I Call to Order and Attendance
Chairman Eby called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m. All members were present except Jones who arrived at 7:32 p.m. and Blanchard who arrived at 7:38 p.m.

II Minutes of August 29, 2002 & September 5, 2002
Simon made a motion, supported by Behan, to approve the minutes of August 29, 2002 and September 5, 2002 as written. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote of the members present.

III Cases
1. CASE #28-02 Patrick Bryan, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Height Modification, S. Lake Shore Drive, Section 1, Friendship Township
A request by Patrick Bryan for a Special Use Permit for a height modification of up to 6.5' to apply to a proposed residence on S. Lake Shore Drive, Section 1, Friendship Township. The property is zoned SR-2 Scenic Resource to a depth of 400' and then RR-2 Recreation Residential for the remainder of the property, where the proposed structure is sited. The tax parcel number is 24-06-11-01-100-004. The request is per Section 1900-g of the Zoning Ordinance.

Putters stated that the case was tabled at the last meeting to allow time for staff to communicate with the applicant. The proposal is for a barn structure with residential uses on the top two floors and horse stalls on the ground floor. The site is located on the east side of M-119 in a steep slope area. The property crosses M-119 but does not extend to Lamkin Drive below the bluff. The site plan, location map, profile sketch, topography map and elevation sketches were displayed to explain the request. Mr. Bryan contacted staff after a letter was sent to him relaying the Planning Commissions questions and concerns. Bryan requested a copy of the height standards from the Ordinance, but has not been in further contact with staff. Friendship Township recommended denial.

No one was present representing the applicant.

Norm Mottl from Friendship Township stated that Mr. Bryan was asked to attend Friendship Township Planning Commission meetings, but has not. They have questions regarding his request and plan.

Behan made a motion to table Case #28-02 to allow the applicant an opportunity to communicate with staff. Alexander supported the motion which passed on a unanimous voice vote.
2. CASE #83B-00 Damian Farrell Design Group for Crooked Lake Properties, LLC, FINAL PUD-1 (Mixed Use) & SITE PLAN REVIEW, Oden Road, Section 18, Littlefield Township

A request by Damian Farrell Design Group for Crooked Lake Properties LLC for a Final Mixed Use PUD-1 Planned Unit Development Overlay District, to apply to the following property: two (2) tax parcels being numbered 24-07-17-18-451-005 and 24-07-17-18-451-004 being some 3.22 acres bordered by US-31 to the north for some 521', Cincinnati Avenue to the west, Crooked Lake to the south for over 900' and the Crooked Lake Yacht Club to the east. Requested modifications to the underlying zoning standards and/or PUD standards are: The 50' perimeter setback, the 60' waterfront setback and the 20' spacing between detached residential buildings, all per the PUD Master Plan. The parcel is located in Section 18, T35N-R4W, Littlefield Township, the Windjammer Marina property, and is zoned R-2C General Residential. The requested mixed uses include retail uses, marina services and sales, 24 units in duplex housing, public areas, walkways, and overnight boat parking (occupancy). The request is per Ordinance Section 1800, and constitutes a major redevelopment of the existing Windjammer property.

Putters explained the site plan for the redevelopment of the property which has been reviewed at length over the last year. The property has been re-zoned to R-2C and a PUD Overlay has been applied. A draft motion was distributed and the site plan review checklist was reviewed by Putters. The perimeter setback and separation between buildings have been modified through the PUD. DEQ permits and Soil Erosion permits have been applied for and may have been issued. The staff suggestion of moving the driveway has been incorporated into the revised site plan. Loading around the business area is questionable. Acceleration and deceleration lanes, if required, would be standards of MDOT and the Emmet County Road Commission on Cincinnati Street. Parking space sizes were substandard, however, a revised plan, received just prior to the meeting, has been provided by the applicant and shows 10' wide parking spaces. The number of parking spaces would allow only low impact commercial uses. The dumpster locations are shown. Easements for utilities may be necessary, but are all part of the development. Sign & Lighting Committee review will be required, but the proposal appears to meet the County Ordinance. The fire department approved the plan. The Site Plan appears to meet the standards of the Ordinance.

Blanchard arrived at 7:39 p.m.

