EMMET COUNTY PLANNING
COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY DECEMBER 7, 2017
7:30 PM
EMMET COUNTY BUILDING
COMMISSIONER'S
BOARDROOM
200 DIVISION ST
PETOSKEY, MI
49770

AGENDA

I Call to Order and Attendance

II Minutes of November 2, 2017

III Cases

CASE FROM PREVIOUS MEETING

1. PSPR17-008  Alpha Invesco-James Shondel, SITE PLAN REVIEW -
Townhouses/multiple family dwellings, 2514 N US 31 Hwy, Section
22, McKinley Township

2. PPUD17-002  Wheres Walda LLC, William & Donald McMaster, PRELIMINARY
PUD, vacant property directly north of 6977 M-68 Hwy, Section 10,
Littlefield Township

NEW CASES

3. PSUP17-018  Emily Giallombardo, SPECIAL USE PERMIT – Home Occupation –
pet grooming, 6350 E. Mitchell Rd, Section 6, Springvale Township

4. PSUP17-008  Larry Williams, SPECIAL USE PERMIT – Resource Extraction
amendment, 7672 Moore Rd, Section 9, Littlefield Township

5. PSPR17-013  Ken Looze for Amerigas Propane, SITE PLAN REVIEW –
Amendment, 160 Reuther Dr., Section 33, McKinley Township

6. PPUDF17-001  Aaron Miller, FINAL PUD & SITE PLAN REVIEW, 1912 Plains
Rd, Section 11, Maple River Township

IV Public Comments

V Other Business
   1. Enforcement Report
   2. Michigan Medical Marihuana update – Readmond Township Resolution
   3. Farming – Accessory Uses
   4. By-Laws
   5. 2018 meeting dates

VI Adjournment
EMMET COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
THURSDAY NOVEMBER 2, 2017, 7:30 P.M.
EMMET COUNTY BUILDING
200 DIVISION ST
PETOSKEY, MI 49770

MEMBERS PRESENT: Kelly Alexander, John Eby, Tom Urman, Jonathan Scheel, David Laughbaum, Steve Neal, Betsy White, James Scott

MEMBERS ABSENT: Toni Drier

STAFF: Tammy Doernenburg, Monica Linehan

I Call to Order and Attendance
Chairman Eby called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. All members were present except Drier.

II Minutes of October 5, 2017
Alexander made a motion seconded by Neal to approve the minutes of the October 5, 2017 meeting as presented. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote of the members present.

III Cases

1. Case #PSPR17-008 Alpha Investco-James Shondel, SITE PLAN REVIEW-Townhouses/multi-family dwellings, 2514 N US 31 Hwy, Section 22, McKinley Township

Legal Notice: A request by Alpha Invesco LLC, James Shondel, for Site Plan Review for approval of new townhouses and conversion of existing buildings to multiple family dwellings at 2514 N US 31 Hwy. The property is zoned R-2 General Residential and FF-2 Farm and Forest and is tax parcel 24-10-10-22-100-022. The proposal is to add two new buildings and convert two existing buildings to be used for multiple family dwellings. Review is per Articles 5 & 20 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Packet items: Email from township (passed out at meeting)

This is the second review of this case. Doernenburg explained that the applicant had gone back to the township which requested postponement due to possible site plan changes submitted at the meeting. The property is located north of Pellston and is zoned R-2 and FF-2. The entire property is 6.13 acres of which the R-2 zoned portion is 2.08 acres. The request is for a duplex and multi-family dwellings. An aerial was shown. There was an existing motel and home which are both currently being remodeled to multiple family. A garage/accessory building is located on the south side of the proposed driveway. The proposal is to add two additional multi-family buildings. Access is proposed through the existing drive and has been preliminarily approved by MDOT. The sizes of the proposed buildings are 64.25'x30' and 100.75'x30'. Parking spaces meet the standards of 10'x20' and there are two spaces required per unit. Gravel parking is proposed; a sealed drainage plan is required but has not yet been received. The Health Department did a preliminary review and need to do a more thorough review yet. The dumpster is proposed to be behind the existing accessory building. The elevations of the buildings were shown; they are proposed to be single story buildings. There is ample snow storage shown on the plan. The Fire Department verbal review indicated no major concerns. Outdoor lighting would need to be reviewed. A drainage plan is needed. Density standards are met. Photos of the site were shown. The proposed site plan was shown. Doernenburg stated that she understands that the
applicant went to the township with a revised site plan but we haven’t received a revised site plan. The
township did provide what they received and it doesn’t appear to meet ordinance standards. At this
point, the options would be to move forward with this existing request and either postpone, approve, or
deny it. Doernenburg stated that the current request appears to meet ordinance standards.

Angelo Genna, applicant’s representative, stated that he just got the copies of their revised plans.
They really don’t want to have two separate buildings so they’ve revised the plan to show one building.
This still keeps them within the 14 total units. The single building would be located within the R-2
district section of the property. The revised plan is really what they wanted for the overall look and the
township has asked for a more overall picture of the property. Genna stated that he would bring the
revised plans into the office.

There was no public comment on this case.

Scheel made a motion supported by Alexander to postpone this case for further information to be
presented. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote of the members present. This case will be
heard again at the Emmet County Planning Commission meeting of December 7, 2017.

2. Case #PSPR17-009 Phil & Kristin Schaner, SITE PLAN REVIEW-Hotel/motel/motor inn
(lodge & villas), 1256 N US 31 Hwy, Section 34, Bear Creek Township

Legal Notice: A request by Phil & Kristin Schaner for Site Plan Review to allow development of a
hotel/motel/motor inn ("Lodge & Villas") on vacant property located at 1256 N US 31 Hwy in Section 34 of Bear
Creek Township. The property is tax parcel 24-01-16-34-100-027 and is zoned R-2 General Residential. The
Special Land Use was approved by the Planning Commission on November 3, 2016. This review is Site Plan
Review per Articles 5, 20, and 22 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Packet items: Request & location map, tax parcel map, application, site plan review checklist, impact statement,
11/3/16 ECPC minutes, easement agreement, private road info, staff report, photos of fences and trash
receptacle, elevations, floor plans, site plan (proposed, existing, road design), Bear Creek Twp minutes, Fire Dpt
review,

This is the second review of this request. The property was granted a Special Use Permit in 2016.
The parcel is located south of Burger King and Pirate’s Cove. The access road has been abandoned
and an easement has been drafted and approved and meets Bear Creek Township’s private road
standards. Doernenburg showed the approved concept plan from 2016 as well as a revised site plan
for this request. The Villa #9 has been moved away from the setback and the flood line form Tannery
Creek is now shown on the plan. A floodplain permit would only be needed if they are affecting this
area and likely would only be needed for a portion of the access drive. The Drain Commissioner visited
the site during the flooding and rain that our area had a week or so ago. He indicated the site to be
high and dry. A sealed drainage plan has been received. The township has reviewed and has
recommended approval with additional conditions. The revised site plan was shown. Doernenburg
explained that parking is congregated parking and meets the requirements. The township
recommended that the congregation area in the public building be limited to 1,050sf based on the
number of parking spaces provided. Language regarding the connectors to the east and west is in the
written easement document. Photos of the property were shown. There is to be no new access to US-
31 as the existing will be used. A privacy fence will be erected between the Burger King parking lot
and this development as well as on the east and south sides of the property to delineate the property
lines. A letter of support has been received from Haggard’s Plumbing and Heating. The Fire
Department has reviewed and approved with the inclusion of a Knox box, a review of the water supply
once building plans are submitted, and that the International Fire Code for access drives that are not paved are followed.

Phil and Kristin Schaner were both present.

There was no public comment on this case.

Urman stated that the drain commissioner was there during one of the bad storms and the creek was flowing between its banks.

Urman made a motion to approve Case #PSPR17-009, Phil & Kirstin Schaner for Site Plan Review for a hotel/motel/motor inn on property located at 1256 N US 31 Hwy, Section 34, Bear Creek Township, tax parcel 24-01-16-34-100-027, as shown on the supplemental details regarding fences, trash storage container, and elevation sketches all dated Received Sept 8, 2017 and the Site Plan dated October 24, 2017 because the standards of Articles 5, 20, 21, and 26 have been met with the following conditions: that the parcel may not be reduced in lot width below 150 feet, the existing vegetation will be retained in the setback areas to the greatest extent possible, that the use of the lodge is limited to single family dwelling and the common area in the lodge may only be used as accessory to the residence and 9 villas and the meeting area will be limited to 1050 sq. ft., that lights and signs be reviewed as required by the Zoning Ordinance, that a performance guarantee in the amount of $3,000 be provided as required for the drainage standards (Section 26.05 G), that the roof run off goes into the catch basin, that the road be brought up to the Private Road standards and be hard surface as well as the sidewalks and parking be hard surface, that Sec. 22.05 is adhered to and they will not create a public nuisance, that the applicant would have to come back to the Planning Commission for review if they wished to do anything more than allowed, and that the Fire Department requirements be met, because the case was recommended for approval by both the Bear Creek Township Planning Commission and Board. The motion was supported by Scheel and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Neal, Scott, Scheel, Laughbaum, Urman, White, Alexander. No: None. Absent: Drier.

3. Case #PPUD17-002 Whereus Walda LLC, William & Donald McMaster, PRELIMINARY PUD, vacant property located directly north of 6977 M-68 Hwy, Section 10, Littlefield Township

Legal Notice: A request by Whereus Walda LLC on property owned by William and Donald W McMaster for a Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) rezoning on vacant property located directly north of 6977 M-68 Hwy, Section 10 of Littlefield Township. The property is zoned R-2 General Residential and is tax parcel 24-07-17-10-200-018. The request is to rezone to PUD to allow the Principal and Special Uses listed in the R-2 Zoning District and offices, storage/warehouse buildings and wholesale distribution. Review will be per Articles 17 and Section 27.11 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Packet items: Request & location map, tax parcel map, application, GIS maps, elevations, building examples, buy and sell agreement, 9/18/17 site plan, Future Land Use Map, Zoning Plan, Wetland map, zoning evaluation form, Littlefield Township Committee meeting notes.

This is the first hearing on this case. The vacant property is located north of the Louie's gas station on M-68 Hwy. It is approximately 10 acres and is zoned R-2. The access to M-68 is through the Louie's drive. During the review of that property (Louie's), the owner rezoned the north part of the parcel to R-2 and MDOT required that the access be through their drive through the north part of the parcel (only 1 access to M-68). The aerial was shown. Doernenburg stated that the proposal is to rezone the property to PUD to allow all R-2 uses plus office, storage/warehouse, and wholesale distribution. Preliminary PUD review is a rezoning in our ordinance and is reviewed by the township, the Emmet County Planning Commission 11/02/2017
County Planning Commission, and the Board of Commissioners. If approved, they would have to come back for final review. The concept plan was shown although Doernenburg explained that we are looking at the uses only at this point. She pointed out that there are some wetland areas noted on the concept plan. Elevations of the proposed buildings were shown which would be one story warehouse buildings. The perimeter setback of 50’ is proposed to be maintained and existing vegetation to be retained there. The Littlefield Township corridor study shows this area as PUD, the Emmet County Master Plan Future Land Use Map (FLUM) shows it as mixed use. Doernenburg noted that the text of the Master Plan needs to be included in the review, not just the FLUM. The text indicates that Brownfields or development ready property is preferred to be used before rezoning of other property is done. A letter of support from Haggard’s Plumbing & Heating was received. Doernenburg stated that she sent the information to MDOT but has not received a response yet. The site plan that was approved for the Louie’s store was shown and the access easement pointed out. Doernenburg showed a slide that listed the questions to consider for a preliminary PUD review which were also included in the staff report for the case. The Future Land Use Map was shown which indicates mixed use adjacent to industrial. The zoning plan indicates that a PUD can be overlaid on any zoning category. The current and proposed zoning maps were shown. Doernenburg stated that the Littlefield Township Planning Committee has recommended denial on a 4-1 vote. Their Board meets on November 9th and the legal notifications sent to the neighbors noted both meeting dates.

Michael Walda, applicant, stated that they have been looking for property that would be able to do what they need. They own a business that is now located in Harbor Plaza near the Harbor Springs Airport. They have a warehousing facility in the back. They have been looking for a 4,000-5,000sf building for their business which is expanding. It is difficult to find anywhere to rent or buy in Emmet County that will work for them so they are working on this proposal and would build an 8,000sf building to move their warehousing and shipping facilities too. They manufacture their product in Grand Rapids and have it shipped here to utilize packaging machines and pallets to ship it out to their customers. It is low impact and they currently have one to two semis per week. If their market share increased to 10% (currently 2%) they’d likely have one per day. They make joint flashings for fiber cement siding. Emily Walda explained that here they use a shrink wrap machine, put it in boxes, and put it on pallets to ship.

Eby opened the floor to public comment.

Fred Hollerback stated that he feels that this would be a big change to the neighborhood and doesn’t fit with what is around it. His house faces the direction of their proposal and he also owns another three residential lots. They are proposing six buildings and this is a lot for that piece of property. There are many other considerations including traffic, lighting, dust, etc.

AJ Hollerback stated that he just bought his first house next to this property and is concerned about what this type of development would do to his property value.

Michael Hall stated that he owns the property adjacent to Louie’s and his property value instantly went down when that store went in. What would it be worth after warehouses are placed in his back yard? He is also concerned about the traffic and stated that the accident rate at Louie’s is unreal since they went in and this proposal would be adding semis going in daily. He stated that he is on the fire and rescue department.

Paul Mooradian, developer of Keystone Park to the east stated that he bought that land 22 years ago as the former Drayton Industrial Park. It had been rezoned but never developed. A big portion still remains undeveloped; they are about halfway built out now. There is plenty of vacant, viable, industrial
use zoned properties. He stated that he understands the PUD tool. The Future Land Use Map has bubbles, not defined areas. Mixed uses don’t necessarily mean that industrial uses blend with residential uses; sometimes it is meant to mix existing uses together. The Waldas are proposing to basically add an I-1 use to a residential area. I-1 and B-2 as a special use are the only districts that can have warehousing and storage. Some of the strategies and goals of the Master Plan include infilling first and using the properly zoned properties first. There are already PUDs in the area of Ellsworth Farmer’s Exchange and Sid Baker Masonry property. Also MDOT requirements should be kept in mind. He stated that he knows what it takes to have an entrance that accommodates semis and the current restrictions on the Louie’s entrance should be looked into. This could create a problem with how that access is used. Mooradian stated that he feels that this would be spot-zoning.

