EMMET COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
THURSDAY JUNE 5, 2014, 7:30 P.M.  
BEAR CREEK TOWNSHIP HALL  
373 DIVISION RD  
PETOSKEY, MI 49770  

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Eby, Dan Plasencia, Kelly Alexander, James Scott, Bert Notestine, Shawn Wonnacott, David Laughbaum, Tom Urman  

MEMBERS ABSENT: Steve Neal  

STAFF: Tammy Doernenburg, Monica Linehan  

I Call to Order and Attendance  
The meeting was called to order at 7:30 PM by Chairman Eby. All members were present except Neal.  

II Minutes of May 1, 2014  
Alexander made a motion supported by Wonnacott to approve the minutes of the May 1, 2014 meeting. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote of the members present.  

III Cases  
1. Case #28C-83 MBK Holdings, LLC, SPECIAL USE PERMIT-Outdoor display; Site Plan Amendment; PUD-1-removal, 4722 US 131 Hwy, Section 30, Bear Creek Township  

Legal Notice: A two-part request by MBK Holdings LLC at 4772 US 131 Hwy, Section 30, Bear Creek Township for 1) a Special Use Permit and Site Plan Review (Amendment) to allow for outdoor display and modification of the site plan, and 2) to remove the Planned Unit Development-1 (PUD-1) overlay. The request is per Sections 1001-4, 2102 and Article XVII of the Zoning Ordinance. The property is tax parcel 24-01-19-30-400-011 and is zoned B-2 General Business with a PUD-1 overlay.  

Packet Information: No new information  

Doernenburg reported that there has been a request for postponement for a month received from the applicant to give them time to address some of the issues brought up by the township and the public. Bear Creek Township has set up a site walk of the property to be held on June 25, 2014 at 5:30 p.m. and could be a joint site walk if this board would like. The case will be heard again at the July 3, 2014 Emmet County Planning Commission meeting to be held again at the Bear Creek Township Hall.  

2. Case #1E-75 Circuit Controls Corporation, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT-1 (Mixed Use), Preliminary, Final, & SITE PLAN REVIEW, 2277 Harbor-Petroskey Rd, Section 27, Bear Creek Township  

Legal Notice: A request by Circuit Controls Corporation at 2277 Harbor-Petroskey Road for a Mixed-Use Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development-1 (PUD-1) overlay and Site Plan Review for expansion of the existing PUD-1 for a factory addition, parking and an accessory building. The property includes tax parcels 24-01-16-27-201-012 - zoned I-1 Light Industrial with a PUD-1 overlay, 24-01-16-27-201-002 (2401 Harbor-Petroskey Rd), 003, 004 (2357 Harbor-Petroskey Rd) zoned R-2B General Residential with a Preliminary PUD-1 overlay and 24-01-16-27-200-002 & 004 zoned R-2B General Residential. The request includes a modification to the PUD-1 perimeter setback standards and the parking space width standards. The request is per Article XVII of the Zoning Ordinance.  

Packet information: 5/7/14 letter from Carol Woodhurst, 5/12/14 letter from Haggard's P&H, email from Dan Zaenglein
Doernenburg reported that there has been a request for postponement for a month received from the applicant to give them time to address some of the issues brought up by the township and the public. The case will be heard again at the July 3, 2014 Emmet County Planning Commission meeting to be held again at the Bear Creek Township Hall.

3. **Case #6-14 Terrance Carolan, SITE PLAN REVIEW-Cabin tourist lodging facility, 4495 N Larks Lake Rd, Section 7, Center Township**

*Legal Notice:* A request by Terrance Carolan for Mary Carolan for Site Plan Review for a tourist lodging/cabin court business at 4495 N Larks Lake Road in Section 7 of Center Township. The property is tax parcel number 24-04-09-07-400-003 and is zoned B-1 Local Tourist Business. The request is per Section 900-7 of the Zoning Ordinance.

