EMMET COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
THURSDAY, JANUARY 3, 2002 - 7:30 P.M.
COMMISSIONER’S ROOM
COUNTY BUILDING
200 DIVISION STREET
PETOSKEY, MI 49770

MINUTES


MEMBERS ABSENT: J. HARRIS

STAFF: M. PUTTERS, D. COON, T. DOERNENBURG

VISITORS: Alyce Conrad, Barbara Walsh, Martha Dyksterhouse, June Summers, William Wodek, David Watson, Jan & Becky Bruin Slot, Mark Rosczewski, Pat Masuch, Thomas Swenor, William Hinds, Lynn Stedman, Memory Massey, Richard Carter, Jim Fuhrman, Lois Dell, Jim Young, Doug Pierce, Bruce Platte, Fred Gray and others.

I Call to Order and Attendance
Acting Chairperson Eby called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. All members were present except Harris. A new member Kelly Alexander has been appointed to the Planning Commission.

II Minutes of December 6, 2001
Jones made a motion to accept the minutes of December 6, 2001 with one change to the wording on Case #23A-98, by adding the word ‘business’ on page three, paragraph one, after the word ‘personal’. So the phrase will read; ‘The material is for the applicant’s personal business use and...’. Blanchard supported the motion which passed on a unanimous voice vote.

III Public Comment
Public comment was deferred until the end of the public hearings.

IV Cases

1. CASE #87B-88 Brian J. Turbin for Carter Family Living Trust, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Larger than maximum size accessory building as a main use, Tower Road, Section 4, Maple River Township
A request by Brian J. Turbin for Carter Family Living Trust for a Special Use Permit for a larger than maximum size accessory building as a main use on property located on Tower Road, Section 4, T36N-R4W, Maple River Township. The property is zoned FF-1 Farm Forest and is tax parcel number 24-09-14-04-300-042. The accessory building currently exists as a contractor’s use building on a parcel of at least ten (10) acres. The contractor’s use would not be allowed to continue because of a proposed lot split.

Case #87B-88 and 87D-88 were reviewed together, agenda item number 1 and number 6.

Using a request/location map, survey plan, tax parcel map, and photos of the accessory building, Coon explained the history of the request, including the land division and the request for a larger than maximum size accessory building as a main use. The building...
exists as a Contractor’s Use and the building use includes material and equipment storage. The use would create minimal noise, there is limited storage, and there will be no on-site employees.

Lynn Stedman, attorney for the Carter Family Trust, stated the deed has been signed combining the properties, creating a parcel greater than ten acres and it will be recorded tomorrow. The applicant has complied with the requests of the Planning Commission, combining Parcel #1 and Parcel AB@.

Eby asked if Case #1 (Case #87B-88) became moot because of the request for a Special Use Permit for the Contractor’s Use?

The building was originally a farm building and the Ordinance has changed since the building was built. The non conformity was made worse when the split occurred. Does the Planning Commission wish to set a precedent? It could be considered a non-conforming conversion of an agricultural building to a Contractor’s Use. Is Case #1, then irrelevant? The building would not be a main use, however, it is larger than allowed.

Jones supported the motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Behan, Jones, Scott, Blanchard, Laughbaum, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none. Absent; Harris.

2. CASE #87D-88 Richard L. Carter for Carter Family Living Trust, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Contractor’s Use, 5320 Tower Road, Section 4, Maple River Township

A request by Richard Carter for Carter Family Living Trust for a Special Use Permit to allow a Contractor’s Use utilizing an existing accessory building at 5320 Tower Road, Section 4, T36N-R4W, Maple River Township. The property is zoned FF-1 Farm Forest and includes tax parcel numbers 24-09-14-04-300-040 & 042. The request is per Section 801-9 of the Zoning Ordinance.

After the previous motion (Case 87B-88) and further discussion about the Township recommendation, additional questions were raised. Was the use specific? The letter provided by the applicant was read in part. Maple River Township recommended allowing the larger building in lieu of outdoor storage.

