affect their residential community. When he bought his house, Harwood stated that he did his research and looked at the zoning of the property and surrounding property to see what was allowed. He had a choice to buy just as the applicants had a choice to purchase their properties as zoned. Harwood stated that all of his residential neighbors are opposed to the request and asked for it to be denied.

Steve Rinock (1526 Kilborn) stated that he recently purchased this house from his mother’s estate. He came back to Petoskey for the quality of life. The properties behind Kilborn provide a transition now. He does not want to see a strip mall, restaurants, etc. The Holiday Inn has an excellent view and they probably are happy as is. Rinock stated that he is very adamantly opposed. He doesn’t want to see the same drainage issues as his neighbors. The drainage at the credit union has already had to be redone.

Bill Larsen (1500 Kilborn) stated that he doesn’t want to see other signs, property value will decrease with the zoning change, and the properties in question are all for sale-who knows who will buy them. Larsen stated that he does not want to have a B-1 designation on these especially since there are uses that they would not be notified with. He stated that they would welcome any business that could come in under the current zoning.

Boyd Manges (1434 Kilborn) stated that he is opposed to the rezoning. The R-2B zoning provides a fair amount of flexibility with special use permits to do less intense businesses. Traffic is already an issue in this area and the lots are fairly small.

Rob Manges (1434 Kilborn) stated that he has grown up at this residence and has adjusted to falling asleep with car lights and noises. The rezoning opens this area up to even more traffic and parking problems and makes the residential area less of a comfortable atmosphere. Manges stated that he likes this neighborhood because it is close to town but is still relatively quiet. If larger developments come in, the feel of the neighborhood would go away.

Aaron Brooks (1474 Kilborn) stated that the Rotary Park property is probably the only place that could be built on due to the terrain. When he bought his home, he spent six months looking for the right parcel. The park was great to have behind him. He does get some trash and leaves in his yard that blows across the park-this would increase if a business were on that property. There is a buffer now. Brooks stated that the concessions that the applicant’s are stating that they will make are not enough. Retail uses is probably the only use that will go into these properties and that can be done now with a special use permit. Brooks stated that he is concerned with possible restaurant use, garbage, drainage, exhaust, employees always there-these reasons are the opposite of why he moved to this neighborhood. The current zoning already gives a lot of leeway in uses. This is the spot that you see as you come over the hill into town. Brooks stated that he wants to be able to enjoy his back yard and not have people able to look into his yard onto his family as he was recently able to out a hotel window in Traverse City.
Mark Tarquinni stated that he lives in Petoskey but sympathizes with the Kilborn Drive owners. He recently learned of the Emmet County Master Plan and doesn’t understand why the applicants need to rezone now; are they currently thinking of building there? There is the Bear Creek Plaza which seems pretty underdeveloped. The buildings that are already there should be used prior to new construction. Tarquinni asked if the additional traffic was looked at. He explained that those who live in Petoskey are dealing with people cutting through the neighborhoods like a business loop so they don’t have to go through Petoskey. If there are more businesses on that side of town there will be more traffic. Are the proposed cross streets in the Master Plan ever going to be built? Tarquinni stated that he is sure that the Kilborn Drive residents’ property values will drop if these parcels are rezoned and developed.

John Morgan (1490 Kilborn) stated that he is probably the newest resident in the neighborhood and he’s been there for ten years. He researched the restrictions of the subdivision prior to moving in; they are only allowed single level homes to protect the views. Now look at what is behind them.

Fred Liderbach stated that his mother lives at 1425 Kilborn Drive. He is not a fan of the NIMBY (not in my back yard) attitude. He would like to discuss the needs of the community. There are obviously property value concerns on both sides. Will this rezone help the business owners? The current businesses are professional buildings and some of the uses that the neighbors are concerned with such as fast food restaurants would probably hurt the current business owners if they were there. Liederbach noted that the bigger question is the preservation of the quiet strip and view coming into Petoskey over the hill. Houses could be placed on the Rotary Park property. Low income housing is not an option in B-1. With rezoning, public notifications for activities that now require a special use permit would not be required. Is there a compelling need for the rezone? There is a ton of retail space in town. Liederbach stated that this is why we as an economy are suffering; we are building new when there are empty buildings to use. Say no to this rezoning.

Curt Harwood added that it is pleasant now because these parcels hold professional office uses; other uses would completely change this feeling. The Planning Commission denied the Hampton Inn years ago in this area. These uses do not fit here.

Steve Rinock added that the professional offices are aesthetically pleasing from the highway and they provide a transition; more intense uses would disrupt this feeling. This is the first appearance you get when you come into town; it has been compared to Norman Rockwell pictures.

Eby asked the Planning Commission members if there was any interest into looking into conditional zoning. There was no interest and Anderson added that there is already a tool in place in the ordinance; PUD.

There was unanimous approval to defer this case back to Bear Creek Township for further review.

IV Public Comment: None

V Other Business

- Enforcement Report – A letter from the Neithercut’s regarding their trailer on Wilderness Park Drive was sent to each member. They received a second enforcement letter from the Zoning department. According to their letter they felt that they should have been contacted first. The minutes were reviewed from the September 2010 Planning Commission meeting and they were directed to remove the trailer. Michalek noted that the enforcement process will continue from
here with tickets being issued. There was no opposition from the Planning Commission with continuing enforcement efforts.

- **Seminars:** The available upcoming seminars were reviewed. Scott asked for a reminder email from staff prior to the seminar held in March in Petoskey.
- **Comparison of Use chart:** Staff were requested to pass out the comparison of uses chart that was shown in the PowerPoint presentation for the next meeting.

**VI Adjournment**
There being no other business, and no additional public comment, Eby called the meeting adjourned at 9:21 p.m.

________________________________________   __________________________
James Scott, Secretary        Date