*Packet Info:* Request & location map, zoning evaluation, application, impact statement, site plan review checklist, photos of example cabins, 5/12/14 site plan

The parcel is 1.5 acres in size and is zoned B-1. Surrounding parcels are zoned FF-2 to the north and to the west and B-1 to the east and on the opposite corner (northeast). The aerial view was shown; the parcel is vacant and wooded. The request is a principle use in the zoning district. The driveway access would be along Larks Lake Road. The Road Commission submitted a letter to the applicant advising that they will require concrete curb and gutter both on the existing drive and the new drive to be installed for the Commons Building which needs a defined access point. The site plan was shown. Setbacks for parking and structures have been met. There is no proposed improved parking at this point. There will be minimal changes to the site. The common building (A) is proposed to be utilized as a bathhouse for all of the cabins. The applicant has had a DEQ cleanup of the site which included removal of old oil tanks. Because of this, he asks that the drainage plan requirement be waived. There is no proposed dumpster or lighting. The Fire Department review has been requested of the applicant but not received yet. State approval for the campground is being sought. There are no additional trees required. Snow management is shown on the interior of the parcel. No signs are proposed. The township recommended approval but in their email asked that neighbors within 1/4 mile be notified of the plans and that no trespassing or warning signs for the pond on the neighboring property be required to be installed. Doernenburg explained that the notification could be done by either the applicant or the township if they so desired but as this is a Site Plan Review only, the MI Zoning Enabling Act does not require neighbor notification and 1/4 mile would be well beyond the 300’ as required for Special Use Permit requests. In order to keep in-line with this statute, our offices would not do the notification. The pond in question was pointed out on the aerial. Doernenburg noted that signage would be a good idea. Graphics of sample cabins were shown; they are very small cabins. Photos of the site were shown.

Terry Carolan, applicant, was present. He explained that this is his daughter's property and as he has been in building and construction most of his life she asked him to help her out. The concept is a small campground for ecotourism with the intent to cater to kayakers, bicyclists, hikers, etc. in the area.

Notestine stated that he doesn't think it is a good idea to not have a dumpster on site. What is the plan for the trash that will be generated. Carolan stated that these cabins would be very small; equivalent of a normal motel room 100-200sf. They will have housekeeping each day and the trash would be taken off site. He has no objection to a dumpster and if there were a need one would be installed. Carolan explained that they are still in the early planning stages on this project. An approval here would allow them to start the ball rolling for other approvals and requirements. A dumpster may be required by another agency during their review process. Doernenburg noted that the motion could be worded to require screening if a dumpster is placed on the site. Alexander asked if the township had any
objections to waiving the drainage plan requirement as requested. No. Eby asked about the stream and bridge shown on the plan. Carolan stated that the property can be a little wet in the spring and the bridge is a nice feature during that time of year and gives the folksy flavor of the campground. Doernenburg asked if it would be pedestrian or vehicle traffic. Carolan responded that it is a pedestrian crossing. Scott asked about the circular path from building A to the cabins. Will this be a pedestrian walkway? Carolan stated that it would be and probably would be a wood-chipped path. The property is relatively flat with the north half being a red pine planting. The south of the property is more mixed hardwoods and conifers. It is also the site of the homestead when there was a gas station. There are flowers that still come up that appear to be planted, the clothesline is still there and the space where an outhouse stood is there as well. Wonnacott asked how the parking spaces will be accessed from the drive. Carolan stated that their original plan since the property is flat would be that it was simple to just drive into the property. The Road Commission, however, wants a designated single access point. He pointed out a location on the site plan about 20' from where the cars are shown near the right-of-way that would be the location for the curb and gutter. Parking would likely be towards the middle of the property. Doernenburg noted that she discussed with Carolan when he applied the need for room to maneuver vehicles and that they had to be at least 10' from the right-of-way. Carolan noted that the drives meet site distance requirements at both locations. Alexander asked if he plans to operate year round. Carolan stated that has yet to be determined. Right now they would operate on a seasonal basis but may expand the project if it goes well. Plasencia stated that he agrees with the township on the property boundary and warning signs for the pond. Carolan agreed. Plasencia stated that the right-of-way should be defined as well. Carolan stated that there is a very specific natural boundary on the south side. A fence could be added as well. Plasencia asked if trees will be coming down for this project. Carolan stated that there have been a few very old willow trees that have come down on their own and the common building may need one 8" tree removed but other than that there is no plan to remove any more trees. The point is to keep it as natural as possible.

