MEMBERS PRESENT: J. EBY, Chairman, J. HARRIS, J. SCOTT, K. DERROHN, J. JONES, K. ALEXANDER, D. LAUGHBAUM
MEMBERS ABSENT: L. BLANCHARD, One Vacant Seat
STAFF: M. PUTTERS, D. COON, T. DOERNENBURG

I Call to Order and Attendance
Chairman Eby called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. All members were present except Blanchard, with one vacant seat.

II Minutes of February 2, 2002 and February 7, 2002
Alexander made a motion to accept the minutes of February 2, 2002 and February 7, 2002 as written. Derrohn supported the motion which passed on a unanimous voice vote.

III Resort Bluffs Grant Application
Eby opened a Public Hearing on the Resort Bluffs Grant Application.

Putters explained the status of the Resort Bluffs project beginning with the history of the grant applications that have been submitted. The County and Township agreed that the County would be the applicant for the next grant application to MNRTF which will allow for more points to qualify for the grants. The property includes 600' frontage on Little Traverse Bay and 1300' on US-31. It is a critical link to connect public properties for the trail system. Having the property in public ownership will protect the views from the fair grounds to the Quiet Moose and allow for a trail on the old rail road bed. The project funding was explained in detail. This Public Hearing is on the grant application. Resort Township held a public hearing last year when they were the applicant.

Jack Jones stated that he would hate to lose the view coming into Petoskey.

Dale Scott, Harbor Springs resident, thinks it’s wonderful and hopes that the County can work with other groups to make it happen. With the increase in the number of people coming into the area, there is a decrease in the open space and property available to the public especially along the lake shore.

Harris recalled that a plan has been approved for the vacant parcel which would reduce the view substantially. Housing units could be built on the property. The property could be subject to multiple family units. The view could be lost as in Charlevoix.

Jones added that the Cliffs Condos at Bay Harbor block the view of the Bay and is a good example of what we don’t want to see happen again.

Putters explained that the grant process is complicated because of the high value of the property. Highway funds and Land Trust funds are being requested to complete the purchase. To his knowledge, the combining of the grants hasn’t been done before. He is optimistic.
There was no other public comment and the Public Hearing was closed.

III Cases

1. 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 (First 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.

The applicant has requested tabling as he is working on a PUD alternative. Case #57-01 remained tabled.

2. CASE #2-02 Anthony Zambrowski, REZONING, B-2 General Business & FF-2 Farm Forest to SR-1 Scenic Resource, US-31, Section 27, Carp Lake Township

A request by Anthony Zambrowski to rezone the following described property in Carp Lake Township: Tax Parcel No. 24-03-06-27-400-009, an elongated 21.7+/-. acre property lying west of US-31 in the E ½ of the SE 1/4 of Section 27, T38N-R4W. The map changes are:

a) From B-2 General Business to SR-1 Scenic Resource - the south 600 ft.

b) From FF-2 Farm Forest to SR-1 Scenic Resource - a triangular fragment lying west of the existing SR-1 District extending to the west property line.

The purposes of the rezoning are to place the entire property in the SR-1 Scenic Resource District and to enable the property to be divided into lots for residential use.

Coon explained the request to rezone the property. An existing zoning map, tax parcel map and proposed zoning map were shown. The southern 600' is currently zoned B-2 and the northern is SR-2. The request is to change the B-2 to SR-2 to allow for residential use. The property has access to Galloway Lake via a 20' easement to the south. The Township has no objection to the rezoning. There was opposition from the neighbors who attended the February meeting and voiced their concerns.

Zambrowski had no further comments. There was no public comment.

Scott thinks the current zoning is not necessarily correct, but feels that FF-2 rather than SR-1 may be more appropriate because of the density. SR-1 is triple the density of FF-2.

Zambrowski stated that if it the property does get split, the lots would be 4 acres.

Harris stated that the problem with rezoning to SR-1 and then applying an overlay of SR-3, (which is a proposed text amendment) is that it cannot be required.

SR-1 and FF-2 are the adjacent Zoning Districts. There was discussion about holding a public hearing to rezone the property to FF-2 rather than SR-1. There appeared to be no clear consensus at the February meeting to advertise for FF-2.

Harris made a motion to recommend approval of the rezoning request, as presented, to the County Board of Commissioners. Scott supported the motion which passed by the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Harris, Scott, Jones, Derrohn, Alexander, Laughbaum. No; none. Absent: Blanchard. (One vacant seat).