Connie Brown was present and stated that Army Corp, Soil Erosion, MDOT and Road Commission approvals have been obtained. Reflector lights were required by Emmet County Road Commission on Cincinnati Avenue. A truck delivery area was shown by Brown. The entry was increased in size to accommodate boat traffic. The boat ramp on the east will be gated off and will be private, with scheduled launches only.

Jones asked about parking for the total units? Brown stated that there are 24-units with two-car garages for each residential unit. Jones asked about the number of parking spots adding that there are significantly more boat slips than the parking provided. If the use is there, then the parking should be available.

Brown responded that there are the same number of total slips. There is potential off-site parking space (South of Alanson) and valet parking will be provided. The off-site parking is about 1.5 miles away. As it exists now there are unlimited curb cuts. Put-ins will be by appointment. Brown explained that the development will be controlled by Woodruff.

Putters stated that it is still a problem. The existing parking and boat slips are there.

Brown added that the new uses have parking accounted for. There is not a parking space for each boat slip, they are solving that with off-site parking. Woodruff stated that not all boat owners are there at one time.

Eby stated that there is nothing official detailing where the parking is going and how it will be handled. Jones stated that the current use pre-existed zoning. With the PUD and new site plan, current standards need to be met.

Alexander asked about the valet service, will it be 24 hour? Brown answered that there will be controls in place and the ramp will not be available for the general public at all hours. Woodruff stated that he offers 15 pontoons for rentals. They have complete control and a shuttle service.

Eby stated that there are provisions for deferred parking, if there is space available for parking on the site, however, in this case there is not space available and there is no documented plan in place for overflow parking. Jones stated that the proposed use is more intense than the current use.
Brown stated that there are times of the year when the use may be intense than at other times. The property owner has made accommodations for additional parking.

Eby stated that the promise for off-site parking must be documented. Jones felt that it must be part of the PUD. There needs to be a plan in place to go with the PUD.

Brown felt that they have satisfied parking for on-site uses. Brown explained the business aspect of providing valet parking.

Eby stated that it is safe to assume that people have to travel to get to the use. The code is somewhat vague regarding parking standards for the specific use being proposed.

Simon asked for clarification. There are 49 slips and 15 will be used for pontoon rentals. There are 16 parking spaces on the east side of the site.

Brown stated that the parking lot is not full all the time, and the property owner would offer valet parking.

Derrohn stated that there is a problem now that will not exist in the future. Eby stated that there could be problems with the valet parking. Is the new site approved for parking under zoning? Would the Planning Commission be violating the zoning code? The site would have to have the proper zoning and be approved for parking.

Simon asked about the east ramp, would it be gated and how would it be used? Woodruff explained that the main entrance to the water would be at the main building. The other is currently used to bring in docks. That use will be continued and it would be an overflow ramp. Simon then asked if the number of docks should match the parking? Brown stated that the code does not require a parking spot for each dock space. The general consensus was that most people would be coming in a vehicle, hence, a need for parking.

Woodruff explained the valet and shuttle service that they are suggesting. They would like to begin construction this year. He has purchased another piece of property and he would move some existing marina storage buildings to crate indoor parking at the remote site. Shepler’s offers shuttle service. Simon asked if there could be conditional approval, if complaints are received, then do something? Behan suggested that the plan could be approved without docks? Valet parking is a use that would need to be reviewed to be sure it meets the zoning standards on the property where it is being proposed. There is nothing showing the valet service or use.

Putters stated that there are 15 pontoon boats and 17 parking spaces. Perhaps for now the Planning Commission could approve 32 slips until off-site parking is reviewed. Putters asked, if someone drops off a boat, how does it go from the marina building to the alternate ramp? Woodruff stated that the boat would be towed by a small tractor. Putters hoped this would not be down US-31.