Gene Reck, Cross Village Township Supervisor, stated that he feels that it is a great idea. There are very few places to stay in that area and it would be useful to have places to stay.

Eby stated that there are issues that need to be resolved on the site plan including defined entrances, fire department review, fencing on the south property line, a dumpster location, and defined parking lot information. He added that there just needs to be a screened area laid out on the site plan for a dumpster; they don't necessarily have to install one. Scott stated that the concept is good, just need a few more details. If the parking lot is defined and they end up using it in the winter they can plow and maintain the area. Plasencia asked if the existing drive is something that needs to remain. Carolan explained that it is already there and there is a culvert. He felt that it would allow for the parking to be somewhat scattered. Although it is a relatively small piece of land, if the northern cabin is rented, they may want their car a little closer to the cabin than the parking area. Plasencia stated that logs or something similar should be in place to designate parking spots.

The case was postponed to allow the applicant time to make the site plan adjustments and additions. It will be heard at the next regular meeting scheduled for July 3, 2014 at the Bear Creek Township Hall. Staff will notify the township that the county Planning and Zoning office will not be able to notify the neighbors of the proposed development.

4. Case #7-14 Bret Huntman & Katherine Melby, SPECIAL USE PERMIT-Contractor's Use, 2200 Howard Rd, Section 18, Bear Creek Township

Legal Notice: A request by Bret Huntman and Katherine Melby for a Special Use Permit for a contractor's use on property located at 2200 Howard Road in Section 18 of Bear Creek Township. The property is zoned FF-1 Farm and Forest and is
part of tax parcel 24-01-19-18-200-038. The request is per Section 801-8 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**Packet Info:** Request & location map, tax parcel map, application, impact statement, site photos with aerial and topo, greenhouse information, site plan checklist, record of phone call with property owner near site who supports request, Fire Dept review, zoning evaluation, 5/21/14 site plan, survey, Road Commission review.

This parcel is zoned FF-1 and is on the west side of Howard Road. A land split has occurred so the location map shows a larger parcel. The survey was shown that shows the 10 acre parcel that is being reviewed. The site plan was shown. Doernenburg stated that it is currently used for residential and farming use. This proposal would add three greenhouse structures in the future. The existing Howard Road access is required to be upgraded to a commercial access. There are 6-8' trees along the property lines. The Fire Department review has been received. Doernenburg reported that there were people at the township meeting that had concerns and she has received one call with questions on this case. Bear Creek Township thoroughly reviewed this case and recommended approval with a list of fourteen conditions. One of the township's conditions were that that a house be left on the property. There is a dwelling on the property, but it is not the intent of the applicant to live on the property. Leaving a house on the property maintains the residential character. Doernenburg read through the fourteen conditions requested by the township. These include: 1) that no burning be allowed, 2) that no brush piles be allowed, 3) that the stock piles be limited to an area of 20 ft. diameter behind the barn as shown on the site plan, 4) that the stock piles be limited to mulch, stone, compost, and similar materials as stated on the site plan, 5) that there be no retail on the site, 6) that heavy equipment be limited to 5 pieces, 7) that there be no outdoor storage of heavy equipment, 8) that there be no additional parking other than what is designated on the site plan, 9) that dust control be applied as needed, 10) that a house is to remain on the property for office or dwelling use, 11) that the site meets Fire Dept. approval, 12) that lighting meet the standards of the Ordinance, 13) that the hours of operation for the business be Mon.-Sat. 7a-7p and for the heavy equipment (anything bigger than a bobcat) the hours are limited to Mon.-Fri. 8a-5p and Sat. 8a-Noon, 14) the Special Use Permit is for landscaping, plant production and planting services only. Photos of the site and an aerial view were shown. Doernenburg noted that you can't see it from Howard Road but you can see it from neighboring properties and Intertown Road. Doernenburg stated that the request is for a contractor's use on the property with the modifications that the property doesn't meet the 600' lot width requirement and the owners will not live on the property.