Mr. Carter stated that trees may be delivered to the site to be used off-site. They will not be stored on the site for very long, but there will be an incidence of outdoor storage for nursery stock.

Jones made a motion to approve Case #87D-88, Richard L. Carter for Carter Family Living Trust, Special Use Permit for Contractor’s Use at 5320 Tower Road, Section 4, Maple River Township on condition that there be no outside storage, the owner must live on the property, and the property cannot be reduced to less than 10 acres. Behan supported the motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Behan, Jones, Scott, Blanchard, Laughbaum, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none. Absent; Harris.

Eby then paused to introduce the new member, Kelly Alexander from Wawatam Township.

3. CASE #58-01 Cross Village Food Farm, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Recreation Farm plus various recreational/educational uses, 5322 Hill Road, Section 1, Cross Village Township

A request by Cross Village Food Farm for Special Use Permits to apply to a property located at 5322 Hill Road, Section 1, T37N-R6W, Cross Village Township. The property is zoned FF-2 Farm Forest and includes tax parcel number 24-05-08-01-300-011. The request is per Section 801-1, 2, 3, & 5 of the Zoning Ordinance, for uses in the nature of a recreation farm with primitive camping, staff housing, community kitchen, classroom space, physical fitness facilities, trails and accessory maintenance facilities and off-street parking.

Putters used a request/location map, tax parcel map and site plan to explain the complicated request for multiple uses on the Cross Village Food Farm property. The parcel is 24.9 acres, 2 tillable and 2 wooded. The request is for a community type farm in which people can buy memberships and become part of the organization. Uses
include agriculture, 6-primitive cabins, a kitchen, guest housing, a ropes course, and class rooms. The scope of the activity has been expanded and has raised some concern. How big will the fund raisers be, what type of events are planned? The proposal is for social programs affiliated with the agricultural activities. Participants could work in the fields and/or the road side stand. Parking spaces are provided to support some of the uses and there are existing trails in wooded areas. The proposed use is different than just a farm.

The pro and con memo, dated December 11, 2001 (revised) was explained by Putters.

MEMO

To: Emmet County Planning Commission and To whom it may concern
From: Emmet County Office of Planning and Zoning
Date: December 11, 2001 (revised)
Subject: Cross Village Food Farm Pro/Con statements

• The farming/agricultural aspect of the use is not called into question.
  a. Can be a Domestic Farm or a Specialty Farm.
  b. It is not a commercial farm, except for the Specialty definition.

• The added Special Use Permit features a variety of activities and programs that are not dependent on a farm use. These are:
  • The Ropes Course
  • Primitive cabins
  • Guest house
  • Classroom
  • Central kitchen

PRO

Diversified uses could provide economic support for a farm.

Diversified uses could help to preserve open space, including a wood lot. The soils are Emmet Sandy Loam (EmB and EmC).

Rustic cabins have a campground setting, in a wooded environment with foot paths that are stated to be accessible by vehicles. Six cabins are planned. Is camping beyond the six cabins being planned?

Recreation farms are aimed at eco-tourism, e.g. dude ranch, game ranch, volunteer farm operators, etc.

CON

CSA Farms are designed to build-in agricultural income from Farm Production to support the farm use.
A relatively small parcel involving only 13 to 14 acres of farmland. Soils are suited to well suited for grain and seed crops. Diversified uses occupy a large percentage of the site.

Occupancy is not aimed at recreational camping, but primitive housing for clients (in therapy or in counseling). These are non-agriculturally dependent.

The non farm program space is about equal to the farmland space. The principal use of the property comes into question, and the planned occupants are not there for recreation-tourism purposes.

Added to the non farm uses are community outreach programs to serve:

- Youth at risk
- Disease survivors
- Loss of mate (grievance recovery)

Undefined fund raisers are proposed. Are the extra fund raisers intended to support the farm or the non-farm social programs?