Derrohn asked how many parking spaces should be required? Putters stated that the ZBA could make a determination if the Ordinance does not identify the number of parking spaces required. Putters felt that his recommendation was a generous standard. Putters added that there was the knowledge that this would be a tight situation. Perhaps 32 slips could be approved on a trial for one summer to see if it works at that number. The PUD is flexible enough that standards can be set for the parking. The commercial use parking allows a low intensity use. Derrohn made a motion to approve the Site Plan for Case #83B-00, Windjammer Marina, dated 9/18/02 and as updated to 10/3/02, applied to a 3.22 acre site comprised of tax parcel numbers 24-07-17-18-451-005 and 24-07-17-18-451-004, and situated in the S ½ of Section 18, T35N-R4W, Littlefield Township, based on the following:
1. The Site Plan is in basic accord with the approved Final and Preliminary Mixed Use PUD Master Plan, including modified standards for building spacing/separation.
2. All necessary environmental permits have been applied for or obtained, and such permits are necessary conditions of this approval.
3. All Highway and Road agency permits have been applied for or obtained, and such permits are necessary conditions of this approval.
4. The Ordinance standards for the density of housing, resulting in 24-condominium units, is satisfied with the designation of “public areas”, including walkways, courts, plazas and the like, and that these public areas be illustrated on the site plan and that the public access permission is included in the Condominium Master Deed documents.

5. That the boat ramp at the east end of the project be gated and designed for safe pedestrian crossing to the designated public areas within the project.

6. Littlefield Township recommended approval with conditions which, by reference, are included in the motion and includes: a) minimum 10’ wide parking spaces (perpendicular), b) the east end parking lot boat ramp is to be equipped with a locking gate, and c) the balcony projections over Crooked Lake be permitted, provided the interior living space is not enlarged over the submitted plans.

7. The Project appears to meet the Ordinance Standards for Site Plan Review.

8. All plans for signing, sign changes and outdoor lighting be submitted to the Planning Commission Sign and Lighting Committee.

9. That permission is granted to construct footings for the marina/commercial building as illustrated on the site plan, provided that the existing marina service/sales building is removed, if the total project fails to materialize as planned.

10. The number of boat slips is limited to 32 slips that can be put in until a determination from staff or the ZBA can be provided and proper approval of off-site facilities reviewed. Off-site parking shall be identified with the plan, in order to increase the number of slips over 32. The revised plan must show how many, where they are to be located and whether it’s legal where it is proposed.

Behan supported the motion. There was discussion and Derrohn then amended the motion to add the condition that a PUD agreement be prepared by staff and signed by the property owner, township and county officials. Behan supported the amendment and the entire motion passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Simon, Jones, Scott, Blanchard, Laughbaum, Behan, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none. Absent; none.

3. CASE #36-02 Joel Frye, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Resource Extraction, Level III, Sommers Road, Section 25, Carp Lake Township

A request by Joel Frye for a Special Use Permit for Level III Resource Extraction on property located on Sommers Road, Section 25, T38N-R4W, Carp Lake Township. The extraction includes parts of tax parcel numbers 24-03-06-25-100-009 & 24-03-06-25-100-010 and the property is zoned FF-2 Farm Forest. The request is per Section 2102-10 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Putters explained the request for resource extraction using a location map, gravel extraction site plan and a final grading plan. The proposed extraction site is located in Carp Lake Township adjacent to other resource extraction sites. The proposal includes an adjacent property. The excavation will essentially remove a low ridge. The existing drives will be used and Road Commission approval may be necessary. The proposed area to be mined is about 11 acres. The shaded area, indicating areas of extraction, falls into the 50' required setback area and appears to be into the road-right-of-way. There is proposed on-site stockpiling for the top soil to be used for reclaiming the site.

Brian Fullford who assisted in preparing the plan explained the request. The applicant would like to extend into the 50' setback area to reduce a berm that would be created by the extraction. It would allow for the grade to be gradual and level. Putters read the standard of the Ordinance which allows for controlled work in the setback area. Fullford stated that the grading would take place in the 50' area, but not extraction. The grading should be an improvement to the site. The stockpiling is proposed on the northeasterly portion of the site and the plan is to mine 3-4 acres at a time and then restore as it goes along.

Joel Frye stated that he wants the reclaiming done as the work goes along. Any grading in the 50' setback would require Road Commission review. Fullford explained that there is a minimal amount of mining in the right-of-way proposed. The grading would be to match the road level. It would slope away to the north. The hatched mark shows all grading and extraction. The Road Commission has been contacted, but no approval has been given for the proposal.