Fred Hollerback stated that he is all for something being developed or done but doesn’t think that this matches what is around it. He stated that he owns a 5 acre parcel up the road that also has a PUD layover on it and he understands the value of it but this would affect many surrounding properties.

White stated that she noticed many residential properties when she went out to the site. They are not all built on yet but it seems to be the intention to place homes there. They were there first; shouldn’t we look at that? Doernenburg explained that this is part of the decision process to determine if the request is consistent with the surrounding uses. While stated that she feels we should wait for the Township Board to review the case. Alexander asked if the primary issue from the township’s point of view is that they thought it was spot zoning. Doernenburg stated that this is what the meeting notes indicate.

Mooradian showed on the PowerPoint where the houses are along the area. He also noted that he has no friends in the neighborhood because of his industrial park. Hollerback stated that he feels that this request would be better suited in an area such as Keystone.

Scheel made a motion to postpone this case and send back to Littlefield Township for their Board to review. The motion was supported by Neal and passed unanimously by voice vote of the members present.

4. Case #PSPR17-011 Michael Hauger for Joseph Hauger, SITE PLAN REVIEW-AMENDMENT, 7983 Reed Rd, Section 28, Carp Lake Township

Legal Notice: A request by Michael Hauger for Joseph Hauger for a Site Plan Review amendment of the site at 7963 Reed Road, Section 28, Carp Lake Township. The property is zoned FF-2 Farm and Forest and is tax parcel 24-03-06-28-200-012. The request is per Article 20 of the Zoning Ordinance. The original use was approved in 2006 as a Forest Production and Harvesting operation.

Packet Items: Request & location map, application, site plan review checklist, impact statement, site plan, 2006 PC minutes, 2006 approved site plan, zoning evaluation form, email from Carp Lake Township.

Doernenburg presented this case. The property is located on the southwest corner of Reed and Schmalzried Roads and is zoned FF-2. The parcel is a 5 acre parcel and has an existing forest product harvesting business that was approved in 2006. Doernenburg explained that she saw the site when travelling in this area during the US-31 road construction. She noticed that the logs and equipment were being stored close to the road. When she compared the approved site plan she requested that the applicant come into compliance or amend their existing site plan. The amended request is to have log storage on the north side of the building meeting the setbacks. Other storage areas would be on the south side of the building and the west side of the property. The township reviewed and recommended approval seeing no issues with the request. The site is located west of...
the Emmet County owned property that is a resource extraction site used periodically. The drive is approved at its existing location. The building exists and there is no proposed expansion. The proposed site plan was shown as well as photos of the site. A letter of support has been received from Haggard’s Plumbing & Heating.

Michael Hauger was present.

White asked if this is where the logs were approved to be originally. Hauger stated that his dad went through the process and these logs have been there since day one. Doernenburg stated that the 2012 aerial shows them there; it has been occurring for a long time. She added that the applicant has been very cooperative and we have received no complaints about the operation.

There was no public comment on this case.

Scott made a motion to approve Case #PSPR17-011, Michael Hauger for Joe Hauger for Site Plan Review – amendment for a logging and log processing facility, on property located at 7963 Reed Road, Section 28, Carp Lake Township, tax parcel 24-03-06-28-200-006, as shown on the site plan dated Received Oct 4, 2017 because the standards of Article 8 and 20 have been met or they do not apply and are waived and because Carp Lake Township has recommended approval. The motion was supported by Urman and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Neal, Scott, Scheel, Laughbaum, Urman, White, Alexander. No: None. Absent: Drier.

5. Case #PPUD17-017 Zachary Goodwin, SPECIAL USE PERMIT-HOME OCCUPATION, 1050 Maplewood Dr, Section 11, Bear Creek Township

Legal Notice: A request by Zachary John Goodwin for a Special Use Permit for a Level 2 Home Occupation to refurbish items at his residence at 1050 Maplewood Dr, Section 11, Bear Creek Township. The property is zoned FF-1 Farm and Forest and is tax parcel 24-01-19-11-100-005. The request is per Section 26.11 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Packet Items: Request & location map, tax parcel map, application, home occupation use plan & impact statement, 10/06/17 aerial site plan, site plan review checklist, Fire Dept review, HD review, GIS map, floor plan, zoning evaluation form, Bear Creek Township minutes, Fire Dept review/requirements.

Doernenburg presented this case. The parcel is located south of Atkins Road and on Maplewood Dr just before it becomes a seasonal road. The parcel is zoned FF-1. The aerial and proposed site plan were shown. There is an existing garage and the applicant proposes to use 500sf of that building. The ordinance allows for up to 600sf of an accessory building to be used for a home occupation. The township has asked that a divider be placed in order to distinguish the home occupation section from the residential use section. Photos of the site were shown. There is a farm use across the street. No additional construction is proposed. The hours of operation are to be M-Th 5:30pm-7pm, F 9am-5pm, Sat 9am-2pm. One car average per day is expected and the applicant indicated that he'd likely be picking up the items himself and bringing them back. The existing drive is to be used and the Road Commission has no issue with them using the existing driveway. The Fire Department review included requiring that they be provided information on storage and use of flammable and combustible liquids, that portable fire extinguishers are provided, and that a Knox Box be installed. The township has recommended approval.

Zach and Casey Goodwin were present.

Doernenburg stated that they discussed the process a lot at the township meeting. The applicant is
bringing in metal materials, sandblasting them, putting on a powder coat, and then finishing in an oven. Urman added that waste is to be hauled by a licensed hauler/recycler. Alexander stated that it doesn't appear to have any real environmental impact. White asked if the farmer had called with issues. Doemenburg stated that she did receive a call from someone that was notified but they just had questions and no issues.

There was no public comment on this case.

Scheel made a motion to approve Case #PSUP17-017, Zackary John Goodwin, Special Use Permit for a Home Occupation to operate a refurbishing business at 1050 Maplewood Dr, Section 11, Bear Creek Township as outlined in the Home Occupation Use Plan and as shown on the site plan both dated 10/6/2017 because the use meets the standards of Section 26.11, the use will not conflict with the residential character of the neighborhood, only people living on the premises may be employees of the home occupation, no outdoor storage is permitted, hours of operation are to be M-Th 5:30pm-7pm, F 9am-5pm, Sat 9am-2pm, scrap materials are to be recycled by a licensed recycler and all other waste material be disposed of in a legal manner. The motion was supported by Neal and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Neal, Scott, Scheel, Laughbaum, Urman, White, Alexander. No: None. Absent: Drier.

6. Case #PPUD17-003  Aaron Miller & John Petre, PRELIMINARY PUD, 1912 Plains Rd & 7575 Woodland Rd, Section 11, Maple River Township

Legal Notice: A request by Aaron Miller and John Petre for a Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) rezoning on their properties located at 1912 Plains Road and 7575 Woodland Road in Section 11 of Maple River Township. Tax parcel 24-09-14-11-400-002 is zoned FF-2 Farm and Forest and tax parcel 24-09-14-11-100-002 is zoned FF-1 Farm and Forest and SR Scenic Resource. The request is to rezone to PUD to allow the Principal and Special Uses listed in the FF Farm and Forest Zoning Districts and portable shed construction, woodworking business and other similar family occupations. The request includes modification of the Perimeter Setback to allow existing buildings to be used for the business – any new construction would meet the minimum fifty ft. PUD perimeter setback. The proposal does not include the portion of the property zoned SR Scenic Resource on the northwest corner of 7575 Woodland Road. Review will be per Articles 17 and Section 27.11 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Packet Items: Request & location map, tax parcel, aerial, application, impact statement, site plan review checklist, 10/09/17 site plan, Future Land Use Map, Zoning plan, zoning evaluation form, Maple River Township meeting minutes.

This request for Planned Unit Development (PUD) rezone includes two properties that total approximately 198.5 acres. Parcel 400-002 is approximately 78.5 acres and 100-002 is 120 acres. These were both shown on the aerial view. The area along the creek is SR zoned and therefore won't be included in the PUD request as this is not allowed. The proposal is to rezone the property to PUD to allow all FF uses plus construction of portable sheds, wood working businesses, and other similar family occupations. Doemenburg showed the concept sketched plan and explained that if approved for the preliminary, the applicants would have to come back with a formal site plan for final review. The buildings shown on the site plan for 1912 Plains Road are existing buildings. The majority of the land is used for agricultural purposes. The township has recommended approval and their notes from their meeting were emailed and passed out tonight. Doemenburg read through the reasons for approval given by the township which include 1) establishment of a PUD area is the stated goal of the township board and the county planning commission, 2) proposed use is in accordance with the stated goal by the applicants for providing home based and family run businesses to supplement traditional farming.
3) reuse and repair of existing large farm building is in the interest of the community, 4) minor setback variance on south is offset by dense and complete existing screening, 5) setback on west side is because of existing building reuse and neighboring property is Amish owned and may at some point become part of the PUD, and 6) other distances are large and supported by neighboring property owners.

Doernenburg noted that the setback modification would be for the area on the south for the existing building only on tax parcel 400-002. The surrounding uses are agricultural. The Future Land Use Map was shown, this area is shown as rural residential. The PUD can overlay all except the area in the SR zone. Photos of the property were shown. The existing and proposed zoning maps were shown. Doernenburg showed a slide that listed the questions to consider for a preliminary PUD review which were also included in the staff report for the case. She noted that the policy is to postpone rezoning for one month in order to have time to review and for the township to review. Since we have the township approval recommendation, it is up to the board if they want to waive this policy or to hold to it.

The applicants Aaron Miller and John Petre were present and thanked the board for looking at the request. Petre noted that there is a lot of existing screening.

Laughbaum asked what happens if the large building is removed or damaged; would the setback waiver line stay the same? Doernenburg stated that it would be permanent in that location just in front of the building.

Eby opened the floor to public comment.

Paul Mooradian asked what overlays are being requested. Doernenburg reviewed the request again. Eby explained that we have been looking at the businesses individually but the PUD option would allow a lot of them to be covered.

White asked what would happen if the property were to be sold and re-used. Would the new owner be able to use the PUD as well? Eby stated that they would be able but only if they conformed to the specifically approved uses. This PUD request is for specific uses only.

Laughbaum stated that he is not really worried about what the current owners will do with the property but down the road a family business could be interpreted to be a full-blown industrial use. He wants to see the applicants be able to use their property in the way that they want but feels we may be opening up a door. Family businesses is a big door to open. Scheel stated they would have to modify the PUD if they wanted to do something different than what was approved. Scott stated that it is only preliminary at this point. More details will come with the site plan. Eby added that the site plan can be used to constrain the uses as well.

Scheel stated that he feels that rezoning is a big deal and feels that each item on the questions to review list should be gone over specifically.

Laughbaum stated that the nature of the use is woodworking; would they have to come back in to get a modification for a sawmill? Eby stated that a sawmill would be a separate request as there is a separate section in the ordinance that deals with this use. They are not asking for this.

Eby read through each of the rezoning standards aloud. The Planning Commission shall review and apply the following standards and factors in the consideration of any rezoning request.
A. Is the proposed rezoning consistent with the current Master Plan?
B. Are all of the allowable uses in the proposed district reasonably consistent with surrounding uses?
C. Will there be an adverse physical impact on surrounding properties?
D. Have there been changes in land use or other conditions in the immediate area or in the community in general which justify rezoning?
E. Will rezoning create a deterrent to the improvement or development of adjacent property in accord with existing regulations?
F. Will rezoning grant a special privilege to an individual property owner when contrasted with other property owners in the area or the general public (i.e. will rezoning result in spot zoning)?
G. What is the impact on the ability of the County and other governmental agencies to provide adequate public services and facilities, and/or programs that might reasonably be required in the future if the proposed amendment is adopted?
H. A zoning ordinance amendment approved by the Planning Commission shall not increase any inconsistency that may exist between the zoning ordinance or structures or uses and any airport zoning regulations, airport layout plan, or airport approach plan.

Scheel asked if there was any concern about the large building being used for these uses. Eby replied that there have been no complaints.

Eby stated that D) asks if there have been changes in land use or other conditions in the immediate area or in the community in general which justify rezoning; we've been approving the uses individually and the nature of the community has changed. Item F) asks will rezoning grant a special privilege to an individual property owner when contrasted with other property owners in the area or the general public (spot zoning). Eby stated that we are looking at the whole community not spot zoning. G) asks what is the impact on the ability of County and other governmental agencies to provide adequate public services and facilities and/or programs that might reasonably be required in the future if the proposed amendment is adopted. Scheel stated that this would be in reference to roads and it doesn't sound like there will be a vast increase in trucks and/or road usage. Eby added that contracts have already been signed to improve roads past this point.

Scott stated that he doesn’t see any spot zoning issues and feels it is very compatible with farm use which is the zoning of the whole area. Laughbaum stated that we may be doing this with good intent but may be opening a door. Scott stated that as long as we are very specific at the next review that door can be closed. The applicants should start to think about the specific uses that they want for that review. Scheel stated that he doesn’t want unintended consequences.

Scott stated that he doesn’t see in this case that we’d learn anything new that we can't handle during the final review and doesn’t see a reason to not let the process to move forward. The review standards appeared to have been met.

Scott made a motion supported by Laughbaum to waive the second hearing for the preliminary PUD review. The motion passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Neal, Scott, Scheel, Laughbaum, Urman, White, Alexander. No: None. Absent: Drier.

Scott then made a motion to recommend approval of Case # PPUD17-003, Aaron Miller and John Petre for a Preliminary Planned Unit Development Rezoning on property located at 1912 Plains Road and 7575 Woodland Road, Section 11, Maple River Township, tax parcels 24-09-14-11-400-002 & 100-002, as shown on the Proposed PUD – Preliminary Development Plans dated Received October 9, 2017 because the standards for the PUD and a Rezoning have been met, the proposal is consistent with the Emmet County Master Plan, and because the township has recommended approval. The

Emmet County Planning Commission 11/02/2017
uses include all FF Farm and Forest uses, and portable shed construction, wood working businesses and other similar family occupations as determined by the Planning Commission during Final Review. The approval includes a modification of the perimeter setback only for the existing building on parcel 400-002 as shown on the Preliminary Property Sketch dated Oct 9, 2017. The proposal does not include the portion of the property zoned SR Scenic Resource on the northwest corner of 7575 Woodland Road. The motion was supported by Urman and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Neal, Scott, Scheel, Laughbaum, Urman, White, Alexander. No: None. Absent: Drier.