Narrative

The Cross Village Township Board voted to deny the proposed non-agricultural uses based on the merits of the uses and programs proposed. The Board’s findings were listed in an outline format, included:

- The uses/programs do not fit the referenced Ordinance Sections.
- Recognized the multiple uses and mixed uses.
- Site Plan is too general (lacks definition).
- The Plan’s impact needs further study.

The Planning Commission was requested to consider:

- The variety of programs and activities, and what is the dominant use?
- The adequacy of the site size to support the proposed uses.
- Question on using PUD, rather than SUP, as the zoning tool for this request. Also, questions community support and rural location for the uses/services.
- Stated considerable opposition toward the use, oral and written.

Special Use Permits must be reviewed in terms of:

1. Non detrimental impact on surrounding uses in the District.
2. Adequate site size.
3. Impact on ground water.
4. Entrance drives, distance from intersections.
5. Conflict with Comprehensive Plan;
   Principles
   Goals
   Objectives
6. Suitability of access, does not use minor residential streets.

7. Safe entrance/exit (per Road Commission).

8. Assured open spaces, when offered by applicant.

Other Standards
a) Compliance with the Ordinance provisions.

b) Proper yard space for parking.

c) Meets intent of the Ordinance.

d) Constitute a public or private nuisance.

e) Interferes or disturbs with a natural or planned development of the surrounding neighborhood.

SUPPLEMENT TO MEMORANDUM DATED DECEMBER 11, 2001 (REVISED)
REGARDING THE CROSS VILLAGE FOOD FARM PROJECT

Parcel Size
There is a question(s) regarding the size of the property for the layers of uses being proposed. For a Specialty Farm, there must be a minimum of 15.0 acres to qualify. The property contains 24.9 acres. If 24.9 acres is farm, by definition, can other uses be planned within the same land area, e.g. a campground? Campgrounds require a minimum of 10 acres. A recreation farm (under zoning) requires a minimum of 10 acres. If there is 5.0 acres of campground, can the remaining 5.0 acres be used for farming? It is noted that a campground is not required to cover 10 acres, only that there be at least 10 acres to be eligible for the use.

The rustic cabins pose more questions. If these are not a cabin court and if they are not camper cabins in a campground, it can be argued that each unit needs to have a separate Zoning Lot of 88,000 sq. ft. Six individual cabins would require 12.1 acres (6x88,000). This would leave only 12.8 acres for the Specialty Farm, not enough to qualify for a commercial farm.

Perhaps the PUD would be a better approach. What is the use intensity? What are the fund raisers? Could all ten acre farms do the same thing?

Pat Masuch stated that prior to last month’s meeting, they needed some time for reflection, but they asked to be tabled because they were out of town and they were Recoiling from the Township meeting. They are disappointed that the information given and submitted on October 16, was overlooked. So many of the issues have been asked and answered in the material that was provided. The materials have been distorted. The application was filled out by the applicant and the Planning staff. They feel that they are a Specialty Farm. The USDA, Michigan Dept. of Agriculture and MSU Extension recognize them as a Specialty Farm. They are a farm that does special things, one being service. They are now asking for a Special Use Permit which doesn’t have anything to do with their use. It has gone a long way against their use. They feel that they have to defend themselves. This is their life and dream.