Eby stated that the Road Commission would have to review the extraction both in the right of way and in the setback area before any work in that area can be done. Fullford explained that they are trying to achieve a 2% grade, rather than leave the road with a ditch, then a hump and then the field. The entire extraction will impact only the south 1/2 of the Frye site.
and approximately ½ acre of the neighboring Ford site as shown on the plan. Hours of operation were proposed for Monday thru Saturday, 8am-5pm, however, they would like to expand those hours to 7:30am to 5:30pm. Fullford agreed, on behalf of the applicant, that because phases were not identified on the plan that a condition could be placed on the permit to limit of number of acres mined and then reclaimed.

Fullford explained the proposed reclaiming and final grading plan. The basic intent is to remove a 4' hill. Frye explained that he is planning to farm the land after the extraction is done. He felt the mining would be complete at the end of 2005 and would return to renew the permit if the extraction is not done by 2005.

Eby asked if the Soil Erosion Control Officer could enforce the four acre permits. Putters requested a map showing the phases and added that the Soil Erosion Control Officer will not enforce zoning standards. The phases should be mapped out.

Terrance Ford stated that there would be screening on the Frye site. There is a processing area shown on the map. Eby asked if the crushing unit could be setback 200' from any property line? Fullford responded yes and agreed that they would not operate on Federal Holidays.

Simon asked about silt control. Eby stated that silt would be controlled by Soil Erosion. Ford stated that the property owner to the east does not object to the operation. Derrohn asked for a letter of support from the neighboring property owner. There is one neighbor within a quarter mile.

Alexander made a motion to approve Case #36-02, Joel Frye, Special Use Permit for Level III Resource Extraction, on condition that a phasing map be provided with a cap of 4 acres to be mined at one time, Road Commission approval regarding work in the road right-of-way, processing equipment and crusher to be a minimum of 200' from all property lines not associated with the extraction, no operations to be conducted on major holidays or Sundays, hours of operation to be 7:30am to 5:30pm for one year, because of the sparsity of the area and other mining operations in the area, and that the operating hours could be cut back if there are complaints, Soil Erosion to monitor site in 4 acre increments, and the permit will be reviewed in one year and because the Township recommended approval and the plan meets the Standards of the Ordinance. Blanchard supported the motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Simon, Jones, Scott, Blanchard, Laughbaum, Behan, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none. Absent; none.

4. CASE #46-02 J. Eberly for Charles VanPatten, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Larger than maximum size accessory building, 8008 Paradise Trail, Section 11, Carp Lake Township

A request by J. Eberly for Charles Van Patton for a Special Use Permit for a larger than maximum size accessory building on property located at 8008 Paradise Trail, Section 11, Carp Lake Township. The property is zoned RR-1 Recreation Residential and is tax parcel number 24-03-06-11-400-038. The request is per Section 2201-8 of the Zoning Ordinance, Exception to the standards of Section 2201. The request is to construct a 1,120 sq. ft. accessory building where 1,000 sq. ft is the standard size allowed.

Dundon explained the request for a 28'x40' accessory building where 1,000 sq. ft. is allowed. The lot is wooded and the building would not be seen from Paradise Trail, being 120' from the road. There is a residence on the property and a log cabin. The accessory building is for personal storage. Carp Lake Township recommended approval because the building will not be seen from the road, it is well screened and they did not receive objections.

Jeff Eberly stated that the property owner feels that the location is the back yard (where a 1,200 sq. ft. accessory building would be allowed). The access is a shared driveway.

Jones made a motion to approve Case #46-02, Special Use Permit for a larger than maximum size accessory building because the Township recommended approval, it meets the conditions of the Ordinance, no objections were received, it will be well screened from the road and there are deep setbacks from the water and the road. Blanchard supported the motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Simon, Jones, Scott, Blanchard, Laughbaum, Behan, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none. Absent; none.

5. CASE #48-02 John & Hanni Youthers, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Home Occupation, 1845 Van Road, Section 17, Center Township

A request by John & Hanni Youthers for a Special Use Permit for a Home Occupation on property located at 1845 Van Road, Section 17, T37N-R5W, Center Township. The property is zoned FF-2 Farm Forest and is tax parcel number 24-04-09-17-300-024. The request is to allow custom firearms work, making pottery & wood products, per Section 2102-12 of the Zoning Ordinance.
Dundon explained the request on a property zoned FF-2 on Van Road. The home occupation use involves a specialized custom firearms business and pottery and wood production. The garage is 30'x75', 2,250 sq. ft. overall, and 600 sq. ft. is the standard allowed for the home occupation use. Presently the firearms business is located in a commercial building in Petoskey. The business has moved to Harbor Springs, and the applicant would like to operate part of the business from their home. They sell pottery and wood products at the store in Harbor Springs. They receive guns and do custom work on gun stocks for the firearm portion of the business. There would be no employees and the dust is to be self contained. Center Township recommended approval.