IV  Public Comments:

Paul Mooradian asked why a 200acre PUD overlay is needed for woodworking businesses. Why do we need so much space? He stated that he is surprised that it's that large of a zone. Laughbaum stated that the thinking is that the predominance of land use is FF and this overlay will allow them to put the businesses wherever it's approved. Eby stated that this is a long term process which has been discussed since last spring.

White stated that she would like to discuss historically how this will work if sold. Doernenburg explained that zoning districts and Special Land Use approvals run with the land and therefore decisions made will affect the future. She gave the example of Bay Harbor as a PUD; they have a mixture of uses and this is a tool to allow this. You do have to think long term as it runs with the land. Laughbaum stated that it is very gracious to give this much area. Most other PUDs seem to be pinched in more.

Fred Hollerback asked why it wasn't smaller so it can be designated and contained.

White asked the applicant if they plan to do the businesses in smaller areas of the property. Petre stated that they will, the PUD route for their properties was recommended for their plan. They are following the County guidelines in regards to employees which will be specified in the final review.

V   Other Business:

1. Friendship Township request-Zoning Ordinance amendment: Friendship Township has requested that standards be placed in the Zoning Ordinance which would require newly created lots in RR and SR zones to be straight. Doernenburg stated that the text was originally created in 1993 to be added to the definitions section of our ordinance. Some approvals have gone through that have not had straight property lines. She stated that the way she interprets this is that it is a definition not a standard. The township wants the property lines to be straight and not meandering. Cynthia Donahey is present from the township. Donahey stated that she'd like to respond to any questions the board has. She stated that in 1993 there was a fairly lengthy process that their Planning Committee at the time went through. Neil Marzella wrote the request as he was chair at that point. She stated that the lots that go between the road and the lake are generally a strip. When zoning came in and said lots need to be a specific size, some were created by using meandering lines to create the conforming lot sizes. The township requests that the lines only meander if there is a topological issue. When the new ordinance came into effect, there were many lots that showed up with the meandering lines again. The assessor then asked the township what could be done about it. At this point this definition is no longer being enforced or followed as it is not considered a zoning standard. The township requests that this definition be put into the standards for SR zones as it is zoned this way to protect scenic resources. More houses
crammed in means less protection for scenic resources. They are also concerned on Shore Drive and Lamkin Rd that there is room for fire protection and emergency services. Laughbaum stated that it doesn’t seem to be zoning issue but a land division issue. He doesn’t see that many lots along the lake and putting more regulations on them is essentially stealing the land from the owners and an alternative method to stop development. He doesn’t see any reason for it. Each time another regulation comes in, it is more necessary to have meandering property lines to make sure a conforming parcel can be made. Eby stated that he sees these examples and what they are trying to solve but what are the further ramifications? Perhaps the land division ordinance for the township should be tweaked instead as a zoning code change affects the whole county. It may be more appropriate to do it that way. Urman agreed. Scott stated that option seems to be a good solution if the township feels that they need to do so. He understands the thought behind it but the zoning ordinance sets up lot sizes and specific requirements for the district. This would be awfully restrictive if set up for the whole county. There are places it will make sense not to have straight lot lines. Scheel stated that if the land division ordinance can take care of it this would be the proper way.

2. Essentials of Planning & Zoning Workshop and MAP conference-Doernenburg noted that there were several attendees for these workshops. Scheel stated that the MAP conference was incredibly valuable and every session he learned something from. There was great networking and he highly recommended going. White stated that the three commissioners that sit on this board were all there and they thought that everyone should have the opportunity to come and get a refresher course and that this should be paid for by the county as further training because things change all of the time. Neal stated that the presenter at the workshop he went to is local and seemed very up to date on information. It is nice to have another resource. Doernenburg stated that the presenter was Brad Neumann and she’s asked him to come and do a workshop for the Planning Commission on ‘very serious consequences’ which he said he can do sometime in February or March.

3. Enforcement Report-There was some discussion on the cases and some updates.

4. Michigan Medical Marihuana update-Doernenburg stated that Cross Village has adopted an opt-out-resolution. She hasn’t received a copy of it yet. This is the fifth township so far. Little Traverse Township is reviewing next week. She noted that LARA has updates on the latest rules. As of 12/15/17 the State will be taking applications.

5. Farming-Accessory Uses-Doernenburg stated that there is a meeting scheduled next week with the Bay View Wine Trail representatives. They have an economic study they’d like to present.

6. By-laws-Doernenburg noted that the by-laws have been distributed. Review them and suggest any changes to be made at the next meeting.

7. Recreation Plan update- Doernenburg stated that she had mailed the plan with the packets but that there have been some minor changes made. The vision statement is changed, the member names updated/corrected, the top goals for the next five years have been listed. She asked for a motion to have the chair sign a resolution to move the draft plan forward for public review. Likely this board will see this again for the first meeting in January 2018. Scott made a motion to authorize the chair to sign the resolution. The motion was supported by White and passed on following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Neal, Scott, Scheel, Laughbaum, Urman, White, Alexander. No: None. Absent: Drier.

8. Trinity Mission Church- Doernenburg distributed a site plan that shows a vestibule that the church would like to add. It is a two-story for accessibility and an elevator. She stated that she didn’t feel comfortable approving administratively without this board looking at the plan first.
They will be displacing five parking spaces but they have two more than required. The aerial was shown. There will be no more impervious surfaces. The dumpster is shown as screened on the plan and the lighting needs to be brought into compliance; both items have been agreed to by the applicant. Neal asked if there are any height issues. No. Scott made a motion to allow the administrator to administratively approve this plan as a minor deviation. The motion was supported by Neal and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Neal, Scott, Scheel, Laughbaum, Urman, White, Alexander. No: None. Absent: Drier.

9. Hay Lake Marina: Doemenburg reported that Littlefield Township is moving forward with this project and park. The plans were shown. The store/marina building is not being built at this time. They are working on dredging now. Working toward this being a viable marina again and accessed by Crooked River with a park, boat parking, and launch.

VI Adjournment

There being no other business Eby called the meeting adjourned at 9:35 p.m.

__________________________  __________________________
James Scott, Secretary  Date
Tammy Doernenburg

From: plnarff@racc2000.com
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2017 9:46 AM
To: Tammy Doernenburg
Subject: RE: 2514 N US 31 Hwy

Tammy, Our main concern is Egress, Getting in and out year around, it does not appear that has changed, therefore I have no problem,

Thank You
Randolph L. Bricker Sr.
Pellston Fire Chief

------- Original Message -------
From : Tammy Doernenburg[mailto:tdoernenburg@emmetcounty.org]
Sent : 11/13/2017 4:59:08 PM
To : plnarff@racc2000.com
Cc :
Subject : RE: 2514 N US 31 Hwy

Hi Randy,

This plan has been revised. Would you have any concerns regarding this proposal?

Thank you.

Tammy

*******************************************************************************

Tammy Doernenburg

Director, Emmet County Planning & Zoning

434 Harbor-Petoskey Rd, Suite E

Harbor Springs, MI 49740

1
231-439-8998 (direct line)
231-439-8933 (fax)
231-348-1735 (main office line)

www.emmetcounty.org
ZONING EVALUATION FORM
Office of Planning and Zoning
Emmet County, MI

DATE: 11/13/2017 

CASE #: PSPR17-008

APPLICANT: ALPHA INVECON LLC – James Shondel

PROPERTY: 2514 N US 31 HWY

TOWNSHIP: MCKINLEY

REQUEST: Site Plan Review – Multiple Family Housing and accessory storage buildings

FACTS: -Revised Site Plan received 11/3/2017 – report based on that revised plan
- The property is zoned R-2 General Residential and FF-2 Farm and Forest.
- The entire property is 6.13 acres in area. The portion zoned R-2 is 2.08 acres.
- The property was used for a dwelling and motel. The existing buildings are being remodeled. A garage/accessory building is located on the south side of the proposed driveway. The proposal is to add 1 multiple family building (reduced from 2 buildings).
- Proposal is to allow 12 one-bedroom units and 2 two-bedroom units. Density standards met. No change to density in revised plan.
- The site is adjacent to residential uses.
- Access is through an existing drive. MDOT preliminary review shows the location approved and a paved approach will be required.
- The proposed buildings meet the setback standards of the Zoning District.
- Proposed new building is “L” shaped – 110’8”x30’+94’4”x30’.
- Parking appears to meet Zoning Ordinance standards. Each space is 10’x20’ and allows for 2 parking spaces per unit. Two barrier free parking spaces have been provided.
- Multiple family use is a permitted use in the R-2 zoning district.
- Parking lot proposed to be gravel. Sealed drainage plan required. Estimated cost of drainage system is not provided.
- Two private wells and two septic/drainfield locations shown on the site plan. Health Department preliminary review received indicates mound system, but that an official evaluation is needed to determine exact requirements for sanitary facilities.
- Properties to the north are zoned the same as the subject parcel. East, west and south are all zoned FF-2 Farm and Forest.
- Dumpster shown on the plan behind the existing accessory building. Details indicate decorative concrete.
- Buildings are single story-14 feet to the peak.
- Ample snow storage area shown on plan.
- Trees provided based on number of parking spaces meet minimum Ordinance standards.
- Revised plan has been submitted to Fire Chief by P&Z staff for review. No concerns.
- Outdoor lighting identified. Lighting Committee review needed for outdoor lighting.
- No drainage plan submitted to date. Applicant’s representative has requested conditional approval and sealed drainage plan required before issuance of a Zoning
Permit.

- Storage units 9'x53' proposed at the rear of the residential units.
- Storage units meet maximum size standards of the Zoning Ordinance.

Staff Comments:

Due to high water-table noted by Health Department, drainage plan, performance guarantee, and as-built plans should be required. Storage units are proposed to be container units. These, if permitted, could only be accessory to the permitted use in the R-2 Zoning District.

ZONING ORDINANCE STANDARDS:

Section 20.05 - Site Plan Review Standards

The Planning Commission shall approve, or approve with conditions, an application for a site plan only upon a finding that the proposed site plan complies with all applicable provisions of this Ordinance and the standards and considerations listed below unless the Planning Commission waives a particular standard upon a finding that the standard is not applicable to the proposed development under consideration and the waiver of that standard will not be significantly detrimental to surrounding property or to the intent of the Ordinance.

A. COMPLIANCE WITH DISTRICT REQUIREMENTS: The site plan shall comply with the district requirements for minimum floor space, height of building, lot size, yard space, density and all other requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance, unless otherwise provided. This standard appears to be met.

B. VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION: Safe, convenient, uncontested, and well-defined vehicular and pedestrian circulation shall be provided for ingress/egress points and within the site. A pedestrian circulation system shall be provided and shall be as insulated as completely as reasonably possible from the vehicular circulation system. Drives, streets and other circulation routes shall be designed to promote safe and efficient traffic operations within the site and at ingress/egress points. The arrangement of public or common ways for vehicular and pedestrian circulation shall respect the pattern of existing or planned streets and pedestrian or bicycle pathways in the area. Streets and drives which are part of an existing or planned street pattern which serves the project area shall be capable of safely and effectively accommodating the traffic volume and pattern proposed by the project. Where possible, shared commercial access drives shall be encouraged.

MDOT has approved the vehicular access location - existing. They should be required as indicated below:

1. Walkways from parking areas to building entrances
   No walkways are proposed.

   a. Internal pedestrian walkways shall be developed for persons who need access to the building(s) from internal parking areas. The walkways shall be located within the parking areas and shall be designed to provide access from these areas to the entrances of the building(s).

   b. The walkways shall be designed to separate people from moving vehicles.
c. These walkways shall have a minimum width of five (5) feet with no car overhang or other obstruction.

d. The walkways must be designed in accordance with the Michigan Barrier Free Design Standards.

e. The walkways shall be distinguished from the parking and driving areas by use of any of the following materials: special pavers, bricks, raised elevation or scored concrete. Other materials may be used if they are appropriate to the overall design of the site and building and acceptable to the review authority.

C. EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS: All buildings or groups of buildings shall be so arranged as to permit emergency vehicle access by some practical means to all sides. 

*Revised Site Plan submitted by P&Z staff to Fire Chief for review.*

D. LOADING AND STORAGE: All loading and unloading areas and outside storage areas which face or are visible from residential districts or public thoroughfares, shall be screened, by a vertical screen consisting of structural or plant materials of sufficient height to obscure the direct view from adjacent first floor elevations. The site plan shall provide for adequate storage space for the use therein. 

N/A.

E. SNOW STORAGE: Proper snow storage areas shall be provided so to not adversely affect neighboring properties, vehicular and pedestrian clear vision, and parking area capacity. *Shown on plan.*

F. BUFFERS: To provide reasonable visual and sound privacy, buffer techniques, screening, fences, walls, greenbelts, and landscaping may be required by the Planning Commission in pursuance of the objectives of this Section and/or as a condition of the establishment of the proposed use.

*Screening exists on north and east property lines – shown to remain. No screening on subject property from south property, however, screening exists on south property.*

G. DRAINAGE: Storm water drainage plans shall address flows onto the site from adjacent sites and roads, storm water impact on the site (soils, impervious surfaces, potential impervious surface, retention ponds, detention ponds, and related management facilities as appropriate), and the storm water outfall, or flow control into adjacent drainage courses, ditches and the like.

The drainage plan shall indicate the manner in which surface drainage is to be disposed of. This may require making use of the existing ditches, natural watercourses, or constructing tributaries, but shall not result in storm water that exits the detention pond and/or property site at an erosive velocity. Additional hard surfaces proposed for a site must provide for detention and/or retention. The minimum requirements for retention and detention facilities are as follows: For sandy sites the volume of retention and/or detention shall be equal to the volume of 1 and ½" of water depth multiplied by the area of additional hard surface. For all sites other than sand, the volume of the retention and/or detention shall be equal to the volume generated from 2" of water depth multiplied by the area of additional hard surface. Both detention and retention facilities must be designed to assure that water is released
within 72 hours. Detention facilities are to have a pipe no larger than 4" exiting the ponds at a grade no greater than 1%.