3. CASE #55A-01 Jamie Martin for Robert & Jane Cardinal, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Exception to Section 2201 to allow a 2nd accessory building on a residential lot, 2999 N. Lakeshore Drive, Section 13, Readmond Township

A request by Jamie Martin for Robert & Jane Cardinal for a Special Use Permit for an exception to the Standards of Section 2201 to allow a 2nd residential accessory building on a zoning lot located at 2999 N. Lakeshore Drive, Section 13, T37N-R7W, Readmond Township. The property is zoned SR-2 Scenic Resource and is tax parcel number 24-12-07-13-476-008. The proposed accessory building is 18'x24'.

Coon explained the request for second accessory building measuring 18'x24', using a site plan and location map. The location of an existing accessory building, which is the same size as the proposed building, is on the lot line. Both
buildings combined are under the 1,000 sq. ft. standard of the Ordinance for an accessory building. The building has been positioned to allow for trees to remain and to avoid a setback variance. Readmond Township recommended approval.

Jamie Martin stated that there were other options, one would require a variance and the other involved cutting trees, however, they would rather not cut trees. He feels the proposal is a nice resolution.

Dale Scott, asked where the property is located? It is in the Plat of Blisswood.

Jim Scott made a motion to approve Case #55A-01, Jamie Martin for Robert and Jane Cardinal for a Special Use Permit to allow a 2nd accessory building on a residential lot as shown on the site plan dated received 1/9/02, because Readmond Township recommended approval and no objections have been received. Jones supported the motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Harris, Scott, Jones, Derrohn, Alexander, Laughbaum. No; none. Absent; Blanchard. (One vacant seat)

4. 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 24-07-17-11-300-004. 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.

Putters explained the request using the Preliminary PUD/Master Plan/Site Plan for Areas 1 & 2/Preliminary PUD Plan for Areas 3 & 4. The property is located on M-68, east of the existing Astro Building business. A tax parcel map and location map were used to identify the property location. Sid Baker Masonry and Emmet Excavating plan to move their existing contractor’s businesses from their respective locations to this site. An elevation sketch of the proposed building was displayed. A bubble diagram for the south ½ of the property indicates uses for mini warehouses/storage on the east and residential to the west. The property may be limited to the number of residences because of sanitation limitations. The southern ½ of the PUD adjoins property proposed for residential uses. Questions remain about the location of a berm. Screening is well defined on the plan. Some trees will remain. Signs and outdoor lighting must be brought before the Sign & Lighting Committee. Dust control measures may be necessary. Some drives will be tarred & chipped.

Derrohn stated that the Township requested dust control measures be in writing. The applicant provided a letter which indicated the dust control measures that will be taken as necessary.

Jim Young, from Bidstrup Engineering, representing the applicant, stated that the plan only differs from the plan shown last month by adding on-site drainage details to the plan. The screening on the east will be from the front setback line to the rear as shown. The berm is optional. If there is a berm, trees will be 4' high on top of the berm, or if there is no berm, trees will be 6' to 8' tall.

There was no public comment.

Derrohn made a motion to approve Case #68-01, Site Plan Review, encompassing tax parcel #24-07-17-11-300-004, being a 20 acre parcel on the south side of M-68, bordered on the East by the N-S quarter line of Section 11, T35N-R4W, Littlefield Township, and incorporating the findings of Littlefield Township, subject to the following:

1. That only the Site Plan for the N ½ of the subject property is being approved by this motion, encompassing PUD areas 1 and 2 on the Master Plan/Site Plan maps dated February 15, 2002.
2. That the recommendations of Littlefield Township be incorporated into or accompany the Site Plan, which includes:
   a) Dust control measures on roads, parking areas and vehicle maneuvering spaces as stated in the letter dated received March 6, 2002,
   b) New trees for intended screening purposes be at least six (6) feet in height, except that trees on top of the berm be at least four (4) feet in height,
   c) Screening for all material and equipment storage uses in PUD area 1 and PUD area 2 shall use and retain the natural tree stand (tree line), including screening employee parking in PUD area 2.
3. That the February 15, 2002 graphic presentation of the subject PUD, Master Plan and Site Plan including all pertinent notations thereon, shall be interpreted as the minimum standards of performance for the PUD project.

4. That all signs and outdoor lighting be reviewed by the Emmet County Sign and Lighting Committee.

5. It is understood that all of the Emmet Excavating business uses (vehicles, equipment, repair/service buildings, and the like) on the Scott Jewell property at 7238 Smith Road, will be removed from that site to occupy PUD area 2 of the subject PUD Master Plan, and that only top soil removal will be continued at the Smith Road site along with the accessory equipment needed to remove the top soil, and that all top soil removal will be terminated within twelve (12) months of the date of final PUD approval by the County Board of Commissioners.