John Yothers explained that he does volunteer work for a non-profit organization that raffles guns. The Federal Firearms License is necessary to receive the guns. He produces art and engraves gun barrels and stocks. It is not very extensive and not a typical gun shop. He is not a dealer and there is no sighting-in on-site. He does art work on the stocks and barrels of guns for the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation. Hanni Yothers explained the process and added that only a portion of the pole barn, approximately 600 sq. ft., would be used for the home occupation.

The Yothers stated that they did read the standards Ordinance regarding Home Occupations.

Blanchard made a motion to approve Case #48-02, John & Hanni Yothers, Special Use Permit for a Home Occupation as requested because the Township recommended approval, there were no objections and the applicant understands the standards of the Ordinance. Behan supported the motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Simon, Jones, Scott, Blanchard, Laughbaum, Behan, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none. Absent; none.

6. CASE #99A-83 Airport Manager of the Pellston Regional Airport, PUD-1, Mixed Use, Preliminary and Final, Sections 27, 28 & 33, McKinley Township

A request by the Airport Manager of the Pellston Regional Airport, owned and operated by the County of Emmet, to apply a PUD-1 Planned Unit Development Overlay District, mixed use, to properties encompassed within the airport and appurtenant improvements and accessory services and uses, and that the 2000 Airport Layout Plan be the PUD-1 Planned Unit Development Master Plan, Preliminary and Final. The PUD-1 Overlay District would specifically apply to the properties in T37N-R4W, McKinley Township, as follows:
1. All of Section 28
2. That portion of Section 27 lying west of the former right-of-way of the Penn Central Railroad and former Michigan Northern Railroad
3. The N ½ of Section 33
4. The N ½ of the SW 1/4 of Section 33

The purpose of the PUD-1 Overlay District is to permit the uses of the airport to operate and expand in accordance with the PUD Master Plan and the 2000 Airport Layout Plan without the limitations of several different zoning district classifications that exist as underlying districts. The PUD Master Plan includes all airport uses, as they exist, including future uses and hangar areas shown on the 2000 Airport Layout Plan. The purposes of the PUD request include:
1. To consolidate the zoning permissives of several underlying districts (FF, I, R-2B, SR)
2. To implement the previously filed 2000 Airport Layout Plan
3. To meet the statutory requirements for zoning airports and airport layout plans (MCL 125.203a).

Putters explained the Planned Unit Development concept for the entire airport which had been I-2 when zoning was originally adopted. A rezoning took place because of the vast area of the industrial uses. The north part was rezoned to FF-2 matching surrounding zoning and at the Corner of Douglas Lake Road a rezoning to R-2B which was carried into the airport property to be consistent on both sides of US-31. The river stream corridor was always SR on both sides of the river that passes through the property. The PUD would be an overlay which would allow the site to be consolidated onto one planned development.

The PUD was prompted by a hangar proposal on the site. The two hangars would be in the R-2B area, which does not allow for airport uses. The airport layout plan has labels showing future corporate development areas including corporate hangars north of the terminal area. There is a northern area of the property, off Ely Road, in the cross of the runways, showing future industrial uses. The rest of the property is not labeled for development. There are official plans prepared and approved by the FAA and adopted by the Airport Board. The PUD wraps up all uses under one umbrella. If the plan is adopted, it would allow hangars north of the airport terminal. In the south quadrant, under PUD, nothing could be constructed unless the PUD were amended. There are currently some industrial uses along Robinson Road, however, the
The proposed PUD does not extend to Robinson Road. The proposal is to apply a PUD-1 Mixed Use Overlay, adopting the Airport Layout Plan by reference. The draft motion suggests that the industrial use designation be removed from the allowed uses along Ely Road. Putters read the draft motion prepared by staff and explained Civil Counsel’s input.