Masuch directed the Planning Commission to brochures that they had provided and explained the proposed uses and how they relate to agriculture. She feels that there are serious questions by the Planning Commission. The Cross Village Food Farm is located in Emmet County on a 25 acre site, agricultural is a means to life. They propose an outreach program for youth at risk, cancer survivors, widows, and others. The Cross Village Food
Farm is an agricultural farm and shows people how to live through some life crisis with the use of agriculture. The primary use is agricultural and the other uses are accessory to the specialty farm operation. They are one entity, one property. Youth at risk programs were explained. The programs are for young people to go and give community service. They learn the connection with the soil. They are not running a camp for criminals. They are also developing programs for low income families, i.e. food preparation skills. The site plan is conceptual. It will take a while to build. The footprint will stay the same. They are concerned about environmental issues. The principal use is agricultural, it is a commercial specialty farm. All of the buildings are accessory to the agricultural uses on the farm. The principal use of each building was explained. They feel that they meet the definition of a Specialty Farm and perhaps do not need a Special Use Permit. Eventually the trees that they have planted along the road will block the view of the structures. There will be 12 to 20 participants in each activity. There may be two activities running at once. Many programs will be held off-site, such as canoeing. Parking will be in designated areas only, participants will be able to walk on trails only. The Food Farm is not open to the public. They feel that their use is responsible use of a Farm Forest property. They feel that they are asking to be allowed to use the property in a way permitted in the Ordinance. They don’t want to be told to go away. They are seriously afraid that they have, at the Township, and through letters from the public, been connected to the Blissfest Organization. It is not Blissfest. Masuch offered a newspaper article from 1998 that stated that she planned to do what she is requesting now.

Eby asked if the definition of a Specialty Farm is available?

Masuch stated that there is an application process that the Soil Conservation District requires. They believe they are a Specialty Farm. She asked if they should withdraw their request because they are a commercial farm which does not require a Special Use Permit.

Putters stated that if farming were the only use a SUP would not be necessary.

Eby explained that every use that they propose may not fall under the Specialty Farm definition.

Masuch responded that the reason for the other activities is because they are agricultural. These activities can happen in the farm setting. It connects people and takes a holistic approach to healing. She is not sure what part is not agricultural.

Mark Rosczewski asked what the difference is between a camper and a guest?

Putters stated that one pays and one does not pay.

Rosczewski stated that this is not a campground. They trusted Putters to assist them in applying for their permits. The roadside stand is not portable. It is not a campground, people cannot come and camp. The cabins are a place for participants to rest. It is not a recreation farm, it is not echo tourism and it is not a dude ranch. They are not planning to operate that way.

Eby asked what they are asking?

Masuch stated that they want to comply. There didn’t seem to be a problem when they applied.

Rosczewski stated that the opposition in the Township is because of another non profit organization (Blissfest). People are opposed because they are friends of Blissfest.

According to Masuch, Putters felt that they didn’t comply with a Specialty Farm. They didn’t know that there was such a stigma with a Special Use Permit. They feel that they are in a dilemma.
Putters explained why a SUP was necessary. The Ordinance doesn’t specifically allow all of the types of uses. There are six primitive cabins, are they a cabin court or hunting cabins, they need to be defined. Taking the whole package, and the whole site plan, this is not a typical rural farm on 25 acres. The uses include lodging, six cabins, a ropes course, programs for social and therapeutic reasons and a machine shop, most of which are not specialty farm uses.

Masuch stated that given that farmers are diversifying, they meet the Specialty Farm criteria.

Eby stated that all of the uses are not Specialty Farm uses. The Planning Commission does agree that certain aspects of their operation do qualify for a Specialty Farm.

There was additional discussion about the need for a SUP and the definition of a Specialty Farm.

Jones stated that if the use is entirely a Specialty Farm, then it would not require a SUP, however, he added that there are uses that do not qualify as a Specialty Farm.

Jones made a motion to table Case #58-01 until a Specialty Farm definition and a legal opinion from Civil Counsel can be obtained. Behan supported the motion which passed by the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Behan, Jones, Blanchard, Derrohn, Alexander. No; Scott, Laughbaum. Absent; Harris.

Masuch asked why tabling was necessary, when the Standards are clearly in the Ordinance?

Because the case was tabled, there was no additional discussion.