And to recommend approval to the Emmet County Board of Commissioners of the Preliminary PUD for Areas 3 & 4 as shown on the PUD Preliminary Master Plan dated February 15, 2002. Alexander supported the motion which passed by the following roll call vote: Yes: Eby, Harris, Jones, Scott, Derrohn, Alexander, Laughbaum. No; none. Absent; Blanchard. (One vacant seat.)

5. CASE #58A-01 Cross Village Food Farm, Act 116 Farmland Agreement, 5322 Hill Road, Section 1, Cross Village Township

Putters explained the request for an Act 116 Farmland Agreement. A memo prepared by staff was discussed. The wood lot does not count as agriculture under Act 116. The Ordinance defines a specialty farm as having 15 acres or more and if qualified, a Specialty Farm which could be classified as a Commercial Farm. Agricultural use is not an issue, however, there are other uses that are not farm/agriculture related. The Township recommendation was distributed recommending denial. Putters stated that their recommendation will go on to the State. The questions raised by the Township were read. Several agencies will look at the request and make recommendations to the Department of Agriculture who makes the final determination.

Jones asked how much is actually under cultivation? How much of the property is tilled soil? He has heard that it is as little as two acres. There was no one present to answer his questions.

Eby stated that it is a complicated request. There are actually 4 different kinds of farms covered in the Act. A Specialty Farm does not require a minimum amount of acreage. He was in contact with the Department of Agriculture and felt that with the information presented, they do qualify as a Specialty Farm, however, uses other than agriculture do not qualify. PA 116 and the Specialty Farm designation do not supersede County Zoning. The Specialty Farm definition is quite specific and was read. Specific rules regarding Act 116 were read by Eby. It lists prohibited uses as anything that is not agricultural.

Jones did not feel there is a problem with allowing Act 116 on the property. The uses are not exempt from Zoning. If it qualifies, it should be allowed.

Laughbaum asked, if they were approved and could not meet the criteria, what happens? They must withdraw.

PA 116 is intended to preserve farmland. Allowing Act 116 allows only agricultural uses. The property is still under County Zoning and other uses must be approved regardless of the Farmland Agreement. At this time, there is no zoning case pending.

Laughbaum made a motion to recommend approval of Act 116 Farmland Agreement for the Cross Village Food Farm property located at 5322 Hill Road, Section 1, Cross Village Township. Harris supported the motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Harris, Jones, Scott, Laughbaum, Alexander. No; Derrohn. Absent; Blanchard. (One vacant seat.)

Harris stated that the Act was created for the purpose of the preservation of farmland and the Planning Commission has always been in favor of preserving farmland.

Jones added that no uses, other than agriculture, are approved. Public Act 116 runs with the land.
Alyce Conrad stated that in light of the fact that the Planning Commission did not honor the Township’s recommendation, she would hope that their comments will be forwarded with the Planning Commission recommendation.

6. CASE #5-02 Randall Vipperman Building for Lindsey Beardslee, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Larger than maximum size accessory building, 4545 N Lakeshore Drive, Section 7, Readmond Township

A request by Randall Vipperman Building, for Lindsey Beardslee, for a Special Use Permit to allow a larger than maximum size accessory building on a lot located at 4545 N Lakeshore Drive, Section 7, T37N-R6W, Readmond Township. The property is zoned SR-2 Scenic Resource and is tax parcel number 24-12-08-07-400-014. The proposed building is a pool house, 25.25'x57.25' (1,445+ sq.ft.) in a location which allows 1,000 sq.ft. The request is per Section 2201-8 of the Zoning Ordinance.

The Township Board has requested tabling, as they have not reviewed the case.

Randall Vipperman explained that he went to the Friendship Township (Planning Committee) meeting last month and the committee approved the request. He didn’t take the information to their board, but was told by a board member the case would be tabled because they did not review the plan. He has started the building and is waiting on approval. The building cannot be seen from M-119 and there is no public road into the property. The bluff obscures the view.

Eby stated that it is a new case and it is the policy of the Planning Commission to allow the Township to review each case.

Jones asked why the building is under construction if a zoning permit has not been issued? Vipperman replied that the building and pool had already been purchased and he was pushed by the homeowner and was led to believe that all the permits were taken care of by the previous builder. When he came to the Zoning Department he found that the builder before him had not applied for permits.