Jones is a member of the Airport Committee and explained the lease agreement for the hangars.

Laughbaum asked about an east-west runway. Jones doesn’t know of an east-west plan. This plan supercedes any previous plans. Putters listed each page of the plans that were provided to the Planning Office.

Laughbaum asked for clarification of the overlay and the underlying zoning. The underlying zoning will not be changed or displaced, the PUD overlay would bring the uses together. Laughbaum thought it could look better.

Nancy Nathan has lived on Ely Road for over 30 years and her three children live along Ely Road as well. She is opposed to industrial development along Ely Road. If they consider industrial development would that allow access from Ely Road? She would prefer eliminating the Industrial uses along Ely Road. Putters stated that the Airport Manager has been requested to provide a new plan without the Industrial uses shown. The PUD requires a 50’ perimeter setback. Putters stated that a PUD amendment and site plan would be required if there is a change to the approved plan.

Robert Kosek asked if he would be notified if there were a change? He suggested that only Section 27 be included in the PUD excluding Section 28 & 33. That would leave the zoning alone. Nothing is being requested in Section 33. He is concerned with Industrial uses along Ely Road because noise would increase, there is a “S” turn with two blind corners and a hill. He is concerned that if a PUD is in place, there would be no mechanism in place to notify him. If site plans are changed, then no notification is sent. Jones stated that a hangar could be built without notification now because it is zoned FF, however, airport uses are subject to Special Use Permit review and would require notification to neighbors under FF zoning.

Putters stated that with a PUD, there would not be notification for a hangar if they are approved uses, unless otherwise stipulated.

Mooradian asked if an airport hangar were to be built, how much would be required for each hangar, what is the density? Putters stated that if the lots were to be split, they would need to meet the underlying zoning standards.

Jones stated that a 50’ perimeter setback would be maintained.

Laughbaum stated that unlimited sized accessory buildings could be allowed in the PUD and only 1,200 sq. ft. across Ely Road.

McKinley Township recommended only Section 27 be included in the PUD, which is the area along US-31.

Lisa Durkalec wondered what happens on the lower part of Section 33 if a PUD is applied? Putters explained that because nothing is shown there, nothing would be allowed unless the PUD were amended through the public hearing process.

Ray Durkalec asked about the notification and the setback. The notification would be 300’ from the subject property. The PUD perimeter setback is 50’. Right now, in the I-2 Zoning District, the setback is 20’. Ray Durkalec asked why it should be put on the airport property? Why not put it across the road where there are other industrial properties? Putters stated that industry is conducive to airports. Putters added that if it is in a PUD then neighborhood notification would be necessary. PUD offers more protection than I-2.

Jones made a motion to recommend approval of the Planned Unit Development to the Board of Commissioners excluding industrial uses on the northerly section of the property adjacent to Ely Road, Scott supported the motion. There was discussion on the motion and Laughbaum made a motion to table the Case. The motion to table failed for lack of support.
Jones made a motion to recommend approval to the County Board of Commissioners of a Preliminary and Final PUD-1 Master Plan Overlay for the Pellston Regional Airport. The overlay encompasses some 1,290 acres of main use airport area, and overlays the zoning districts of R-2B, SR-1, FF-2 and I-2 Industrial, all lying west of the west right-of-way line of the former Penn Central Railroad. The PUD-Overlay approval incorporates the following:

1. Recognizes all existing site plans, facilities and services needed for airport operations.
2. Accepts by reference, the Official Airport Layout Plan (ALP), dated February 12, 2001; but excludes non-airport related industrial use from locating along Ely Road (north property area), but does not exclude potential aircraft hangar buildings, navigational aids, and necessary airport facilities to safely manage aircraft operations.
3. Hangars and aircraft service facilities and uses proposed to locate along Ely Road in the North ½ of Section 28 shall be subject to the Zoning Ordinance procedures and processes that apply to Principal Uses Subject to Special Conditions.
4. The PUD Master Plan may be amended or updated from time to time as provided for by Ordinance, and, except for the Ely Road exclusion, the ALP can be implemented through the site plan review process.
5. Fulfills the Statutory requirements of Zoning for Airports and accepting Airport Layout Plans (MCL 125.203a).