Bret Huntman, applicant, stated that he is the proposed owner of the site. He will be working on the site but just not living there. This is a seasonal business. Currently they do not do any snow plowing. The planned pervious surfaces will stand up to this type of use. The company is North by Nature and has been in business for about four years. He stated that he feels that this site will allow for expansion anywhere between 8-20 people. If their business grew bigger than that, they would need to look at another location. The business plans to rent out the house, barn, and land separately. The business may occupy the house for office space in the future.

Alexander asked if they feel that there is no need for retail at this location. Huntman stated that this is not part of his business. If they wanted to sell, they would sell at a better retail location. They would be growing plants and trees in order to install for customers. Plasencia asked if we are reviewing the greenhouses. Doernenburg stated that they would likely fall under Right to Farm and would just need to meet setbacks. Alexander asked if there is a timeframe for the greenhouses to be built. Huntman stated that they do not have a specific plan at this time. Urman asked if the Road Commission required a commercial drive. Huntman stated that they did. The existing drive that you can see on the aerial is adequate but needs a commercial entrance.

Eby opened the floor to public comment.
Donna Theriault asked what will be grown in the greenhouses. Huntman stated that it would be ornamental plants, perennial landscape materials, shrubs, etc. D. Theriault stated that it sounds like it would be mostly a quiet operation. Huntman agreed stating that it would be quiet for the most part although they may have some mulching grinders on a temporary basis at times and there will be other agricultural activities on the property. The front two acres will be used for the nursery and landscape company where the remaining eight acres will be used to grow other agricultural products.

Paul Theriault asked if the property is owned by Huntman. Huntman stated that they have a purchase agreement in place. P. Theriault stated that Howard is a two-lane road with no shoulders and isn't very accommodating for what could happen there. The terrain is rolling and rather dangerous. It is not very serviceable for a commercial operation. Huntman stated that they are landscaping contractors and would load up trucks in the morning and go out to the customer. They will use a range of vehicles from pickups to one-ton trucks. P. Theriault stated that they live on the northwest corner of this site. He can only anticipate objectionable noises. A grinder has been mentioned; is there to be a mining operation there? He asked how this property can be used this way with the rolling terrain. Are they bringing in trees and then selling them? He is opposed to this request. The Master Plan was developed years ago. Why is a variance to the Master Plan being considered? It should be abided by.