All storm water drainage plans shall be sealed by a Michigan Registered Professional Civil Engineer. The Planning Commission may waive the requirement, defer the requirement, or determine that a fully engineered storm drainage plan is not necessary, or can be deferred to a future date. Improvement guarantees shall be required, unless waived by the Planning Commission, for all storm water drainage plans in the form and amount acceptable by the Planning Commission to guarantee completion of the project in accordance with the conditions of the zoning permit. The performance guarantee will be released upon final inspection and approval by the Zoning Administrator, and receipt of sealed as built plans for storm water drainage.

Storm water retention basins designed to keep a fixed pool of water shall include one or more of the following safety features: 1) safety ledge(s) at least (10) feet wide at the basin perimeter, 2) vegetation surrounding the basin to discourage wading, or 3) fencing to prevent unauthorized access to basin.

Sandy, for the purpose of this Section, shall be defined as soils that meet a percolation rate consistent with the Emmet County Sanitary Code of 0 to 15 minutes.

No drainage plan submitted. No estimated cost provided.

H. SPACES, RIGHTS-OF-WAY, EASEMENTS: Spaces, rights-of-way, easements, and related site plan elements needed to serve the proposed use or development for such services as fire protection, sanitary sewers, water supplies, solid waste, storm drainage systems, and related. Utility easement shown for overhead electrical on plan.

I. WASTE RECEPTACLES: Waste receptacle and enclosure requirements

Shown behind the accessory building.

1. Receptacles, including waste receptacles, waste compactors, and recycling bins shall be designed, constructed, and maintained according to the requirements of this Section.

2. Waste receptacles, including dumpsters or compactors, shall be required for all nonresidential uses unless interior facilities are provided. The requirement to provide a waste receptacle may be waived by the planning commission if the applicant provides documentation that the development will not necessitate a waste receptacle.

3. All outdoor waste receptacles shall be enclosed on three (3) sides and screened. The enclosure shall be constructed of brick or decorative concrete material, consistent with the building materials of the principal building.

4. The enclosure shall also include a gate, made of wood or other high quality material, as determined by the planning commission, on the fourth side. If the waste receptacle is a dumpster it must have an enclosing lid or cover.
5. The enclosure shall have a minimum height of six (6) feet or one (1) foot above the height of the waste receptacle, whichever is greater, but may not be less than four (4) feet in height.

6. Waste receptacles and enclosures shall be located in the rear yard, not closer than three (3) feet from the rear lot line, or non-required side yard, unless otherwise approved by the planning commission and shall be as far as practical, but in no case be less than twenty (20) feet, from any residential district. If practical, the back side of the waste receptacle enclosure should be placed against the building. In this circumstance the wall may act as one (1) side of the enclosure.

7. Waste receptacles shall be easily accessed by refuse vehicles without potential to damage automobiles parked in designated parking spaces or interfering with the normal movement of vehicles on or off the site.

J. MECHANICAL OR ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT: Mechanical or electrical equipment requirements. None shown.

1. Ground mounted mechanical or electrical equipment, such as blowers, ventilating fans, and air conditioning units are permitted only in side yards or in the rear yard.

2. Mechanical or electrical equipment shall be placed no closer than three (3) feet to any lot line.

3. Any ground, building, or roof mounted mechanical or electrical equipment or utilities, including water and gas meters, propane tanks, utility boxes, transformers, elevator housings, stairways, tanks, heating, ventilation and air conditioning equipment (HVAC), and other similar equipment, shall comply with the following standards:

   a. All such equipment shall be screened by a solid wall, fence, landscaping, and/or architectural features that are compatible in appearance with the principal building.

   b. Roof mounted equipment shall not exceed a height of ten (10) feet above the surrounding roof surface. All roof mounted mechanical units must be screened so they are not visible from ground level, even if not specifically addressed as part of site plan review.

Draft Motions:

To approve Case #PSPR17-008, James Shondel for Alpha Invesco LLC for Site Plan Review – multiple family dwellings, on property located at 2514 N US 31 Hwy, Section 22, McKinley Township, tax parcel 24-10-10-22-100-022, as shown on the site plan dated Received Nov 3, 2017 because the standards of Articles 5, 19, and 20 have been met, and on condition that any exterior lighting be reviewed by the Sign and Lighting Committee and sealed drainage plan which meets the Zoning Ordinance standards with a performance guarantee in the amount of the estimated cost of the drainage system be submitted prior to issuance of a zoning permit, and that the storage units may only be used as accessory to the dwellings, and (other conditions or statement of facts may be inserted here).

To deny Case #PSPR17-008, James Shondel for Alpha Invesco LLC for Site Plan Review – multiple family dwellings, on property located at 2514 N US 31 Hwy, Section 22, McKinley Township, tax parcel 24-10-10-22-100-022, as shown on the site plan dated Received Nov 3, 2017 for the following reasons: (list reasons).
NOTES:
6 ACRE TOTAL LOT SIZE
4 + ACRE FF-1 174,240 S.F.
2 + ACRE R-2 89,176 S.F.
MINIMUM LAND AREA REQUIRED PER DWELLING UNIT
1 BEDROOM UNIT 6000 S.F. (12 UNITS) = 72,000 S.F.
2 BEDROOM UNIT 6000 S.F. (12 UNITS) = 12,000 S.F.
TOTAL REQUIRED AREA OF LAND = 84,000 S.F.
ALL TOWNHOUSE BUILDINGS EXISTING AND PROPOSED S.F. = 6,087
% OF LOT COVERAGE
ALLOWABLE 1/2 ZONING = 36%
% OF LOT COVERAGE ALL BUILDINGS = 10%
ALLOWABLE NET DENSITY UNITS PER ACRE
1 BEDROOM = 7,000 S.F.
TOTAL PROPOSED AND EXISTING 1 BEDROOM UNIT S.F. = 6,087
ALLOWABLE NET DENSITY UNITS PER ACRE
2 BEDROOM = 6,125 S.F.
TOTAL PROPOSED 2 BEDROOM UNIT S.F. = 1,880
REQUIRED PARKING, 2 SPACES PER UNIT FOR 14 UNITS EXISTING AND PROPOSED = 28
SITE DRAINAGE - SITE IS GENERALLY FLAT SLOPES SLIGHTLY TO THE S

FLOOR PLAN OF PROPOSED
6 UNIT (2-1 BR, 2-2 BR) TOWNHOUSE = 4,077 FOOTPRINT S.F.

TYPICAL FRONT ELEVATION NTS.

PROPOSED SITE PLAN
REQUEST

PSUP17-018

A request by Emily Giallombardo for a Special Use Permit for a Home Occupation for a dog grooming business at 6350 E. Mitchell Rd, Section 6, Springvale Township. The property is zoned FF-2 Farm and Forest and is tax parcel 24-14-20-06-400-008. The request is per Articles 8 and 21 and Section 26.11 of the Zoning Ordinance.

LOCATION
APPLICATION FOR ZONING ACTION
EMMET COUNTY OFFICE OF PLANNING, ZONING, AND CONSTRUCTION RESOURCES
3434 HARBOR-PETOSKEY RD, SUITE E, HARBOR SPRINGS, MI 49740
PHONE: (231) 348-1735 FAX: (231) 439-8933 EMAIL: pzcrr@emmetcounty.org

DATE RECEIVED: 10-9-17
$300.00 - 225. refund 10/4/17
FEE

APPLICATION # 10-9-17
DATE PAID

PLEASE MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO: EMETT COUNTY

Applicant's Name: Emily Giannonardo Phone: 231-330-2346
Applicant's Address: 6350 E. Mitchell Rd, Petoskey, MI 49770
Applicant's Email Address: giannonardo@gmail.com

Owner's Name: Douglas Giannonardo Phone: 231-330-2345
Owner's Address: 6350 E. Mitchell Rd, Petoskey, MI 49770
Owner's Email Address: dougiannonardo@gmail.com

JOB SITE LOCATION:
Township: Springdale Tax Parcel #: 24-14-20-064-040-008
Address: 6350 E. Mitchell Rd.

ZONING REQUEST:
Planning Commission:
Special Use Permit ✔
Site Plan Review ☐
Planned Unit Development ☐
Zoning Map Change ☐
Zoning Text Change ☐

REQUIRED USE INFORMATION
Ground floor area main building: 2000 Sq. Ft.
Floor Area accessory building: ____________________________ Sq. Ft.
Lot/Parcel Size: 2.0 Acres ____________________________ Sq. Ft.
Site/Plot Plan required* 2 full sized & 14 reduced sized (max 11"x17") site plans required for Planning Commission cases.

Date Submitted
Elevation Drawing ☐ Site Inventory ☐
Engineered Drainage Plan ☐ Fire Dept Approval ☐
Soil Erosion Permit ☐ Wetlands Permit ☐
Health Dept. Approval/ Road Commission/ ☐
Sewer Taps ☐ MOOT Approval ☐

Date Submitted
Desired Request: Relocate grooming business to a existing building (garage) as a bar & occupancy.

*Please attach a site/plot plan to show property dimensions; front, rear, and side yard setbacks; streets, roads, and all buildings on the lot. Review Section 2405 of the Zoning Ordinance for Site Plan requirements.

RECEIVED

EMMET COUNTY PLANNING & ZONING

Date of Application: 10-9-17
Date Paid: 10-9-17
Date Received: 10-9-17

As owner/and or applicant representing the owner, I do ___ do not ___ authorize Emmet County (staff, appointed board, and/or commissioners, or committee members) to enter upon the subject property for purposes of making inspections related to the project or request identified in this application. If authorized, such inspections or site walks shall be conducted at reasonable hours and times.

I certify that all the above information is accurate to my fullest knowledge:

Signature of Applicant
Printed Name of Applicant

Signature of Property Owner
Printed Name of Property Owner

Date

*Required Signature of Property Owner
PROPOSED HOME OCCUPATION -
USE PLAN and IMPACT STATEMENT  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT</th>
<th>CASE #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emily Gialombardo</td>
<td>P317-013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPERTY LOCATION</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6350 E. Mitchell Rd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY SPACE:</th>
<th>IN RESIDENCE</th>
<th>IN ATTACHED GARAGE</th>
<th>IN DETACHED BUILDING</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DESCRIBE HOME OCCUPATION ACTIVITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pet Grooming</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOURS OF OPERATION</th>
<th>M - F 7:30am - 5:30pm by appointment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOISE CONTROL MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing structure (Natural Screening)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOXIC OR HAZARDOUS MATERIALS INVOLVED:</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| IF YES, HOW WILL TOXIC MATERIALS BE HANDLED ON-SITE AND DISPOSED OF OFF-SITE? |
HOW WILL THE ACTIVITY IMPACT SANITARY SERVICES AND WATER?

None  Septic & well are in place

WHAT MEASURES ARE IN PLACE FOR FIRE PROTECTION?

Smoke detectors, fire extinguisher & CO2 detector

WILL FUMES, ODORS, OR DUST BE GENERATED BY YOUR ACTIVITIES?

YES  NO

WILL YOUR ACTIVITIES GENERATE VEHICLE TRAFFIC?

YES  NO

IF YES, APPROXIMATE NUMBER PER DAY 4-5

WILL YOUR ACTIVITIES GENERATE TRUCK TRAFFIC?

YES  NO

IF YES, TYPE

FREQUENCY

IS STATE OR OTHER LICENSING REQUIRED TO CONDUCT YOUR BUSINESS?

YES  NO

IF YES, DO YOU HAVE A CURRENT LICENSE?

YES  NO

HAVE YOU REVIEWED AND DO YOU UNDERSTAND THE REQUIREMENTS FOR A HOME OCCUPATION ACCORDING TO EMMET COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE?

YES  NO

APPLICANT SIGNATURE

DATE 10-23-17

RECEIVED  OCT 2 3 2017
EMMET COUNTY PLANNING & ZONING
## SITE PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST

**Subject Property Address:** 6350 E. Mitchell Rd.  
**Subdivision and Lot Number (If Applicable):**  
**Tax Parcel Number:** 24-14-20-00-400-008  
**Township:** Springdale  
**Proposed Use of Property:** Pet+Grooming  
**Proposed Number of Employees:** 1-2

### CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Map Information</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Proposed site location map (indicate sufficient area reference to locate site) May use plat map, Google map or other map to identify parcel.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Appropriate scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Date, North Arrow, Street Names (existing and proposed right-of-ways).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Name, Address and Phone Number of person preparing plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Property line dimensions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Basic Zoning Information

<p>| 6 Zoning setback lines - Building (including the eave) Setbacks: Front 53', Side 38', Side 20', Rear/Water 27' | ✓ | | | |
| 7 Distance between buildings (nearest point to nearest point) | ✓ | | | |
| 8 Location of new buildings and general floor plan Dimensions of bldg(s) = x Total sq.ft. = | ✓ | | | existing building |
| 9 Proposed building elevations (to scale) Max. Height = 13' existing | ✓ | | | |
| 10 All existing structures (labeled) within 100 feet of perimeter property lines | ✓ | | | |
| 11 Multiple housing units - Number of units = composition (efficiency, one bedroom, two, three) | ✓ | | | FF-2 &amp; FF-3 |
| 12 Surrounding zoning (properties immediate to subject site) | ✓ | | | FF-2 &amp; FF-3, border |
| 13 Lot coverage of proposed buildings | ✓ | | | 1200 sq ft, existing building |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Natural Features</strong></th>
<th><strong>yes</strong></th>
<th><strong>No</strong></th>
<th><strong>N/A</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Boundaries of existing natural features (trees, lakes, ponds, streams, rock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Aerial</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Has a wetland permit been applied for?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Photo</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Existing topography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Soil analysis is it in a Critical Dune Area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Site Inventory provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Are there scenic view considerations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drainage / Parking / Roads</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Access drives, internal roads (note public or private) service roads; Width of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Loading/unloading, service areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Sidewalks, paths, and trails (internal and public within road right-of-ways).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Acceleration/deceleration lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Road agency approval?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Applied</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Parking areas (dimensioned typical parking space, maneuvering lanes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Parking spaces required 2-3, parking spaces actual 3. Handicap parking location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Required landscaping in parking areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Screening</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Snow storage/snow management plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Dumpster location, screening indication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Existing easements (utility, access) within site limits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Location of Water/well, Sewer/septic, and stormwater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Site grading and drainage plan (on-site elevations for pavements, drives,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Proposed retention/detention sedimentation ponds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OCT 9 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Site Requirements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed landscaping (required greenbelts, plant materials/size and type, fences, retaining walls, earthberms, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Existing Vegetation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of outdoor lights, pole heights, bollards, building attached, luminary shielding techniques*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing light on exterior of building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of sign(s)*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mark on map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site amenities (play area, pools, beaches, tennis courts, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement attached?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire hydrants and fire vehicle access.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Agency approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health agency approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Corps of Engineers approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Department of Environmental Quality approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Applied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Signs and lights will need to be approved by the Emmet County Sign and Lighting Committee.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