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

7. CASE #47-02 Jordan Construction Services, Inc for Mike Meagher & Jim Moffit, SITE PLAN REVIEW, Airplane Hangars, US-31 (Pellston Regional Airport), Section 27, McKinley Township

Dundon explained that approval would have to be conditional on approval of the PUD (from Case #47-02) by the Board of Commissioners. The proposal is to construct two new hangar buildings, each 62'x65', 20 ft. apart, with a top height of 23'. A letter from Bidstrup Engineering was received stating that on-site retention is not required because of the soil conditions. A third hangar is planned in the future. McKinley Township recommended approval.

Larry Trumble stated that the roof height is slightly taller than 23'.

Jones stated that the Airport Committee approved the plan.

Laughbaum asked about notices for this hangar. Notices would not be required for this Site Plan Review because the hangars are in line with the approved airport uses.

Jones made a motion to approve Case #47-02 as proposed on the site plan dated 9/18/02PZ for construction of 2 hangars on condition that the Board of Commissioners approved the Planned Unit Development for the airport property, and because it meets the standards of the Ordinance. Behan supported the motion which passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Eby, Simon, Jones, Scott, Blanchard, Laughbaum, Behan, Derrohn, Alexander. No; none. Absent; none.

8. CASE #49-02 Isabel & Bernard Scollon, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, motel/tourist homes, 2514 US 31 N, Section 22, McKinley Township

A request by Isabel & Bernard Scollon for a Special Use Permit to construct lodging facilities on property located at 2514 US-31 N, Section 22, McKinley Township (known as Cronn’s Motel). The property is zoned R-2B to a depth of 500 ft. and then FF-2 Farm Forest for the remainder and is tax parcel number 24-10-10-22-100-022. The request is per Section 501-2a) of the Zoning Ordinance.

Putters explained the request to add tourist lodging at a location with an existing motel and residence. The request is to add three additional units to the property. The elongated parcel is divided by a zoning line. The first 500’ is R-2B which allows hotels and motels and FF-2 for the remainder of the property which allows motels but requires more acreage and a lot width that is more than what the subject parcel has. The applicant’s site plan and proposed concept plan were displayed. Staff has requested that the site plan be more accurately dimensioned and verified. The concept plan proposes two cabins and to convert an existing garage to a cabin and then add a garage to the front of the house. A power line runs through the property.

Isabel Scollon stated that there isn’t room for the cabin as shown along the south line. The cabins are available at another site and would be moved to this property.
The case was deferred until a more complete site plan is provided.

9. CASE #37-02 Steve Pemberton, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Larger than Maximum Size Accessory Building, 5073 Hurd Road, Section 10, Friendship Township
A request by Steve Pemberton for a Special Use Permit for a larger than maximum size accessory building on property located at 5073 Hurd Road, Section 10, T36N-R6W, Friendship Township. The property is zoned FF-2 Farm Forest and is tax parcel number 24-06-12-10-400-024. The request is per Section 2201-8 of the Zoning Ordinance, Exception to the standards of Section 2201. The request is to allow a 2,400 sq. ft. accessory building where 1,200 sq. ft. is the standard size allowed.

Dundon stated that a 2,400 sq. ft. building is currently existing on the property. 1,200 sq. ft. was approved and then it appears that an addition was constructed creating a 2,400 sq. ft. building. The setbacks are not documented on the site plan. There are questions regarding the total square footage of the building because the photos show a lean-to at the rear of the structure. Friendship Township requested tabling because information is missing from the site plan.

Don Cheshire, property owner to the north, stated that the Ordinance has been violated. The Pembertons have two businesses being operated from the property. There is a lot of traffic using the private road easement. There is an upholstery business and dog kennels.

Kathy Cheshire stated that they are using the property for additional uses. Traffic should be taken in consideration. The easement is intended to be for the home owners and their guests, not for business uses.

The case was deferred until the next regular meeting to allow time for questions to be answered.