The case was deferred until the Township recommendation is received.

7. CASE #1-02 Friendship Township, PRELIMINARY MIXED-USE PUD-2, Stutsmanville Area, State Road and Stutsmanville Road, Section 14 & 24, Friendship Township

A request by Friendship Township for the following Zoning map changes:

Proposed map changes to PUD-2 Planned Unit Development for all or part of the areas encompassed in the following areas within the described perimeters listed herein:
1. From B-1. With State Road on the east, a line along the south right-of-way of Stutsmanville Road, extending 300 ft. west from the west r/w line of State Road, then south 231 feet paralleling State Road then east 300' to the west line of State Road.
2. From B-1 and FF-2. A line extending west along the north right-of-way of Stutsmanville Road, 633 ft. west from the west r/w line of State Road, then north 508 feet, then east to the west line of State Road, then south to Stutsmanville Road.
3. From FF-2, B-1 and B-2. A line on the north right-of-way of Stutsmanville Road, extending east 378 feet, from the east r/w line of State Road, thence north 830 feet, then west to the east line of State Road, then south along State Road to Stutsmanville Road.
4. From B-1 and FF-2. On the east right-of-way line of State Road, a line extending south from the south r/w line of Stutsmanville Road 535 feet, then east 300', then north 531 ft. to the south line of Stutsmanville Road, then west to the east line of State Road.

For interpretation, the above areas follow existing property lines and road right-of-way lines except where only portions of a property ownership are included. The purpose of the rezoning is to create more uniform zoning boundaries for each of the four corners of Stutsmanville and State Roads. It is the intent of the re-zoning to respect the existing business use rights within the commercial districts as they existed on 12/31/01, and that the PUD Master Plans consider existing (12/31/01) zoning boundaries as business use areas unless and until specific PUD Master Plans and Site Plans are approved to modify the designated business area boundaries. The PUD-2 District is retained and valid existing site plans and PUD site plans shall remain valid by this map change when effective.

Putters explained the request by Friendship Township. There has been quite a history of zoning actions of different kinds in the vicinity creating irregular zoning classifications. A location map and the existing zoning map were shown. The plan is to bring all zoning together under a PUD-2. It would be a permanent zoning classification. The Zoning District
boundaries would coincide with a current PUD-2 zoning and square off zoning districts. All existing approved uses would be allowed to continue.

A lot split occurred after the B-1 zoning was created on the south east corner of State and Stutsmanville Roads. The owner of the 80' B-1 area objects to the proposal, however, the 80' commercial area cannot be used for commercial because of the 100' lot width requirement in a B-1 Zone. The objection letter was included in the documents provided to the Planning Commission. The objecting owner is in the nursery/landscape business. A PUD could accommodate a nursery which would be better than leaving an 80' piece of B-1. Follow-up steps would be a comprehensive plan for the Stutsmanville area. A Zoning History map was displayed as well as a preliminary conceptual plan - bubble diagram. Current uses include a church, residential, with low density to the south, a restaurant, and storage-resale buildings, all illustrated on an existing conditions map with photos. The proposed PUD-2 Zoning is a step to organize the future of Stutsmanville. There has been a series of proposed PUD plans. Cupps PUD to the north, has expired, but is now proposed to be included in the PUD-2 district.

Laughbaum asked why the area to the west of State Road was not included? Putters answered that they are trying to get started on a minimum level. Currently there is a large lot residential development to the west of State Road.

Denise Simon, Friendship Township Planning Commission Chair, stated that their Township is working on a Master Plan. There has been interest from residents during town meetings and a survey sent to residents. The Stutsmanville area is a small business district within the Township. This approach is the best way to work with business owners. The Township supports the plan and is willing to work with the property owner who objected.

Dale Scott, Friendship Township Supervisor, stated that the process fits in well with the concept of Planning for the area. The Public Hearings are necessary for making their Master Plan. People who live in the area can assist the Planning Commission and Township in coming up with things they’d like to have in the area and the things they would not like to have.

This is the first hearing. There were no objections.

Tom Swenor asked if a plan similar to the PUD-1 for the Sid Baker request will be required for the PUD-2. Putters responded that this is a rezoning, which doesn’t require a site plan. The existing site plans would be incorporated. Being the first Public Hearing regarding the rezoning, Case #1-02 was deferred until the next regular meeting.