RECEIVED

Oct 8 9 2017

EMMET COUNTY PLANNING & ZONING

Applicants Signature

9/26/17 Date
SUP - HOME OCCUPATION

ZONING EVALUATION FORM
Office of Planning and Zoning
Emmet County, MI

DATE: 11/07/2017 CASE #: PSUP17-018

APPLICANT: EMILY J GIALLOMBARDO

PROPERTY: 6350 E MITCHELL RD

TOWNSHIP: SPRINGVALE

REQUEST: Special Use Permit - Home Occupation - Pet Grooming

FACTS:
- The request is for a Home Occupation - Pet Grooming.
- The property is zoned FF-2 Farm and Forest.
- Applicant resides at the property.
- The property is 17.86 acres.
- Request is to use a portion of the residence for the business.
- No additional construction proposed.
- Proposed hours of operation - M-F 7:30AM-5:30 PM - by appointment.
- Four to five cars per day expected.
- Maximum sign permitted is 32 sq. ft. - proposed at drive entrance.
- Proposal to use existing driveway.
- Site distances met for commercial driveway access.
- Crash data provided by Emmet County Road Commission.
- MDOT crash data map for 2016 only provided in this report.
- A child home daycare (up to 6 children) was approved for the site in 1997.
- Owner planning to use existing 32 sq. ft. sign located on US-31 for this property.

ZONING ORDINANCE STANDARDS:

Section 21.02 Special Land Use Review Standards

In reviewing all requests for Special Land Uses the Planning Commission or Zoning Administrator shall require compliance with any of the following as may reasonably apply to the particular use under consideration (See also Article 20 and Section 21.01):

A. Non-detrimental impact upon the surrounding uses in the District, particularly as related to traffic generating potential, servicing by trucks, hours of operation and pedestrian traffic. A traffic impact study may be required by the Planning Commission

B. A large enough size of the parcel or project site to accommodate the use, its future expansion, customary accessory uses and on-site services (such as but not limited to sewage disposal and water supply).
C. Impact of the proposed use on the quality and quantity of water resources, domestic water supplies and capacity to absorb the anticipated sewage disposal demand.

D. Entrance drives to the use and off-street parking areas shall be no less than twenty-five (25) feet from a street intersection (measured from the road right-of-way) or from the boundary of a different Zoning District. Road agency review shall be required.

E. The use does not conflict with the principles, goals, or objectives of the County Comprehensive Plan.

F. Suitability of access to the use, assuring that minor residential streets are not used to serve uses that have larger area-wide patronage.

G. Allowance is made for vehicles to enter and exit the use safely and no visibility impediments to drivers are created by signs, buildings, land uses, plantings, etc.

H. Open spaces and common areas, when offered by an applicant as an integral element of a Planned Unit Development or Special Land Use Project, may be required to be formally assured by one or more of the following instruments: Scenic Easement; Conservation Easement; Deed Restriction; or similar dedication mechanism.

The open space dedication instrument shall name the State, the County, a Local Unit of Government, or a land conservation/conservancy organization, as a party to the instrument, as determined to be most acceptable for the particular property and agency involved.

Definition (Sec. 200):

**HOME OCCUPATION**: An occupation, profession, activity, or use carried out for gain that is secondary to the use of a dwelling unit for residential purposes.

**Section 26.11 Home Occupations**

Home occupations that are operated in accordance with the Definition in Section 2.00, may be approved in any zoning district by the Planning Commission subject to the following conditions:

**Level II**

A. Any structural additions to the home for purposes of operating the occupation shall be of an architectural style that is comparable with the architecture of the existing home, or surrounding homes, and further, is designed so that the addition can readily be used for housing purposes if the occupation is discontinued. No structural changes proposed.

B. Only the occupant or family living on the premises shall conduct the home occupation and no off-premises person(s) shall be employed in connection with the home occupation. This standard appears to be met.
C. If an accessory building is to be used for a home occupation, the building shall be sited, designed, and located on the property in such a manner as to avoid the appearance of a retail store or industrial building, and it shall be readily re-useable for residential purposes if no longer used for the home occupation. Accessory building space for home occupations shall not exceed a total floor area of 600 sq. ft. and shall not exceed one per parcel. This standard is not applicable (a portion of the house proposed to be used for the business.)

D. The Planning Commission shall deny a Special Use Permit for a home occupation in those instances where it is determined that the proposed use would:

1. Lack an occupied residence on the property.

2. Conflict with the residential character of the neighborhood or surrounding area, because of the type of use proposed, or hours of operation, and/or number of vehicles attracted to the site.

3. Have parking, traffic or loading demands that would exceed the carrying capacity of the property, serving streets, or utilities.

4. Require vehicles, machinery, mechanical devices, or equipment that would generate operational nuisances in direct conflict with homes in the vicinity.

5. Require physical design, display, sign or locational features that are inconsistent with the residential character of the area.

E. There shall be no open display of goods, materials or services in connection with a home occupation, and no off-street parking shall be permitted within the setback area.

DRAFT MOTIONS:

Motion to approve Case #PSUP17-018, Emily Goallombardo, Special Use Permit for a Home Occupation to operate a pet grooming business at 6350 E Mitchell Road, Section 6, Springvale Township as outlined in the Home Occupation Use Plan dated Oct 23, 2017 and as shown on the plot plan dated Oct 24, 2017 because the use meets the standards of Section 2102-12, the use will not conflict with the residential character of the neighborhood, only people living on the premises may be employees of the home occupation, hours of operation may be from 7:30AM to 5:30PM, M-F, by appointment and. (other reasons, or conditions may be added).

Motion to deny Case #PSUP17-018, Emily Goallombardo, Special Use Permit for a Home Occupation to operate a pet grooming business at 6350 E Mitchell Road, Section 6, Springvale Township as outlined in the Home Occupation Use Plan dated Oct 23, 2017 and as shown on the plot plan dated Oct 24, 2017 because of the safety concerns at that location of E. Mitchell Road with additional traffic accessing the road, the required access is not in keeping with the residential character of the area or the intent of a Home Occupation, and: (insert additional reasons).
Motion to postpone Case #PSUP17-018, Emily Goallombardo, Special Use Permit for a Home Occupation to operate a pet grooming business at 6350 E Mitchell Road, Section 6, Springvale Township as outlined in the Home Occupation Use Plan dated Oct 23, 2017 and as shown on the plot plan dated Oct 24, 2017 because:

MDOT crash data map – 2016.
https://www.michigantrafficcrashfacts.org/querytool/map?q=0;2016:o24;
CERTIFICATE OF SURVEY

PART OF THE SE1/4 OF SECTION 6, T34N., R4W., SPRINGVALE TWP., EMM. CO., MICH...

7.97 acre parcel...Part of the southeast 1/4 of section 6, T34N., R4W., Springvale Township, Emmet County, Michigan; Beginning at the southeast corner of said section 6; Thence N1°47'00"W 463.14 feet along the east line of said section 6; Thence along the arc of a 1145.92 foot radius curve 145.36 feet (the long chord of which bears NS5°23'30"W 145.27 feet) along the centerline of Mitchell Road; Thence N99°01'33"W 527.53 feet along said centerline; Thence along the arc of a 1145.92 foot radius curve 18.26 feet (the long chord of which bears N89°28'57"W 18.26 feet) along said centerline; Thence leaving said centerline S1°42'10"E 555.25 feet; Thence NS5°44'36"E 690.95 feet along the south line of said section 6 to the point of beginning; Containing 7.97 acres, more or less; Subject to Mitchell Road along the north side thereof, and Berger Road along the east side thereof.

20.00 acre parcel...Part of the southeast 1/4 of section 6, T34N., R4W., Springvale Township, Emmet County, Michigan; Commencing at the southeast corner of said section 6; Thence S85°44'34"W 690.95 feet along the south line of said section 6 to the point of beginning; Thence continuing S86°44'34"W 690.95 feet along said south section line; Thence N1°42'10"W 587.34 feet along the north and south 1/4 line of said section 6; Thence along the arc of a 758.87 foot radius curve 130.46 feet (the long chord of which bears S74°58'27"E 130.30 feet) along the centerline of Mitchell Road; Thence S79°53'57"E 440.71 feet along said centerline; Thence along the arc of a 1455.56 foot radius curve 859.76 feet (the long chord of which bears NS8°10'46"E 867.32 feet); Thence along the arc of a 1145.92 foot radius curve 476.06 feet (the long chord of which bears NS8°09'34"E 472.65 feet) along said centerline; Thence leaving said centerline S1°42'10"E 535.25 feet to the point of beginning; Containing 20.00 acres, more or less; Subject to Mitchell Road along the north side thereof.

[Signature]

MICHAEI A. TROWBRIDGE
LAND SURVEYOR
3775 EDWARDS ROAD
ALANSON, MICHIGAN 49706

FILE NO. 1649
FLD. BK. NO. 16, PG. 78-

DATE 8/4/88. REV. 8/24/88
8. CASE #71-97

Janet Riker, Special Use Permit, to operate a children's Day Care Center from a residence as a Home Occupation, 6340 Mitchell Road, Springvale Township.

A request by Janet Riker for a Home Occupation, Special Use Permit to establish a day care center for up to six children located at 6340 Mitchell Road, Section 6, T34N-R4W, Springvale Township. The parcel is zoned FF-2 Farm and Forest and is Tax Parcel Number 24-20-06-400-005. The request is per Ordinance Section 2102-12.

Springvale Township requested that this case be deferred for their review. The applicant was present and upset because she was not notified of this change.

Staff explained that the applicant is asking for a home occupation for a state licenced day care center. There were no public comments.

Conrad made a motion, supported by Eby, to approve the request by Janet Riker for a Home Occupation, Special Use Permit to establish a day care center for up to six children located at 6340 Mitchell Road, Section 6, T34N-R4W, Springvale Township because the applicant is aware and will oblige by all the Home Occupation rules and on condition that the Township approve the request. The motion carried on the following roll call vote: Yes; Harris, Conrad, Eby, Desy, Gregory, Jones, Ledingham, Tanton, Veurink. No; none. Absent; none.
REQUEST

PSUP17-008

A request by Larry Williams for a modification of the site plan for the Special Use Permit resource extraction operation at 7672 Moore Road in Section 9 of Littlefield Township. The property is zoned R-1 One & Two Family and is tax parcel 24-07-17-09-300-001. The request is to modify the site plan by changes in the setbacks to: 200’ from the road right-of-way, 250’ from the north property line, 100’ from the south property line, and 50’ from the west property line. The review is per Articles 20, 22, and Section 26.10 of the Zoning Ordinance.

LOCATION
APPLICATION FOR ZONING ACTION
EMMET COUNTY OFFICE OF PLANNING, ZONING,
AND CONSTRUCTION RESOURCES
3434 HARBOR-PETOSKEY RD, SUITE E, HARBOR SPRINGS, MI 49740
PHONE: (231) 348-1735 FAX: (231) 439-8933 EMAIL: pzer@emmetcounty.org

10/19/17
DATE RECEIVED
$300.00 + 7.00 COPIES
FEE

PSUP-17-008
APPLICATION #
10/19/17
DATE PAID

PLEASE MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO: EMMET COUNTY

Applicant's Name Larry R. Williams Phone 231.838.9242
Applicant's Address 8196 Milton Road, Alanson, MI 49706-9741
Applicant's Email Address WilliamsExcavatingInc @ aol.com
Owner's Name Williams Excavating, Inc. Phone 231.347.2632
Owner's Address 8196 Milton Road, Alanson, MI 49706-9741
Owner's Email Address WilliamsExcavatingInc @ aol.com

JOB SITE LOCATION:
Township: Littlefield Tax Parcel #: 24-07-17-09-300-001
Address: 7672 Moore Rd.

ZONING REQUEST:
Planning Commission:
Special Use Permit ☑
Site Plan Review ☐
Planned Unit Development ☐
Zoning Map Change ☐
Zoning Text Change ☐

REQUIRED USE INFORMATION
Ground floor area main building:_______ Sq. Ft.
Floor Area accessory building:_______ Sq. Ft.
Lot/Parcel Size:_______ Acres_______ Sq. Ft.
Site/Pot Plan required*
2 full sized & 14 reduced sized (max 11"x17")
site plans required for Planning Commission cases.

Date Submitted
Elevation Drawing ☐
Engineered Drainage Plan ☐
Soil Erosion Permit ☐
Health Dept. Approval/ ☐
Sewer Taps ☐

Date Submitted
Site Inventory ☐
Fire Dept Approval ☐
Wetlands Permit ☐
Road Commission/ ☐
MDOT Approval ☐

*Please attach a site/plot plan to show:
property dimensions; front, rear, and side
yard setbacks; streets, roads, and all
buildings on the lot.
Review Section 2405 of the Zoning
Ordinance for Site Plan requirements.

Other:
As owner and/or applicant representing the owner, I do ☑ do not ☐ authorize Emmet County (staff, appointed
board, and/or commissioners, or committee members) to enter upon the subject property for purposes of making
inspections related to the project or request identified in this application. If authorized, such inspections or site-
walls shall be conducted at reasonable hours and times.