4. CASE #57-01 William J. Wodek, REZONING from R-2B General Residential to B-2 General Business or I-1 Light Industrial, Trails End Road, Section 24, Wawatam Township (Second Hearing)

A request by William J. Wodek to rezone property located off of Trails End Road, Section 24, T39N-R4W, Wawatam Township from R-2B General Residential to B-2 General Business or I-1 Light Industrial. The tax parcel number is 24-15-03-24-200-007. The property is some 5.4 acres in area. The purpose of the rezoning is to allow B-2 uses, but providing an option to apply an industrial or business zoning classification.

A request/location map, tax parcel map, current zoning map, and concept site plans for future storage buildings were used to explain the rezoning request. Putters explained the location of the property which is adjacent to Village of Mackinaw City Property. The adjacent property zoning districts were identified, being R2-B and formerly industrial. The request is for industrial or commercial to allow for storage buildings to be placed on the property. The two concept site plans prepared by staff were explained. The applicant prefers the plan with two longer buildings rather than several storage buildings. The Township recommended commercial zoning but wants the commercial uses restricted to storage, however, the use cannot be restricted if the property is rezoned. Photos of the property were distributed.

After the last meeting when a suggestion of PUD was made, staff created a Preliminary Mixed Use Concept Plan and a Final Mixed Use concept plan which were displayed and explained. A PUD would allow for limited uses as requested by the Township.

Wodek explained that he must conduct research regarding the type of buildings and the functional uses of the buildings. If the board thinks that the PUD is the direction he should go, then he would like to take that direction. The neighbors and the Township seem to support the use, however, have concerns over a rezoning and the possible other uses. He asked several questions regarding a PUD. He doesn’t want to completely change his plan, and then find out that he should have continued with the rezoning request.

Putters stated that each project is reviewed individually. The perimeter setback in a PUD could be modified. Wodek would be required to reapply if he chose to pursue a PUD.
Scott agreed that it wouldn’t be difficult to grant an exception to the setback along the access road.

Eby stated that the rezoning request could be tabled until Wodek decides if he will proceed with a PUD, then the rezoning could continue to be reviewed or withdrawn by the applicant. The PUD process and the steps necessary for a PUD were explained. Wodek could present the Preliminary Plan or the project could be phased. Every use in a PUD is a Special Approval Use and would need to be shown on the Master Plan, which could be amended if the plan changes.

Jones made a motion, supported by Blanchard to table Case #57-01 until the next regular meeting. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

5.CASE #62-01 Donna Krall, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Larger than maximum size accessory building, 6394 S. Beach Road, Section 22, Littlefield Township

A request by Donna Krall for a Special Use Permit for a larger than maximum size accessory building on property located at 6394 S. Beach Road, Section 22, T35N-R4W, Littlefield Township. The property is zoned RR-1 Recreation Residential and is tax parcel number 24-07-17-22-300-015. The request is to construct a 1,350 sq. ft. building initially for dwelling purposes, and to be converted to an accessory building upon completion of the residence. The request is per Section 2201 of the Zoning Ordinance.

A recommendation from Littlefield Township was distributed, and using a request/location map, tax parcel map and site plan, Coon explained the location of the proposed 1,350 sq.ft. accessory building. In the location proposed, a 1,000 sq.ft. accessory building is allowed. The building is proposed to be a temporary dwelling until the applicant can construct their permanent dwelling. The building is located 200' from Pickerel Lake. There is wet land near the lake and there are few trees on the property. Photographs of the site were distributed. One objection from a neighbor has been received. Littlefield Township recommended that the structure be 1,200 sq.ft. with top height of 22' and if a kitchen is constructed, it is to be removed upon completion of the permanent dwelling.

Jim Fuhrman representing the applicant, stated that they would like a Special Use Permit to build the building 150 sq. ft. more than the Township recommended because it is a temporary dwelling until the main house is built. It shouldn’t be used more than 9 months before the main house is built, then the livable area would be vacated. He needs more than 1,200 sq.ft. because he wants a pick up truck, 30' trailer for a boat, wave runners, and other toys in the building. Fuhrman passed around pictures of the proposed building. They would also like to have a deck on the upper level. There is no kitchen area in the temporary building. There is a utility tub proposed in the garage area and sleeping quarters, a living area and bathroom in the upper level. They moved the building five feet to accommodate concerns of a neighbor.