Putters read a proposed resolution to support Friendship Township for Small Town Design Initiative Grant Application. Harris made a motion to allow the Chairman to sign the resolution as printed. Scott supported the motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Harris, Jones, Scott, Laughbaum, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none. Absent; Blanchard. (One vacant seat.)

Harris asked about the status of the Steep Slopes Ordinance. He wishes to have the Ordinance for review. It is still in draft form, requiring some modifications.

Simon thanked Harris for his interest in the Steep Slopes issue adding the importance of reviewing the Ordinance.

8. CASE # 61-01 Springvale Township, TEXT AMENDMENT, SR-3 Overlay District

A request by Springvale Township for the following Zoning Ordinance Text Changes:

- To Article VII, add to the title, “AND SR-3 SCENIC RESOURCE OVERLAY DISTRICT”;
- To Section 700, add the following sentence at the end of the paragraph, “The SR-3 District is subject to the same boundary standards.”
- To Section 701, add sub-paragraph: “3. All principal uses and special approval uses permitted in the RR-2 Recreation Residential District shall be permitted in the SR-3 Scenic Resource Overlay District.”
- To Section 702, add at the end of the first paragraph, “All uses are subject to the waterfront setback requirements of Section 2209.”

- Add the following paragraph at the end of Section 702, “The SR-3 District, as an overlay, supercedes the lot requirements for any underlying district that prescribes lot area and lot width standards that are less than 44,000 sq. ft. or narrower than 150 feet. If the underlying district prescribes a larger lot area and width, then the larger or more strict standards apply.”
Putters explained the request for a text amendment to add an SR-3 Overlay District to the Ordinance. This is a text amendment only. It would not apply to exiting zoned areas, until the process is taken to apply the overlay. The amendment essentially lowers density on properties where the overlay is applied. A letter from Friendship Township was received and distributed supporting the text amendment. Eby stated that Maple River Township supports the amendment as well.

Dean Shorter asked Putters who would implement the SR-3 Overlay? Property owners or Townships could, like any other rezoning. The property owners would receive notices and hearings would take place. What does the category do? It would require wider lots and more land area for newly created lots. Shorter posed questions and Putters answered regarding non-conforming lots and hypothetical property situations.

Eby explained there are areas where SR has allowed for greater density. This is for new land divisions. It is a tool that may be used in certain spots.

Shorter stated that sometimes text amendments have good intentions, but results are not always good. He is concerned and wonders why an overlay is needed. Overlaying zoning districts is a new concept in terms of zoning. Why not just rezone to other existing districts?

Bill Shorter asked when the SR Zoning Districts were established? In Springvale Township, it was 5 to 6 years ago, when the Township adopted the County Zoning Ordinance and continued when the County assumed responsibility for Springvale Township’s Zoning. There was discussion about non-conforming uses in the District. The SR-3 Zoning District would not effect any property, it is only a proposed text amendment.

Shorter asked how many lots, currently zoned SR are less than 150' in width? Putters stated that the figure could possibly be obtained through the mapping program.

Jones asked if this is an overlay that can be placed over any district? It is proposed that way. He does not feel that the same conditions should apply in FF or RR as in SR. He feels it is putting very restrictive conditions on property that may be zoned against a property owner’s will.

Putters stated that there would be two hearings plus Township hearings to apply the zone to a property.

Jones has a problem with restricting people from cutting their trees and brush.

Scott felt that the amendment would bring the SR District into meeting the intent of the Ordinance. It could be made as an overlay just for the SR district.

There was discussion regarding the SR zones and how they were created in Springvale Township.

Conrad stated that the intent of the proposed amendment was to protect streams and channels. It is not intended as an overlay for large parcels of land.

Jones felt that the language is not spelled out enough.

Laughbaum stated that there is nothing to preclude someone from keeping their 80 acres complete. This amendment cheapens the rezoning process. Properties could be picked off one at a time, it is not the way to go. Putters stated that rather than requiring increased lot sizes in all Scenic Resource Zones, this allows flexibility and selectivity. It seems like a flexible tool that would be available for rezoning. Putters gave an example of when the overlay could be used.

Eby asked if the zoning density of SR Zones is proper for northern Emmet County?
Scott stated that the issue, in Springvale Township, is that there are miles of creeks bordered by FF-2 with a strip of SR along the streambeds. The intent of Scenic Resource is to preserve the natural integrity of the resource. Allowing for triple density causes a conflict. Increasing density does not preserve the stream.

Eby asked for staff to prepare a pro/con sheet.

Laughbaum stated that if the land is zoned FF-2, leave it in FF-2. People want to live along the view corridors and the rivers and lakes.