Wonnacott asked if this is near Bill's Auto. That area already has commercial uses. Doernenburg stated that it is across Howard Road from that operation and down the road from Evergreen Lawn Care; both non-conforming uses. Theriault stated that the area is highly populated with lots of residences. This is a good area for residential expansion. Doernenburg explained that this case was discussed at length at the township meeting and there were other residents in attendance which is why there were conditions placed on the use of the property. Urman added that they did stipulate no burning or brush piles but they didn't think about grinding. Eby stated that condition #10, the word house should be changed to residence. Doernenburg stated that the goal on that condition was to specify the use of the building to limit the use to either residence or office. Laughbaum stated that since they are a landscaping business it would seem like old trees would be brought back to the site and grinding should be allowed on occasion. Urman stated that the township discussed other similar uses in the area and want to avoid the problems that they have with them. They still want to allow the applicant to be allowed the use but they wanted the conditions and specific site plan details ironed out before an approval. These restrictions keep the property more residential. The Special Use Permit could be passed along if the property sold so they wanted to keep the approval very tight and specific to this use. Urman stated that he would say no to grinding as they aren't supposed to have brush piles. Scott asked if the applicant meant that they would have a commercial grinder or would it be more of a residential wood chipper that you could pull behind a truck. Huntman stated that he meant chipper that could be pulled behind a truck. He didn't mean to imply that there would be a commercial grinder on site. Plasencia asked if this is something that they could do on the back of the property. Doernenburg stated that if they wanted to amend the site plan they would have to come back to the Planning Commission. Huntman stated that they are not in the business of selling wood chips. Notestine stated that they probably wouldn't have enough material to bring in a commercial tub grinder if they are limited to 20' stockpiles. Wonnacott added that we could simply add no commercial grinding to the requirements. Plasencia would like heavy equipment defined. It was pointed out that it is defined in requirement #13 as no larger than a Bobcat. Eby stated that the term should be changed to a generic term of skid steer as Bobcat is a brand name for many sizes of machines. Laughbaum asked about the hours of operation. If they are coming back from a job bringing back equipment would they be in violation? They would probably be out past 5pm in the summer. Urman pointed out that the hours for non-heavy machinery go until 7pm. The 5pm cutoff was for heavy machinery run on site.
Urman motioned to approve Case #7-14, Bret Huntman and Katherine Melby, Special Use Permit for a contractor’s use on the north 10 acres (labeled parcel #2 on survey dated May 15, 2014) on property located at 2200 Howard Road, Section 18, Bear Creek Township, tax parcel 24-01-19-18-200-038 based on the revised site plan dated May 21, 2014 for the following reasons: the site is 10 acres meeting the lot depth requirement, the use is screened from public view, with the modifications allowed that the owner does not live on the property and the property is less than 600 feet wide and subject to the following conditions:

1) that no material burning be allowed
2) that no brush piles be allowed
3) that the stock piles be limited to an area of 20 ft. diameter behind the barn as shown on the site plan dated 5/21/2014
4) that the stock piles be limited to mulch, stone, compost, and similar materials as stated on the site plan
5) that there be no retail on the site
6) that heavy equipment (anything larger than a skid steer) be limited to 5 pieces
7) that there be no outdoor storage of heavy equipment (anything larger than a skid steer)
8) that there be no additional parking other than what is designated on the site plan
9) that dust control be applied as needed
10) that a dwelling is to remain on the property for office or dwelling use
11) that the site meets Fire Dept. approval
12) that lighting meet the standards of the Ordinance if installed
13) that the hours of operation for the business be Mon.-Sat. 7a-7p and for the heavy equipment (anything bigger than a skid steer) the hours are limited to Mon.-Fri. 8a-5p and Sat. 8a-Noon
14) the Special Use Permit is for landscaping, plant production and planting services only
15) that there be no commercial or industrial grinding equipment used for grinding materials.

The motion was seconded by Wonnacott and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Notestine, Scott, Wonnacott, Laughbaum, Urman, Plasencia, Alexander. No: None. Absent: Neal

5. Case #8-14 Kevin & Lisa Pike, SPECIAL USE PERMIT-Exception to accessory building size standards, 4877 E Robinson Rd, Section 32, McKinley Township

Legal Notice: A request by Kevin and Lisa Pike Estate for a Special Use Permit for an Exception to the Accessory Building standards at 4877 E Robinson Road, Section 32, McKinley Township. The property is zoned FF-2 Farm and Forest and is tax parcel 24-10-10-32-400-001. The request is to allow a 3,360 sq. ft. accessory building where 2,400 sq. ft. is allowed per Section 2201-6 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Packet Info: Request & location map, tax parcel map, application, impact statement, site plan checklist, zoning evaluation, property dimension details with proposed building sizes, site plan, aerial

This parcel is approximately 80 acres and is zoned FF-2. The request is for a 3,360sf accessory building where a 2,400sf building is allowed. The proposed building meets the setback standards and is 678' from the right-of-way, 400' and 820' on the sides, and 1896' from the rear of the property. Doernenburg showed photos of the site. It is very well screened. The aerial was shown as well as the site plan. The township has recommended approval with five yes votes.