I certify that all the above information is accurate to my fullest knowledge:

Larry R. Williams
Signature of Applicant

Printed Name of Applicant

Williams Excavating, Inc.
Printed Name of Property Owner

10-19-17
Date

SCANNED
## SITE PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST

**Subject Property Address:** 7672 Moore Road, Alanson, MI 49706  
**Subdivision and Lot Number (If Applicable):**  
**Tax Parcel Number:** 24-07-17-09-300-001  
**Township:** Littlefield  
**Proposed Use of Property:** Resource Extraction  
**Proposed Number of Employees:** 4

### CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Map Information</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Proposed site location map (indicate sufficient area reference to locate site) May use plat map, Google map or other map to identify parcel.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Separate map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Appropriate scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Date, North Arrow, Street Names (existing and proposed right-of-ways).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Name, Address and Phone Number of person preparing plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Property line dimensions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Basic Zoning Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Zoning Information</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Zoning setback lines Building (including the eave) Setbacks: Front <em>SO</em> Side <em>SO</em> Side <em>SO</em> Rear/Water <em>SO</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Distance between buildings (nearest point to nearest point)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Location of new buildings and general floor plan Dimensions of bldg.(s) = ___ x ___ Total sq.ft. = ___</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Proposed building elevations (to scale) Max. Height = ___</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 All existing structures (labeled) within 100 feet of perimeter property lines</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aerial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Multiple housing units -Number of units = _____, composition (efficiency, one bedroom, two, three)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Surrounding zoning (properties immediate to subject site)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Lot coverage of proposed buildings = ___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Features</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Boundaries of existing natural features (trees, lakes, ponds, streams, rock outcroppings, severe topography, wetlands, woodlands, etc.).</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Has a wetland permit been applied for?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Existing topography</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Soil analysis Is it in a Critical Dune Area?</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Site Inventory provided?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Are there scenic view considerations?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage / Parking/ Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Access drives, internal roads (note public or private) service roads. Width of Right-of-Way =</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Loading/unloading, service areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Sidewalks, paths, and trails (internal and public within road right-of-ways).</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Acceleration/deceleration lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Road agency approval?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Parking areas (dimensioned typical parking space, maneuvering lanes)</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Parking spaces required <strong><strong><strong>, parking spaces actual _____ Handicap parking location and number</strong></strong></strong></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Required landscaping in parking areas</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>kept as is natural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Snow storage/snow management plan</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Dumpster location, screening indication</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Existing easements (utility, access) within site limits</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Location of Water/well, Sewer/septic, and stormwater</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Site grading and drainage plan (on-site elevations for pavements, drives, roads, parking lots, curbs, sidewalks and finished grades at building facades) Attach a sealed Engineered Drainage Plan.</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Proposed retention/detention sedimentation ponds</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Site Requirements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed landscaping (required greenbelts, plant materials/size and type, fences, retaining walls, earthen berms, etc.)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of outdoor lights, pole heights, bollards, building attached, luminary shielding techniques*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of sign(s)*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site amenities (play area, pools, beaches, tennis courts, etc.)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement attached?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire hydrants and fire vehicle access.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Agency approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health agency approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Corps of Engineers approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Department of Environmental Quality approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Signs and lights will need to be approved by the Emmet County Sign and Lighting Committee.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

---

*Sally Williams*

Applicants Signature

10-19-17

Date
IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW

APPLICANT'S
NAME Larry R. Williams CASE#

PHONE
NUMBER 231.838.8738 DATE 10-19-17

PROJECT TITLE
7672 Moore Road Pit ~ Williams Excavating, Inc.

PROPERTY TAX ID
# 24-07-17-09-300-001 TOWNSHIP Littlefield

DIRECTIONS TO APPLICANT
BELOW ARE THE REQUIREMENTS TO CONFORM TO SECTION 20.04, IMPACT STATEMENT, OF THE EMMET COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE #15.1. THESE ITEMS MUST BE ADDRESSED AND SUBMITTED WITH THE SITE PLAN AT LEAST 24 DAYS PRIOR TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING IN ORDER TO BE PLACED ON THE FOLLOWING MONTH'S AGENDA. (REGULAR MEETING DATE IS THE FIRST THURSDAY OF THE MONTH.) ITEMS LISTED ARE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS, AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION MAY BE SUBMITTED TO DESCRIBE THE PROJECT IMPACT.

1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Give a description of the proposed development including: Site area, number of proposed lots and/or units, population density, other pertinent population data, vehicle traffic, and related.

Expand resource extraction to 5-10 acres beyond original approval.

Reclamation is occurring as resource is removed.
2. EXPECTED DEMANDS ON COMMUNITY SERVICES

Explain what the impact will be on the following community services and describe how services will be provided (if applicable):

a. Sanitary Services
   N/A

b. Domestic Water
   Existing

c. Traffic Volumes
   Same as current

d. Schools
   N/A

e. Fire Protection

3. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Include statements relative to the impact of the proposed development on (if applicable):

a. Soil Erosion
   Current

b. Storm Drainage

---

c. Shoreline Protection

---

d. Wildlife

---

e. Air Pollution

---

f. Water Pollution

---

g. Noise
   Minimal - operating hours.
LARRY WILLIAMS – SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR SAND AND GRAVEL EXCAVATION

LOCATION - A 40 acre site fronting on the west side of Moore Road, in the NW ¼ of Sec 9, Littlefield Township.

PERMIT REQUIREMENTS PER SEC. 26.10

1. No mining activities will be allowed within 200 feet of the road right-of-way, 250 feet of the north property line, 50 feet of the west line and 100 feet of the south property line.

2. Excavation work will be as shown on the approved Site Plan dated xxxx. At any given time the disturbed area to encompass between 5 and 10 acres.

3. Stockpiles of sand and gravel will be located in the center of the parcel, off the access road (per site plan).

4. The average depth of the excavation will be between 10-15 feet, with the maximum depth of 20-40 feet. The final slope is not to exceed 1:4.

5. The hours of operation for extracting and hauling resources shall be between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m., and prohibited on Sundays and the holidays of Easter, Memorial Day, Independence Day and Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day and New Year's Day.

6. Machinery used for the mining activity are dump trucks and front end loaders. There will be no buildings, no permanent machinery, and no sediment basins necessary at this time.

7. The applicant states that wells in the area are 100 feet or deeper and mining activities will not adversely affect ground water.

8. Stated setbacks from property lines, as described in #1 will be maintained. The pine plantation extending the entire length of the property along the road frontage to a depth of 200 feet (minimum) will be retained. All vegetation (predominately hardwoods) within the setback areas from the other property lines will be retained.

9. Site reclamation, as reasonable shall be progressive as the mining continues. Overburden shall be returned to the excavated area after final grading in order to promote re-vegetation of the site.

10. This permit is valid providing the 40 acre site remains under single ownership and is based upon the site plan illustrating the terms of the permit.

11. All applicable State and Federal Laws/Regulations pertaining to mining operations shall be complied with, e.g. noise, dust, etc., as well as laws pertaining to wetlands, wildlife habitat, etc.

12. The site will be inspected by staff of the Office of Planning and Zoning and Soil Erosion control officer on an annual basis.
Signed
Larry Williams, Williams Excavating, Inc.

Date

Signed
Tammy Doernenburg, Planning & Zoning Director

Date
ZONING EVALUATION FORM
Office of Planning and Zoning
Emmet County, MI

DATE: 11/08/2017  CASE #: PSUP17-008

APPLICANT: WILLIAMS EXCAVATING INC

PROPERTY: 7672 MOORE RD

TOWNSHIP: LITTLEFIELD

REQUEST: Special Use Permit – Level III Resource Extraction Operation – Amendment

FACTS:
• The property is zoned R-1 One & Two Family Residential.
• The total property is 40 acres in area.
• Request is to expand a Level III mining operation to remove sand and gravel in an area of approximately 10 acres maximum.
• No impact to ground water expected.
• Vegetation proposed to be retained along the property lines to a depth of 50 feet along the west line, 200 feet from the road right-of-way, 250 feet from the north property line, and 100 feet from the south property line.
• The site to be accessed via an existing driveway locations.
• No lighting proposed.
• No new structures are proposed as part of this application.
• Applicant proposes hours of operation 7AM-6PM Mon-Sat, closed on Sundays and Holidays.
• Reclamation to occur as resources are exhausted and is ongoing. The use is not visible from the road.
• Soil Erosion permit is obtained annually.

ZONING ORDINANCE STANDARDS:
26.10.4 Performance Standards

The following shall apply to all proposed extraction, mining, fill operations:

A. All excavations or extractive work shall maintain a minimum perimeter setback of 50 feet from road right-of-way and all property lines. Controlled work in the 50 feet setback area may be permitted if spoils, over burden, or other earth fill material replaces the resources removed as the work progresses (in cases of a pit).
Setback is the minimum along one property line (adjacent to MDNR property). All other setback standards exceed the minimum requirement.

B. The working face of an excavation shall maintain slope angles sufficient to prevent sloughing, erosion or earth disturbances of any kind of adjoining properties.
The site is reclaimed as it moves to unmined location.

C. Leave sufficient native topsoil on the site as a ready resource to be used in reclamation work following excavation/extraction activity, unless a guaranteed replacement plan is approved.
There appears to be topsoil in place to use in reclamation.

D. Fences, berms, walls, and visual screening devices may be required, if necessary, to protect adjoining properties and/or persons in the vicinity of the site. Factors of safety and aesthetics shall be addressed.
Screening is provided by existing vegetation.

E. The operation of mechanical equipment of any kind may be limited by the day and/or the hour if the site is in a location that directly impacts homes, by creating an operating nuisance.
Hours of operation proposed to be the same as the existing permit.

F. All structures, equipment, and machinery of any kind shall be considered temporary and shall be removed from the site upon completion of the terms of the Special Use Permit. This item shall not apply to industrially zoned sites.
No structures proposed.

G. Air pollution, noise, and vibration factors shall be controlled within the limits governed by State and/or Federal regulations applicable to the facility.
No complaints have been received.

H. If necessary to protect the area, access routes serving the site may be limited as stated on the Permit or as illustrated on the site plan, it being the intent to minimize the exposure of residential streets to earth moving vehicles.
This site has been active since 1988.

I. The location of earth stockpiles, machinery, equipment and any buildings, shall be approved by Permit but only in terms to protect adjoining properties, and obtain the optimum use of the site. Topography, vegetation, screening devices, and physical isolation from residential properties shall be considered in locating site facilities and earth stockpiles.
Stockpile locations noted on site plan. No equipment locations identified on the plan.

Draft Motions:

TO APPROVE
To approve PSUP17-008, Williams Excavating/Larry Williams, for a Special Use Permit for a Level III Resource Mining operation expansion located at 7672 Moore Road, Section 9, Littlefield Township. The parcel is approximately 40 acres, zoned R-1 One and Two Family Residential, tax parcel number 24-07-17-09-300-001 because it meets the standards of the Zoning Ordinance as shown on the Plot Plan dated received 4/24/2017, and subject to the permit requirements submitted with the application labeled DRAFT, the permit must be signed by the
property owner and the Zoning Administrator and the following additional conditions: (Add additional conditions here)

TO DENY
To deny PSUP17-008, Williams Excavating/Larry Williams, for a Special Use Permit for a Level III Resource Mining operation expansion located at 7672 Moore Road, Section 9, Littlefield Township. The parcel is approximately 40 acres, zoned R-1 One and Two Family Residential, tax parcel number 24-07-17-09-300-001 because it meets the standards of the Zoning Ordinance as shown on the Plot Plan dated received 4/24/2017 for the following reasons: (Add reasons here.)

TO POSTPONE
To postpone PSUP17-008, Williams Excavating/Larry Williams, for a Special Use Permit for a Level III Resource Mining operation expansion located at 7672 Moore Road, Section 9, Littlefield Township. The parcel is approximately 40 acres, zoned R-1 One and Two Family Residential, tax parcel number 24-07-17-09-300-001 because it meets the standards of the Zoning Ordinance as shown on the Plot Plan dated received 4/24/2017 because of the following reasons: (Add reasons here.)
Case PSPR17-013

A request by Ken Looze for Amerigas Propane for Site Plan Review amendment to allow a second 8'x60' propane storage tank at 160 Reuther Dr in Section 33 of McKinley Township. The property is zoned I-2 General Industrial and is tax parcel 24-10-10-33-300-003. The request is per Articles 15 and 20 of the Zoning Ordinance.

LOCATION
**APPLICATION FOR ZONING ACTION**

**EMMET COUNTY OFFICE OF PLANNING, ZONING, AND CONSTRUCTION RESOURCES**

3434 HARBOR-PETOSKEY RD, SUITE E, HARBOR SPRINGS, MI 49740

PHONE: (231) 348-1735 FAX: (231) 439-8933 EMAIL: pzc@emmetcounty.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE RECEIVED</th>
<th>$ 100.00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**DATE PAID**

| APPLICATION # | 11-8-17 |

**PLEASE MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO: EMMET COUNTY**

**Applicant's Name:** Ken Loose  Phone: 231-342-1631

**Applicant's Address:** 1901 River Rd, Petoskey, Mich, 49770

**Applicant's Email Address:** kenneth.loose@americas.com

**Owner's Name:** Americas Propone  Phone: 231-342-8181

**Owner's Address:** 1901 River Rd, Petoskey, Mich, 49770

**Owner's Email Address:** kenneth.loose@americas.com

**JOB SITE LOCATION:**

**Township:** McFarleny  **Tax Parcel #:** 24-10-10-22-300-003

**Address:** 160 Weather Dr, Pellston

**ZONING REQUEST:**

- Planning Commission
- Special Use Permit
- Site Plan Review
- Planned Unit Development
- Zoning Map Change
- Zoning Text Change

**REQUIRED USE INFORMATION:**

- Ground floor area main building: NA Sq. Ft.
- Floor area accessory building: NA Sq. Ft.
- Lot/Parcel Size: 7.83 Acres 330x160 Sq. Ft.

- Site/Plot Plan required* 2 full sized & 14 reduced sized (max 11"x17") site plans required for Planning Commission cases.
- Describe Request: Act 14 Storage Tank
- To Existing Site

*Please attach a site/plot plan to show property dimensions; front, rear, and side yard setbacks; streets, roads, and all buildings on the lot.

Review Section 2405 of the Zoning Ordinance for Site Plan requirements.