Behan asked why a deck would be put on the building if it will only be used for 9 months? Fuhrman answered that it was for a grill.

Derrohn asked if the deck must be included in the size of the building? The Township Committee did not realize there would be a deck on the structure. Is the deck part of the 1,200 sq.ft? Putters stated that it would be considered as part of the floor area. The deck provides a roof over the lower level.

Jones asked if others had been required to meet size standards?

Laughbaum asked where the deck would be attached? Fuhrman showed the location of the deck and asked what Attached@ means? Eby responded that there must be a common wall for the home and garage to be considered attached. Fuhrman asked if he attached a breeze-way to the home, could it be any size?
Laughbaum stated that the Ordinance allows 1,000 sq.ft. and many communities are demanding boats be stored inside. He felt that 1,350 sq. ft. was not unreasonable.

Derrohn made a motion that Case #62-01 a request by Donna Krall for a Special Use Permit for a Larger than Maximum Size Accessory Building be approved for up to 1,200 sq. ft, on condition that the height be no greater than 10 ft. to the eave and a 22 ft. top height, if a kitchen is installed, it must be removed once the main house is built. Alexander supported the motion.

Laughbaum made an amendment to the motion to strike out the 1,200 sq.ft. and replace it with 1,350 sq. ft. The amendment to the motion failed for lack of support.

The original motion then passed by the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Jones, Blanchard, Derrohn, Alexander. No; Behan, Scott, Laughbaum. Absent; Harris.

6. CASE #64-01 Lois Dell, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Home Occupation, 985 S. Ellsworth Road, Section 3, Springvale Township
A request by Lois Dell for a Special Use Permit for a Home Occupation at a residence located at 985 S. Ellsworth Road, Section 3, T34N-R4W, Springvale Township. The property is zoned FF-2 Farm Forest and is tax parcel number 24-14-20-03-390-001. The request is to allow an upholstery shop as a Home Occupation, per Section 2102-12 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Using a tax parcel map, request/location map and site plan, Coon explained the request for a Home Occupation for re- upholstery of furniture in an attached garage. The use would involve sewing, stapling and hammering. The business was formerly located in Bear Creek Township and Ms. Dell would like it relocated to Springvale Township. The use will not generate a large amount of traffic and the Township recommended approval.

Dell asked about a sign, 2 sq. ft. is allowed.

Scott made a motion to approve Case #64-01, Lois Dell, Special Use Permit for a Home Occupation for an upholstery business because the use meets the criteria of the Ordinance, the applicant recognizes the restrictions of a Home Occupation and Springvale Township recommended approval. Blanchard supported the motion which passed by the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Behan, Jones, Scott, Blanchard, Laughbaum, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none. Absent; Harris.

7. CASE #67-01 David R. Watson, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Land Development Standards, Maxwell Road, Section 16, Springvale Township
A request by David J. Watson for a Special Use Permit for Land Development Standards to create 10 parcels on some 166.23 acres located on the east side of Maxwell Road, Section 16, T34N-R4W, Springvale Township. The property is zoned FF-2 Farm Forest and is tax parcel number 24-14-20-16-300-001. The request is per Section 2102-14 of the Zoning Ordinance.

A surveyed drawing and request/location map were used by Putters to explain the request for land division creating large (6 to 10 acres) lots on 166+ acres. Road specifications meet the Ordinance standards with a 22' surface and 4% maximum grade. Springvale Township recommended approval. The new lots are mostly level with a big hill on the east 80+ acre parcel being retained for future use.

Watson stated that there are some interested parties in the lots and they are not interested in a future access road. The 80 acre parcel is an investment.