Lisa Pike, applicant, explained that the entire building is 56'x60'. The enclosure would be 36'x60' with two 10' covered roofs on either side for parking of bicycles and personal property. There are trees that block the property from the road. Also, they plan to have the barn built in a dark tan color to allow it to blend in better with the landscape even in the fall and winter. The barn is for personal storage only.
Notestine asked how high the building would be. Pike stated that the peak would be 16'-17' and they are surrounded by DNR and Emmet County property. Eby stated that we have approved many 3,200sf buildings; this would only be slightly larger than allowed. Scott stated that they could have more than one building. Pike stated that they could but they would rather have one nice building.

Scott motioned to approve Case #8-14, Kevin and Lisa Pike Estate for a Special Use Permit for an Exception to the size standards of an accessory building on property located at 4877 E Robinson Rd, Section 32 of McKinley Township on tax parcel 24-10-10-32-400-001, as shown on the site plan dated 5/15/14, based on the facts presented in this case, including the lot size of the property (80 acres), the building will be screened from public view, and because no good purpose would be served by strict compliance with the size standards of the Ordinance and on condition that the building be used for personal use and an affidavit of personal use be filed with the Emmet County Register of Deeds, and because the township has recommended approval. The motion was seconded by Alexander and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Notestine, Scott, Wonnacott, Laughbaum, Urman, Plasencia, Alexander. No: None. Absent: Neal

6. Case #23A-86 Ryan Musch for Brian Goodwin on behalf of UPS, SITE PLAN REVIEW-Amendment, 1995 Fochtman Industrial Dr, Section 26, Bear Creek Township

Legal Notice: A request by Ryan Musch for Brian Goodwin on behalf of UPS for Site Plan Review - amendment at 1995 Fochtman Industrial Drive in Section 26 of Bear Creek Township. The property is tax parcel number 24-01-16-26-200-019 and is zoned I-1 Light Industrial. The request is per Section 1000-9 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Packet Items: Request & location map, application, site plan review checklist, Fire Dept review, zoning evaluation, 5/9/14 site plan

Doernenburg presented this case. The proposal is to replace the existing truck dock and increase from 10 bays to 14 bays. The original dock was approved by the Planning Commission in 1991. The property is zoned I-1 Light Industrial. Eight parking spaces would be displaced to maintain driveway access. Additional information has been provided by the applicant regarding parking. There are 30 employees and the parking standards are met with 40 actual spaces provided. Snow storage area is provided at the rear of the lot. No new impervious surfaces are proposed. The aerial and the site plan were shown as were photos of the site.

Brian Goodwin was present for UPS. There was no public comment.

Urman made a motion to approve Case #23A-86, Ryan Musch for Brian Goodwin on behalf of UPS, Site Plan Review of the site plan dated 5/9/14 for a 14 bay truck dock (an increase from 10 bays) at 1995 Fochtman Industrial Drive, located in Section 26 of Bear Creek Township tax parcel 24-01-16-26-200-019 based on the facts presented in this case: the use is a permitted use in the I-1 zoning district, the site plan meets the standards of the Zoning Ordinance and because the township recommended approval. The motion was supported by Notestine and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Notestine, Scott, Wonnacott, Laughbaum, Urman, Plasencia, Alexander. No: None. Absent: Neal

IV Public Comment:
Terry Carolan asked for some clarification about where to go from here on his plan. He was advised that the site plan needs to be revised to address the issues previously discussed. Fire Department review is needed. The concept is acceptable to the Planning Commission, they just need some further details to be shown on the plan.
Gene Reck stated that they have become aware of drilling on Valley Rd in Bliss Township. Many of the constituents are very concerned. Doernenburg stated that her office has no jurisdiction in regards to that activity. She added that the Zoning Enabling Act specifically exempts that type of activity from local jurisdiction. A notice had been sent to the county of an intent to drill a test well.