10. CASE #39-02 John Engle, SITE PLAN REVIEW, Furniture sales & assembly, 8895 Rose Street, Section 17, Littlefield Township
Putters explained the request using a short range plan and a long range plan. The long range plan is only for reference. The applicant has been doing the business outside, and it looks industrial with outdoor storage which includes vehicles, logs used for fences and re-siding buildings. The Planning Office has worked with the applicant to prepare the site plan. Because the property is zoned B-1, the use cannot include manufacturing unless it is accessory to a store. Existing buildings were shown as well as proposed buildings. Some furniture would be displayed. The status of the right-of-way of the former railroad is unclear. The site plan shows a portion of the r-o-w included in the property under control of Mr. Engle. The request shows a showroom, there is the question of open storage in the B-1 area. There is proposed parking on the interior of the property. A screened area in the back was shown for log storage. There are plans for two temporary storage buildings. There is an active outside use at this time. The Township requested tabling, intending to conduct a site walk.

John Engle was present and stated that there were log cabin rentals on the property for decades and his plan is to restore that use. He purchased a load of cedar logs which have been stored on the site. He has been building some furniture, but expects the main use to be cabin rentals. He understands that the property has been unsightly. The lumber has been there to dry, less than a year.

The case was deferred at the request of the Township.

IV Other Business
• Case #32-02 SR-2 - Scenic Resource Rezoning
Putters gave an overview of the proposed rezoning study started by members of the Planning Commission. Letters have been sent to Townships with responses from three of the six townships. Eby reported that both Maple River and Bliss have not met regarding the matter, but they seem to support the rezoning.

Paul Lowley a member of Springvale Township Planning Committee stated that the Townships wonder why the change is proposed? There are approximately two miles of undeveloped lake shorelines that the Township would prefer to keep in the SR district.
Eby stated that the rivers and streams would remain Scenic Resource. Eby stated that it appeared that most of the proposed rezoning area is developed and in small lots. Lowley stated that there are areas that are undeveloped.

Scott added that many of the lots were developed before the current zoning. Maybe it should be looked at closer. Lowley agreed that there should be further review lot by lot perhaps. Enforcement is a separate issue. It would be a shame to lower the zoning standards in the undeveloped shoreline areas. Lowley explained the Township’s viewpoint.

The matter will continue to be discussed under Other Business to give additional time for the Townships to respond.

**Zoning Coordinating Committee**

*Case #1D-00 Little Traverse Township - Rezoning*

Putters explained the review by the Zoning Coordinating Committee to comment on a request by Nubs Nob for rezoning from FF-2 to R-1 because they wish to develop near the Nubs Nob ski resort. Little Traverse Township Zoning Board recommended approval of the rezoning.

Staff felt that there was a good opportunity to apply an open space plan on the property. The current property owner feels that would be a burden and would leave only 60 acres, which is not in their best interest. The build-out statistic would be increased with the change. The density in the FF-2 is 180,000 sq. ft. per dwelling where the R-1 is approximately ½ acre. Laughbaum asked if the Township had considered FF-1?

Jim Bartlett, representing Nubs Nob, stated that the rezoning would allow an additional 32 dwelling units which is not a significant increase for the Township overall. It is not a large influence on the Township. The zoning in the adjacent Township (Pleasantview) allows 5,000 to 9,000 sq. ft. lots. It seems like a very logical step. During the Township meeting, there was considerable public comment with no negative comments and the rezoning was recommended by a unanimous vote.

Blanchard made a motion to approve the recommendation prepared by staff, with the addition of Laughbaum’s recommendation to suggest FF-1 zoning rather than FF-2. Scott supported the motion which passed by a unanimous voice vote.

**Case #78B-00 Bear Creek Township - Zoning Ordinance**

Staff prepared a memo which was distributed, explained and discussed.

One letter of objection was received.

Scott made a motion to authorize Chairman Eby to sign the memo and forward it to Bear Creek Township. Derrohn supported the motion which passed by a unanimous voice vote.

**Case #77D-00 Resort Township - Zoning Ordinance**

Staff prepared a memo which was distributed, explained and discussed.

Scott made a motion to authorize Chairman Eby to sign the memo and forward it to Resort Township. Behan supported the motion which passed by a unanimous voice vote.

V Public Comment

- Les Compton from Cheboygan County Planning introduced himself. He was in attendance to observe the Planning Commission meeting process.
- Paul Mooradian asked about the review of Case #83B-00, Windjammer Marina, specifically maneuverability and Private Road standards. He felt that the board has overlooked some safety issues.

VI Adjournment

There being no other business, Chairperson Eby declared the meeting adjourned at 11:31p.m.

James Scott, Secretary Dated