---

**Date Submitted**

| Date Submitted | 10-9-17 |

**Elevation Drawing**  
**Engineered Drainage Plan**  
**Soil Erosion Permit**  
**Health Dept. Approval**  
**Sewer Taps**

**Site Inventory**  
**Fire Dept Approval**  
**Wetlands Permit**  
**Road Commission**  
**MDOT Approval**

**Other:**

As owner/and or applicant representing the owner, do not authorize Emmet County (staff, appointed board, and/or commissioners, or committee members) to enter upon the subject property for purposes of making inspections related to the project or request identified in this application. If authorized, such inspections or site-walks shall be conducted at reasonable hours and times.

**I certify that all the above information is accurate to my fullest knowledge:**

**Signature of Applicant**  
**Printed Name of Applicant**

**Americas Propone**

**Printed Name of Property Owner**

**10/9/17**

---

**Required Signature of Property Owner**

---
Michigan Department of Labor & Economic Growth

Filing Endorsement

This is to Certify that the CERT. OF CHANGE OF REG. OFF./RES. AGENT
for
SHELL GAS (LPG) BULK LLC

ID NUMBER: B9478G

received by facsimile transmission on May 2, 2007 is hereby endorsed
Filed on May 3, 2007 by the Administrator.

The document is effective on the date filed, unless a subsequent effective date within 90 days after received date is stated in the document.

In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the Seal of the Department, in the City of Lansing, this 3RD day of May, 2007.

[Signature]
Director

Bureau of Commercial Services
**MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF LABOR & ECONOMIC GROWTH**
**BUREAU OF COMMERCIAL SERVICES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>FOR BUREAU USE ONLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This document is effective on the date filed, unless a subsequent effective date within 60 days after received data is stated in the document.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EFFECTIVE DATE:**

Document will be returned to the name and address you enter above. If left blank, document will be mailed to the registered office.

**CERTIFICATE OF CHANGE OF REGISTERED OFFICE AND/OR CHANGE OF RESIDENT AGENT**

For use by Domestic and Foreign Corporations and Limited Liability Companies

(Please read information and instructions on reverse side)

Pursuant to the provisions of Act 284, Public Acts of 1972 (profit corporations), Act 162, Public Acts of 1982 (nonprofit corporations), or Act 23, Public Acts of 1983 (limited liability companies), the undersigned corporation or limited liability company executes the following certificate:

1. **The name of the corporation or limited liability company is:** Shell Gas (LPG) Bulk LLC

2. **The identification number assigned by the Bureau is:** B9478G

3. **a. The name of the resident agent on file with the Bureau is:** CSC-LAWYERS INCORPORATING SERVICE (COMPANY)

   **b. The location of the registered office on file with the Bureau is:**
   
   601 ABBOTT ROAD
   EAST LANSING, Michigan 48823

   **c. The mailing address of the above registered office on file with the Bureau is:**

   (Street Address or P.O. Box) (City) (State) (ZIP Code)

**ENTER IN ITEM 4 THE INFORMATION AS IT SHOULD NOW APPEAR ON THE PUBLIC RECORD**

4. a. **The name of the resident agent is:** The Corporation Company

   b. **The address of the registered office is:**

   30600 Telegraph Road, Suite 2345
   Bingham Farms, Michigan 48025-5720

   **c. The mailing address of the registered office if different than 4B is:**

   (Street Address or P.O. Box) (City) (State) (ZIP Code)

5. The above changes were authorized by resolution duly adopted by: 1. ALL CORPORATIONS: its Board of Directors; 2. PROFIT CORPORATIONS ONLY: the resident agent if only the address of the registered office is changed, in which case a copy of this statement has been mailed to the corporation; 3. LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANIES: an operating agreement, affirmative vote of a majority of the members pursuant to section 502(1), managers pursuant to section 405, or the resident agent if only the address of the registered office is changed.

6. The corporation or limited liability company further states that the address of its registered office and the address of its resident agent, as changed, are identical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Type or Print Name and Title or Capacity</th>
<th>Date Signed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jane Zachritz</td>
<td>Jane Zachritz, Authorized Person</td>
<td>4/25/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATE OF WITHDRAWAL
For use by Foreign Limited Liability Companies
(Please read information and instructions on reverse side)

Pursuant to the provisions of Act 23, Public Acts of 1993, the undersigned limited liability company executes the following Application:

1. The name of the limited liability company is: AmeriGas Michigan Bulk LLC

2. The identification number assigned by the Bureau is: 894786

3. It is organized under the laws of Delaware

4. The limited liability company is not transacting business in Michigan.

5. The limited liability company hereby surrenders its authority to transact business in Michigan.

6. The limited liability company revokes the authority of its resident agent to receive service of process in this state and consents that service of process in any action, suit, or proceeding based upon any cause of action arising in this state during the time the foreign limited liability company was authorized to transact business in this state may thereafter be made on the company by service upon the administrator.

7. The address to which the administrator is to mail a copy of any process against this limited liability company is:

AmeriGas Propane, Inc.
460 N. Gulph Road, King of Prussia, Pa 19406

Signed this 20 day of November 2007

[Signature]
Robert H. Knauss, Vice President and General Counsel

[Type or Print Name]
**SITE PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST**

**Case #**

**Date Received**

**Subject Property Address** 160 Reuther Dr, Pelton

**Subdivision and Lot Number (if Applicable)**

**Tax Parcel Number:** 24-10-10-23360-003

**Township** McKinley

**Proposed Use of Property** Add, Storage Tank to Existing Site

**Proposed Number of Employees** 0

### CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Map Information</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Proposed site location map (indicate sufficient area reference to locate site) May use plat map, Google map or other map to identify parcel.</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Appropriate scale</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Date, North Arrow, Street Names (existing and proposed right-of-ways).</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Name, Address and Phone Number of person preparing plan</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Property line dimensions</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Basic Zoning Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning setback lines -Building (including the eave) Setbacks: Front__ Side__ Side__ Rear/Water__</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Distance between buildings (nearest point to nearest point)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Location of new buildings and general floor plan Dimensions of bldg(s) = <em>x</em> Total sq.ft=__________</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Proposed building elevations (to scale) Max. Height =__________</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 All existing structures (labeled) within 100 feet of perimeter property lines</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Multiple housing units -Number of units = ________, composition (efficiency, one bedroom, two, three)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Surrounding zoning (properties immediate to subject site)</td>
<td>See site plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 LOT coverage of proposed buildings =__________</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Features</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Boundaries of existing natural features (trees, lakes, ponds, streams, rock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Has a wetland permit been applied for?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Existing topography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Soil analysis Is it in a Critical Dune Area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Site Inventory provided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Are there scenic view considerations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage / Parking / Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Access drives, internal roads (note public or private) service roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of Right-of-Way = 102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Loading/unloading, service areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Sidewalks, paths, and trails (internal and public within road right-of-ways)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Acceleration/deceleration lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Road agency approval?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Parking areas (dimensioned typical parking space, maneuvering lanes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Parking spaces required_____ parking spaces actual_____ Handicap parking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>location and number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Required landscaping in parking areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Snow storage/snow management plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Dumpster location, screening indication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Existing easements (utility, access) within site limits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Location of Water/well, Sewer/septic, and stormwater</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Site grading and drainage plan (on-site elevations for pavements, drives,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roads, parking lots, curbs, sidewalks and finished grades at building facades)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attach a sealed Engineered Drainage Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Proposed retention/detention sedimentation ponds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Site Requirements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed landscaping (required greenbelts, plant materials/size and type, fences,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retaining walls, earthberms, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of outdoor lights, pole heights, bollards, building attached, luminary</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shielding techniques*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of sign(s)*</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site amenities (play area, pools, beaches, tennis courts, etc.)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement attached?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department approval?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire hydrants and fire vehicle access.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Agency approval?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health agency approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Corps of Engineers approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Department of Environmental Quality approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Signs and lights will need to be approved by the Emmet County Sign and Lighting Committee.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Applicants Signature: [Signature]

Date: 10/9/17
IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW

APPLICANT'S
NAME_ American___ CASE#_

PHONE NUMBER_231-347-8131_ DATE 10/19/17

PROJECT TITLE_ Add Storage Tank To Existing Site

PROPERTY TAX ID_
#24-10-33-300-003 TOWNSHIP McKinley

DIRECTIONS TO APPLICANT
BELOW ARE THE REQUIREMENTS TO CONFORM TO SECTION 20.04, IMPACT STATEMENT, OF THE EMMET COUNTY ZONING ORDINANCE #15.1. THESE ITEMS MUST BE ADDRESSED AND SUBMITTED WITH THE SITE PLAN AT LEAST 24 DAYS PRIOR TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING IN ORDER TO BE PLACED ON THE FOLLOWING MONTH'S AGENDA. (REGULAR MEETING DATE IS THE FIRST THURSDAY OF THE MONTH.) ITEMS LISTED ARE MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS, AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION MAY BE SUBMITTED TO DESCRIBE THE PROJECT IMPACT.

1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Give a description of the proposed development including: Site area, number of proposed lots and/or units, population density, other pertinent population data, vehicle traffic, and related.

Add Propane Storage Tank To Existing Site
2. EXPECTED DEMANDS ON COMMUNITY SERVICES
Explain what the impact will be on the following community services and describe how services will be provided (if applicable):

a. Sanitary Services
   none

b. Domestic Water
   none

c. Traffic Volumes
   minimum

d. Schools
   none

e. Fire Protection
   yes

3. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
Include statements relative to the impact of the proposed development on (if applicable):

a. Soil Erosion
   none

b. Storm Drainage
   on site plan

c. Shoreline Protection
   none

d. Wildlife
   none

e. Air Pollution
   none

f. Water Pollution
   none

g. Noise
   none
ZONING EVALUATION FORM
Office of Planning and Zoning
Emmet County, MI

DATE: 11/09/2017                      CASE #: PSPR17-013

APPLICANT: Amerigas-Petroskey

PROPERTY: 160 REUTHER DR

TOWNSHIP: MC KINLEY

REQUEST: Site Plan Review - Amendment

FACTS:
- The property is zoned I-2 General Industrial.
- The property is 5 acres in area.
- The property is used for a propane storage/distribution facility.
- The original site plan (Special Use Permit) was approved in 2000 and included one large propane storage tank (and several smaller tanks).
- The site is adjacent to vacant land on all sides. It is at the extreme south end of the Pellston Regional Airport property.
- The access is via a 760' long public dead-end road extending north from Robinson Road.
- No changes to the access are proposed.
- The proposed storage tank is the same size as the previously approved large tank—approximately 8' wide and 66' long.
- No other changes to the site plan are proposed.
- No dumpster is shown on the plan.
- Ample snow storage area provided.
- Road has been reconfigured since approval in 2000.
- All setback standards appear to be met.

ZONING ORDINANCE STANDARDS – some text removed as noted*:

Section 20.05 Site Plan Review Standards

The Planning Commission shall approve, or approve with conditions, an application for a site plan only upon a finding that the proposed site plan complies with all applicable provisions of this Ordinance and the standards and considerations listed below unless the Planning Commission waives a particular standard upon a finding that the standard is not applicable to the proposed development under consideration and the waiver of that standard will not be significantly detrimental to surrounding property or to the intent of the Ordinance.

A. COMPLIANCE WITH DISTRICT REQUIREMENTS: The site plan shall comply with the district requirements for minimum floor space, height of building, lot size, yard space, density and all other requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance,
unless otherwise provided. *District requirements appear to be met based on setback, height, and use.*

B. VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION: *No change.*

C. EMERGENCY VEHICLE ACCESS: *Site Plan submitted to Fire Chief for review.*

D. LOADING AND STORAGE: *No change.*

E. SNOW STORAGE: *No change.*

F. BUFFERS: *No change.*

G. DRAINAGE: *No change*

H. SPACES, RIGHTS-OF-WAY, EASEMENTS: *No change.*

I. WASTE RECEPTACLES: *No change.*

J. MECHANICAL OR ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT: *No change.*

Draft Motions:

To approve Case #PSPR17-013, Ken Looze for Amerigas Propane, for Site Plan Review – amendment for a propane storage and distribution business, on property located at 160 Reuther Drive, Section 33, McKinley Township, tax parcel 24-10-10-33-300-003, as shown on the site plan dated Received Nov 8, 2017 because the standards of Articles 15 and 20 have been met, and *conditions or statement of facts may be inserted here.*

To deny Case #PSPR17-013, Ken Looze for Amerigas Propane, for Site Plan Review – amendment for a propane storage and distribution business, on property located at 160 Reuther Drive, Section 33, McKinley Township, tax parcel 24-10-10-33-300-003, as shown on the site plan dated Received Nov 8, 2017 for the following reasons: (list reasons).
September 20, 2017

Shell Gas (LPG) Bulk LLC
c/o Amerigas Propane LP
P.O. Box 798
Valley Forge, PA 19482

RE: NOTICE OF VIOLATION
Emmet County Zoning Ordinance, Planning Commission Case #211-99
Property location: 160 Reuther Rd., McKinley Township, Section 33
Property tax id #10-10-33-300-003

Dear Shell Gas (LPG) Bulk LLC:

It has come to the attention of this office, the above stated site is not in compliance with the approved site plan. An additional large propane tank has been added to the site. Only one tank has been approved. Enclosed is a copy of the approved site plan for your reference. You have 30 days from the date of this letter to remove the additional propane tank or apply for an amendment to your site plan. Enclosed for your convenience is an application for site plan review amendment. Failure to comply with this notice will result in further enforcement action. Please call if you have questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Nancy Salar
Ordinance Enforcement Officer
Emmet County

Cc: Robert Engel, Emmet County Civil Counsel
3. **CASE #211-99**

Great Lakes Energy, SPECIAL USE PERMIT, Propane storage/distribution, Robinson Road, Section 33, McKinley Township.

A request by Great Lakes Energy for a Special Use Permit to construct a propane storage/distribution facility on property located on Robinson Road, Section 33, T37N-R4W, McKinley Township. The property is zoned I-2 General Industrial and is identified as tax parcel no. 24-10-30-33-001. The request is per Section 1401-1 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Putters explained the Site Plan which has been reviewed by the Planning Commission, staff and the County Board. The County Board suggested placing the facility at the rear of the property, reserving the road frontage for uses which could benefit from that exposure. Great Lakes Energy accepted the change and has provided a Site Plan on the new location. There are trees on the property screening the facility. The storage tank is located near the west setback and smaller, empty tanks will be stored on the site. A new access road has been proposed. A loop drive with engineered drainage and cross-sections is shown. Zoning setbacks and fire safety setbacks, which are required by national standards, are met. A proposed right-of-way is shown. The Site Plan is very complete. The Pellston Fire Department had no objections.