V Other Business:

- **Internet Tower Discussion:** Doernenburg stated that a map of areas in which the Zoning Administrator could approve internet towers as long as they meet specific criteria was produced. The conditions would be that the proposed tower be in the FF districts, pose no danger to adjacent structures or utilities and setback at least 1.5 times the tower height, not interfere with normal radio/television signals in the area, they would be no more than 125' in height in an area in which it would be shielded by vegetation or 75' in an area visible from a public road, tower circumference would not exceed 18", and they would be clearly identified with ownership and contact information on site. Doernenburg noted that Steve Neal had emailed her some comments as he wasn't available tonight. He feels that all towers should have to go through the same process. He doesn't want the Planning Commission bypassed. He feels that they should make all reasonable measures to blend towers into the landscape. Doernenburg reported that Kathy Abbott reviewed the language and is comfortable with it if the Planning Commission wants to move forward. Plasencia stated that this takes away all public comment. He didn't think that when this was originally discussed we were looking at a county-wide area. He wants to keep the public comment and wouldn't support bypassing the Planning Commission. Wonnacott stated that he agrees and thinks that although the internet towers are needed, especially in the northern part of the county, he thought we were going to get a plan of where the company wanted to put these towers not a blanket coverage for the whole county.

Rachel Smolinski of HARBOR INC stated that they had talked about getting a more focused map of specific areas for the towers but wanted to see how the Planning Commission felt about this option first. They can go back to the specific areas to do a bit more work. Smolinski asked what the general feeling of the board was on this issue. Plasencia stated that it should be a site specific review. Wonnacott stated that he objects to taking away the public's right to come in and state their opinion. Smolinski stated that they are just trying to find a way to streamline the process. She explained that HARBOR INC covers most of the Harbor Springs school district. Internet is a necessity for these children to do homework assignments. The need is getting more extensive and it is now a necessary infrastructure similar to phones or electricity. They aren't trying to cut out the public but want to streamline the process and stress the necessity of this. Doernenburg stated that part of the issues with the towers is that there was a feeling from an installer that permits were not required. If someone applies and submits complete information, most get a response to their request at the first hearing of the Planning Commission. If they are planning ahead this shouldn't be an issue. Eby stated that we have tried to draw back from the more restrictive original guidelines. The issue may not be the process, just the preparation that slows it down. Wonnacott stated that if there is no avenue for the public to express their opinions about a project, this is where the issues come in. Gene Reck stated that most of the complaints that come in are aesthetic complaints. He questioned how valid they are for a necessary operation and compared them to telephone or electrical wires. Scott stated that he thinks these can be turned around rather quickly at the Planning Commission level. Plasencia added that having nine sets of eyes on a site plan can help to make improvements. Laughbaum stated that as time goes by these towers may become more
necessary. After this discussion the consensus was to leave the Planning Commission review as a requirement. It was noted that the changes do remove the co-location requirement.

- **Master Plan 2014:** Doernenburg had sent out Chapters 7-9. She explained that the census information was updated, email addresses and contact information were updated in the intergovernmental cooperation section, support for low-impact design was added. The last chapter, Goals & Objectives, is now being reviewed.

- **Zoning Ordinance:** The new ordinance has been emailed to everyone. Doernenburg asked for direction in how the Planning Commission would like to proceed with the review process. After discussion it will be reviewed a bit at a time at regular meetings similar to how we've been looking at the Master Plan.

- **Enforcement Report:** Distributed. Some discussion.

**VI Adjournment**

There being no other business, and no additional public comment, Eby called the meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m. The next meeting will be held on July 3, 2014 at the Bear Creek Township Hall at 7:30 PM.

________________________________________   __________________________
James Scott, Secretary        Date