Scott stated that the setback is the same, however, the density is 3 times greater. The density is too high in the situation like Springvale Township. Mud Creek from Pickerel Lake to Pickerel Lake Road and Silver Creek are surrounded by FF-2 except for the SR zones immediately surrounding the rivers and creeks.

Jones is against the zone being applied to any zoning district. Property can be zoned against the property owner’s will. It has happened.

Case #61-01 was deferred until the next regular meeting.

9. CASE #3-02 Brian Turbin for ATT & K Investments, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Land Development Standards, Crooked River Road, Section 27, Maple River Township (Applicant requested tabling)

A request by Brian Turbin for ATT&K Investments for a Special Use Permit for Land Development Standards to create 16 parcels on property located on Crooked River Road, Section 27, T36N-R4R, Maple River Township. The property is zoned FF-1 Farm Forest and is tax parcel numbers 24-09-14-27-100-011 & 012 being some 18 acres. The request is per Sections 2102-14 and 1901 of the Zoning Ordinance.

The applicant requested tabling because a draft plan has been submitted and the final plan is being prepared. The Township endorsed the conceptual drawing.

Case #3-02 was deferred because of the applicant’s request.

10. CASE #94A-76 Fred VanderBreggen, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Larger than maximum size accessory building or two accessory buildings on one residential lot, 3134 Oden Road, Section 18, Littlefield Township

A request by Fred VanderBreggen for a Special Use Permit to allow the construction of a second accessory building on a residential lot or a larger than maximum size accessory building. The property is located at 3134 Oden Road, Section 18, T35N-R5W, Littlefield Township and is tax parcel number 24-07-17-18-351-003, zoned RR-2 Recreation Residential. The proposed building is 24'x32' (768 sq.ft.) and the existing accessory building is 24'x48' (1,152 sq.ft.). The request is per Section 2201-8 of the Zoning Ordinance.

The applicant requested tabling because he was not able to attend the meeting. Littlefield Township recommended approval.

The case was deferred because of the applicant’s request.

IV Other Business

· Steep slopes

Derrohn would like to see Steep Slopes standards. She asked for a time line. Putters explained that the standards are being looked at to apply as an overlay zone and to certain soil groups. It is moving along, but legal considerations must be taken into account. Soil Erosion would be included in the review process, but it would primarily be a zoning review. They are trying to determine where the gaps are that zoning should pick up in the Ordinances, considering soil erosion and the new Stormwater Ordinance.

Dale Scott, as a member of the Ad-Hoc Committee, stated that next week the Committee may be brought together for further discussion. Some time is needed for legal review, perhaps it can be ready for the next meeting.

· By-laws & Policies
By-laws and policies have been changed, removing some items from the policies that were added to the bylaws and adding County Staff to the policies as a resource, as recommended at the last meeting. The Emmet County By-Laws and Policies are attached and have been provided to the Emmet County Clerk.

**Revised Land Development project - Case #66-01**

Putters explained that revisions have been proposed by the applicant, Tom Swenor for Roger Winslow, for a land development project previously approved in Section 9, East Mitchell Road, Springvale Township. An owner to the west would like to buy property to join to his. A memo detailing the proposed changes was distributed and include the split to create a non-buildable lot to add to the adjacent property. At the front part of the property one parcel created by combining two lots and an interior lot is proposed to be split. The roads would be shortened up somewhat. All lots meet the minimum zoning standards. Staff wonders if the changes are substantial enough to require the changes to be reviewed by the Planning Commission, e.g. re-advertising?

Jim Scott stated that the Township has asked that the revisions come back to them. They voted unanimously to have the division come back to the Township for review. They had questioned whether the property to be added to the adjacent property was an allowable split? Eby stated that it is under the Land Division Act.

Tom Swenor felt that he had addressed the Township’s issues, reducing the size of the parcel.

Roger Winslow stated that at the Township’s request, he took the plan to the Township assessor who did not believe it was a land division under the land division act. That is a non-issue. The only issue is the adjustment of the lots in the front and the interior split.

Derrohn stated that the Planning Commission should respect the Township’s request.

Scott made a motion to require changes to be deferred back to the Township. Derrohn supported the motion which passed by the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Harris, Jones, Scott, Laughbaum, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none. Absent; Blanchard. (One vacant seat.)

V Public Comments
There was no public comment.

VI Adjournment
There being no other business, Chairperson Eby declared the meeting adjourned at 9:40p.m.

_____________________________________________________
James Scott, Secretary Dated