Putters showed possible foot path linkages to the state forest land. It wouldn=t be for the public, it would be for the property owners in the development, so that all lots would experience the benefit of access to the State Forest.
Watson felt that easements would encourage undesirable traffic. Privacy is the desire.

Scott made a motion to approve Case #67-01, David Watson, for a Special Use Permit for Land Development to create 10 parcels on 166 acres on Maxwell Road, Section 16, Springvale Township because it meets the Standards of the Ordinance and Springvale Township recommended approval. Behan supported the motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Behan, Jones, Scott, Blanchard, Laughbaum, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none. Absent; Harris.

8.CASE #68-01 Sid Baker, PRELIMINARY & FINAL MIXED-USE PUD-1 OVERLAY, & SITE PLAN REVIEW, M-68, Section 11, Littlefield Township
A request by Sid Baker for a Preliminary and Final Mixed-Use PUD-1 Overlay to apply to property located in Section 11, T35N- R4W, Littlefield Township on M-68. The property is zoned R-1B One Family Residential along M-68 to a depth of approximately 230' and the remaining is zoned FF-1 Farm Forest. The property tax number is 24-07-11-00-11-300-004. The Preliminary PUD-1 Plan encompasses the entire 20 acres, but the Final PUD-1 Plan encompasses only the north 10 acres. The proposed uses include two Contractor=s Uses, aggregate stockpiling, equipment storage, a self storage area and residential. The Mixed PUD Plan is an extension of the PUD to the west, and generally follows an overall development plan for this area of the Township.

A request/location map, tax parcel map and Master Plan were displayed.

Derrohn stated that the Township Planning Committee has not formally reviewed the request.

Jim Young, representing the applicant, stated that they would like initial comments and will come back next month for final approval. They are looking for approval in February. The site is 20 acres located between Astro Building Products and Flynn=s gravel pit. The request is for a PUD overlay, with two contractors uses, Sid Bakery Masonry and Emmet Excavating. They are asking for Preliminary, Final and Site Plan approval for the first two areas and Preliminary for the third and fourth areas which are proposed for storage and residential uses. A Health Department letter was provided regarding septic treatment. This is part of a community plan which suggests a PUD use on the property. Astro has expressed a willingness to participate in the cost of expanding a connector road across their property to Sid Baker=s property. The plans have been submitted to Littlefield Township Fire Department and they have approved the plan.

Putters explained some background on the area using an existing conditions map and a series of concepts. The General PUD Master Plan showed some retail and outdoor display on the property. An Industrial Park is located across M-68. There are concerns with the tourist image, as Contractor=s Uses are not typically a favorable image on the road side. He suggested adding some screening and permission for a non-motorized trail along M-68. Part of the initial overall plan is being followed with the service road being utilized and extended. Vehicles wouldn=t have to go back onto the highway to serve Astro, Sid Baker and Scott Jewell.

Young showed a photo of a proposed attractive block building.

Laughbaum asked about the nearest residences. Young explained that directly to the east is a 50' out-lot which accesses the Flynn pit and the nearest residence is approximately 100' to 150' east of the property. They are proposing an east buffer area well screened. They intend to move away from their current locations and wish to be good neighbors. Screening is an issue.

The case was deferred until the Township has an opportunity to review the request.

9.CASE #39A-89 Doug Pierce, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Home Occupation, 3708 Powers Road, Section 18, Littlefield Township
A request by Doug Pierce for a Special Use Permit for a Home Occupation at a residence located at 3708 Powers Road, Section 18, T35N-R4W, Littlefield Township. The property is zoned FF-1 Farm Forest and is tax parcel number 24-07-18-200-002. The request is to establish a furniture rental business, a trophy shop, photography service and sale of pre-engineered buildings, e.g. car ports. The request is per Section 2102-12 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Using a request/location map, tax parcel map, site plan and floor plan Coon explained the existing conditions on the property. The buildings on the property include the house, a garage, a car port and a contractor’s trailer. The applicant is proposing to have multiple home occupations, including trophy sales, renting canopies for off-site use, insurance photography, and car port sales. Business hours are proposed for 9am to 4pm, Monday thru Friday. The basement of the house will be the primary location for the home occupation with storage in the other buildings as well. Staff wondered if the storage in the accessory buildings would exceed 600 sq. ft. Noise will be minor and there will be some traffic, approximately 2 vehicles per day, and UPS deliveries with the possibility of semi deliveries occasionally. There is ample parking area next to the home. Littlefield Township made a recommendation to approve with conditions.

Doug Pierce was present and stated that the carport would be the only thing outdoors. He has a 24' enclosed cargo trailer for storage and besides the basement, storage would be in the garage.

Putters stated that there seems to be a large area of the yard plowed, will it be graveled? No it will remain grass. Some trees may be removed.

Pierce stated that the carports would be sold through catalog sales and sent directly to the purchaser=s house. Putters stated that the property must retain the character of a residential site. Will building kits be dropped-off on this site? If so, the outdoor storage would be an issue.

Jones would prefer no semi deliveries. Pierce stated that semi deliveries would be very minimal, if ever. Mr. Hinds, a neighbor, has no objection. His questions have been satisfied.

Derrohn made a motion to approved Case #39A-89, Doug Pierce for a Special Use Permit for a Home Occupation because the applicant understands the standards of the Ordinance, there will be no outside employees, no outside display other than the car port which will be used for personal use, the trailer(s) on the property must be licensed, a sign no bigger than 2 sq. ft. may be displayed and hours are to be 9am to 4pm with no weekends or holidays. Behan supported the motion which passed by the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Behan, Jones, Scott, Blanchard, Laughbaum, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none. Absent; Harris.

V Other Business

• There was no public comment.

• SR-3 Overlay District - discussion
Scott stated that Springvale Township felt the proposed amendment accomplished their goals. Once the district is created, then there is the implementation process. Further discussion or review was deferred until the annual meeting.

• Annual Meeting - set date
A date for the Annual Meeting was tentatively set for February 2, 2002 at 8:00 am until noon, at the Little Traverse Township Hall. Some topics to be discussed include: Uses for existing farm buildings, steep slopes and SR-2 Zoning District. There was a consensus to keep the agenda small.

• Marty Gargaro - Resolution and Certificate of Appreciation
Motion by Jones, supported by Blanchard to approve the Resolution and Certificate of Appreciation for Marty Gargaro. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

- Road Commission - A portion of Dekruif Road Abandonment
  Putters explained the proposed road abandonment and the adjacent properties on Dekruif Road in Carp Lake Township. A memo was distributed and there was discussion. The road is a small road end, 66’ wide. It is mainly a passive open space where the lake can be seen. Jones felt that it should be preserved. He is opposed to giving up accesses to the lakes. He lives adjacent to a similar road end and feels the worth of the access is greater than the nuisance to the neighbors. A Public Hearing has been scheduled by the Road Commission.
  Jones made a motion to recommend the property be preserved as an open space and that the memo prepared by staff be sent to the Road Commission as a Planning Commission response. Behan supported the motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Behan, Jones, Scott, Blanchard, Laughbaum, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none. Absent; Harris.

- Security Towers
  Putters explained the proposed installation of three security towers on existing gas lines owned by the Great Lakes Transmission Company. The towers would alert the gas company of vandalism to the equipment. He has spoken with the Supervisor of Littlefield Township who agreed that the permits can be approved administratively, if they meet the 30' height standards.

- Steep Slopes
  The Steep Slopes Ordinance status was explained by Putters. There was some discussion regarding the steep slope reviews that may occur.

VI Adjournment
There being no other business, Acting Chairperson Eby declared the meeting adjourned at 9:57p.m.

James Scott, Secretary
Dated