The Village of Pellston is concerned with the possible damage to Robinson Road and the future possibility of a regional jail being located in the area. At this time, there is no concrete plan for a regional jail, according to the County Controller. Concerns about safety near the airport were raised. Louis Schomberger, previous Emergency Services Coordinator for Emmet County had no objections. McKinley Township recommended approval, but they would like the new access road to become a County Road if Popal Road is abandoned, they also prefer that it only be abandoned east of the proposed new road. The Site Plan is not impacted regardless of the status of Popal Road.

Geoff Steiler, engineer representing Great Lakes Energy, added that the road has been discussed with the Emmet County Road Commission. The new access road could become a County Road. Abandonment of Popal Road is not being done by Great Lakes Energy, but by the County. Steiler is not sure when or if that road will be abandoned. There are still many questions about the future of Popal Road. Discussion about Pellston Village's concerns will continue at their Planning Commission meeting next Monday. Great Lakes Energy will meet with the Village, even though Pellston does not have zoning jurisdiction. The only restriction from the airport is vertical and the facility clearly meets those standards.

John Eby arrived at 7:50 p.m.

Gregory made a motion, supported by Jones, to approve Case #211-99, Site Plan dated 1/25/00PZ, a Special Use Permit to construct a propane storage and distribution facility on property located off Robinson Road, on condition that the access road be built to Emmet County Road Commission specifications, and because McKinley Township recommended approval and the standards of the ordinance are met. The Sign and Lighting Committee will need to approve any signs and lights. The motion passed on the following roll call vote: Yes; Harris, Gregory, Jones, Scott, Blanchard, Eby, Derrohn. No; none. Absent: Munger, Veurink.
REQUEST

PPUDF17-001

A request by Aaron Miller for a Final Planned Unit Development (PUD) and Site Plan Review on property located at 1912 Plains Road in Section 11 of Maple River Township. The property is tax parcel 24-09-14-11-400-002 is zoned FF-2 Farm and Forest. The request is to finalize the portable shed construction/woodworking business at the property per the approved Preliminary PUD Plan. The existing buildings are proposed to be used for the business. Review will be per Articles 17 and 20 of the Zoning Ordinance.

LOCATION
APPLICATION FOR ZONING ACTION
EMMET COUNTY OFFICE OF PLANNING, ZONING, AND CONSTRUCTION RESOURCES
3434 HARBOR-PETOSKEY RD, SUITE E, HARBOR SPRINGS, MI 49740
PHONE: (231) 348-1735 FAX: (231) 439-8933 EMAIL: pzer@emmetcounty.org

DATE RECEIVED: 11-16-17
FEE: 200.00

APPLICATION # 17-01
DATE PAID: 11-10-17

PLEASE MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO: EMMET COUNTY

Applicant's Name: Aaron J Miller
Phone: 231-539-7060

Applicant's Address: 1912 Plains Rd Brutus Mi 49716

Owner's Name: Aaron J Miller
Phone: 231-539-7060

Owner's Address: 1912 Plains Rd Brutus Mi 49716

JOB SITE LOCATION:
Township: Maple River
Tax Parcel #: 24-09-14-14-00-002
Address: 1912 Plains Rd Brutus Mi 49716

ZONING REQUEST:
Planning Commission:
Special Use Permit:
Site Plan Review:
Planned Unit Development:
Zoning Map Change:
Zoning Text Change:

REQUIRED USE INFORMATION
Ground floor area main building: 5760 Sq. Ft.
Floor Area accessory building: 10446 Sq. Ft.
Lot/Parcel Size: 78 Acres
Site/Plot Plan required*
2 full sized & 14 reduced sized (max 11”x17”)
site plans required for Planning Commission cases.

Date Submitted
Elevation Drawing
Engineered Drainage Plan
Soil Erosion Permit
Health Dept. Approval/
Sewer Taps

Site Inventory
Fire Dept Approval
Wetlands Permit
Road Commission/

Date Submitted

Other:
As owner/and or applicant representing the owner, I do X do not ___ authorize Emmet County (staff, appointed board, and/or commissioners, or committee members) to enter upon the subject property for purposes of making inspections related to the project or request identified in this application. If authorized, such inspections or site-walks shall be conducted at reasonable hours and times.

I certify that all the above information is accurate to my fullest knowledge:

Signature of Applicant
Printed Name of Applicant
Date

*Required Signature of Property/Owner
Printed Name of Property Owner
Date

Please attach a site/plot plan to show:
property dimensions; front, rear, and side yard setbacks; streets, roads, and all buildings on the lot.
Review Section 2405 of the Zoning Ordinance for Site Plan requirements.
Tammy Doernenburg

From: plnarff@racc2000.com
Sent: Monday, November 13, 2017 9:36 AM
To: Tammy Doernenburg
Subject: Aaron Miller Property Maple River Township Sand Road and Plains Roads

Tammy,

I have reviewed the Aaron Miller Plans for the property on Plains Road and Sand Road. The Pellston Fire Department has no objections, as to egress as presented per the plans. We are familiar with this property as it was the former Brill Farm. We find no problems with the additions as presented.

Randolph Lee Bricker Sr.
Pellston Fire Chief
1-231-838-4499

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Tammy Doernenburg[mailto:tdoernenburg@emmetcounty.org]
Sent:
To: plnarff@racc2000.com

Our Planning Commission will be reviewing the attached site plan for the address above (just north of Ski's Place) on a vacant parcel. The proposal is an commercial indoor storage garage for vehicles.

Do you have any concerns or comments from the Fire Chief's perspective?

Thank you.

Tammy
IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW

APPLICANT'S NAME: Aaron J. Miller  CASE#: PLLP17-01
PHONE NUMBER: 231-539-7060  DATE: 11-10-17

PROJECT TITLE: 

PROPERTY TAX ID: #24-09-14-11-400-002 TOWNSHIP: Maple River

DIRECTIONS TO APPLICANT:
BELOW ARE THE REQUIREMENTS TO CONFORM WITH SECTION 2407-3, SITE PLAN REVIEW-Impact Statement, of the Emmet County Zoning Ordinance. These items must be addressed and submitted with the site plan at least 24 days prior to the Planning Commission meeting in order to be placed on the following month's agenda. (Regular Meeting Date is the first Thursday of the month.) Items listed are minimum requirements, and additional information may be submitted to describe the project impact. Feel free to attach a written statement of the below information.

1. PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Give a description of the proposed development including: Site area, number of proposed lots and/or units, population density, other pertinent population data, vehicle traffic, and related.

   We are proposing to change the use of existing farm buildings for the use of a workshop to build portable storage barns. We have a good natural screen of pine trees for sight and sound barrier. Traffic will increase slightly with semi-truck making deliveries approx. twice a week and the product will leave via pick-up truck and trailer. Most of inventory will be on display. Occasional customer would be seen at workshop. We are proposing to have approx. 1-5 workers/employees at times.
2. EXPECTED DEMANDS ON COMMUNITY SERVICES
Explain what the impact will be on the following community services and describe how services will be provided (if applicable):

a. Sanitary Services
   as required by Health Dept and plumbing code

b. Domestic Water
   private well

c. Traffic Volumes
   2-3 semi per week for deliveries - less in winter
   Product going out with pickup truck and trailer

d. Schools
   none

e. Fire Protection
   as required

3. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
Include statements relative to the impact of the proposed development on (if applicable):

a. Soil Erosion
   N/A

b. Storm Drainage
   minimal change request waiver

c. Shoreline Protection
   N/A

d. Wildlife
   N/A

e. Air Pollution
   minimal

f. Water Pollution
   N/A

g. Noise
   minimal noise with equipment inside of building
SITE PLAN REQUIREMENTS
EMMET COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
3434 Harbor-Petoskey Rd, Suite E
Harbor Springs, MI 49740
231-348-1735
pzcr@emmetcounty.org

DIRECTIONS TO APPLICANT

The following items are needed to comply with the site plan requirements of the Emmet County Zoning Ordinance. All items should be submitted to the Emmet County Planning Department at least 24 days prior to the Planning Commission meeting in order to be heard at the Planning Commission meeting the following month. (Regular meeting date is the first Thursday of each month.)

2. Site Plan Review Check List in accordance with Article 20 of the Emmet County Zoning Ordinance. Applicable agency reviews as required.
3. Impact Statement for Site Plan Review.
4. Site Plans - (2) full sized and fourteen (14) reduced size (maximum 11"x17") copies of all maps or graphics. Digital format including data layers may be required, if deemed necessary by the Zoning Administrator.

IN ADDITION:
The applicant should distribute one copy of the completed plan to each of the following agencies (if required):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Department</td>
<td>3434 Harbor Petoskey Rd Suite A</td>
<td>231-347-6014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harbor Springs, MI 49740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Jurisdiction</td>
<td>2265 E. Hathaway Harbor Springs, MI 49740</td>
<td>231-347-8142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Road Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Gaylord Transportation Service Center</td>
<td>989-733-3832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1088 M-32 East Gaylord, MI 49735</td>
<td>888-304-MDOT (6368)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Highway Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department</td>
<td>(obtain from local source)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Erosion Officer</td>
<td>3434 Harbor-Petoskey Rd Suite E</td>
<td>231-439-8996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(If the building is within 500' of surface water or an acre or more of land is disturbed, including roads.)</td>
<td>3434 Harbor Springs, MI 49740</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected Township</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SITE PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST

**Subject Property Address**: 1912 Plain Rd Brutus Mi  
**Subdivision and Lot Number (if Applicable)**: NA  
**Tax Parcel Number**: 24-09-14-400-002  
**Township**: Maple River  
**Proposed Use of Property**: Storage  
**Proposed Number of Employees**: 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Map Information</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proposed site location map (indicate sufficient area reference to locate site) May use plat map, Google map or other map to identify parcel.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Appropriate scale</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Date, North Arrow, Street Names (existing and proposed rights-of-way).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Name, Address and Phone Number of person preparing plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Property line dimensions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Zoning Information</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Zoning setback lines -Building (including the eave) Setbacks: Front 50, Side 50, Rear/Water 50</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>except existing buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Distance between buildings (nearest point to nearest point)</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Location of new buildings and general floor plan Dimensions of bldg(s) = x Total sq.ft. =</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Proposed building elevations (to scale) Max. Height =</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. All existing structures (labeled) within 100 feet of perimeter property lines</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Multiple housing units -Number of units = , composition (efficiency, one bedroom, two, three)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Surrounding zoning (properties immediate to subject site)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lot coverage of proposed buildings =</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Features</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Boundaries of existing natural features (trees, lakes, ponds, streams,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rock outcroppings, severe topography, wetlands, woodlands, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Has a wetland permit been applied for?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Existing topography</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Soil analysis Is it in a Critical Dune Area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Site Inventory provided?</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Are there scenic view considerations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage / Parking / Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Access drives, internal roads (note public or private) service roads.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of Right-of-Way = ___ to ___</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Loading/unloading, service areas</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Sidewalks, paths, and trails (internal and public within road right-of-ways)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Acceleration/deceleration lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Road agency approval?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Parking areas (dimensioned typical parking space, maneuvering lanes)</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Parking spaces required______, parking spaces actual______</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap parking location and number____</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Required landscaping in parking areas</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Snow storage/snow management plan</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Dumpster location, screening indication</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Existing easements (utility, access) within site limits</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Location of Water/well, Sewer/septic, and stormwater</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waiver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waiver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Site grading and drainage plan (on-site elevations for pavements, drives,</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roads, parking lots, curbs, sidewalks and finished grades at building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facades) Attach a sealed Engineered Drainage Plan. Estimated cost of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drainage work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Proposed retention/detention sedimentation ponds</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Site Requirements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed landscaping (required greenbelts, plant materials/size and type, fences, retaining walls, earthberms, etc.)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of outdoor lights, pole heights, bollards, building attached, luminary shielding techniques*</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of sign(s)*</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site amenities (play area, pools, beaches, tennis courts, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement attached?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department approval?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire hydrants and fire vehicle access.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Agency approval?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health agency approval?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Corps of Engineers approval?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Department of Environmental Quality approval?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Signs and lights will need to be approved by the Emmet County Sign and Lighting Committee.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

Applicant's Signature ___________________________  Date 11-10-17
DATE: 11/14/17

APPLICANT: Aaron Miller

PROPERTY: 1912 Plains Rd.

TOWNSHIP: Maple River

REQUEST: Final Planned Unit Development and Site Plan Review

FACTS:

- The property is 78.5 acres
- The property is zoned FF-2, Farm Forest.
- The surrounding zoning is Farm Forest, FF-1 and FF-2
- The property has road frontage on 3 sides, Woodland, Plains, and Sand Roads.
- The request is to finalize the portable shed construction/woodworking business per the approved preliminary PUD plan.
- The request includes a perimeter setback modification from the required 50’ PUD setback to accommodate existing buildings.
- No new buildings proposed.
- Stormwater drainage plan not required due to no new impervious surface.
- Emmet County Road Commission has not yet provided feedback.
- Four parking spaces proposed. Ten parking spaces required. Requesting deferral of 6 parking spaces.
- Dumpster located on site plan. Natural screening provided by existing vegetation.
- Fire Dept. approval has been provided.
- Plans indicate no outdoor lights.
- Snow storage/management shown on plan.
- Sign proposed at drive entrance. Review by Administrator or Sign and Lighting Committee required.

ZONING ORDINANCE STANDARDS:

SEE PUD STANDARDS (10 pages)

SECTION 20.05 Site Plan Review Standards

The Planning Commission shall approve, or approve with conditions, an application for a site plan only upon a finding that the proposed site plan complies with all applicable provisions of this Ordinance and the standards and considerations listed below unless the Planning Commission waives a particular standard upon a finding that the standard is not applicable to the proposed development under consideration and the waiver of that standard will not be significantly detrimental to surrounding property or to the intent of the Ordinance.
A. Compliance with District Requirements
The site plan shall comply with the district requirements for minimum floor space, height of building, lot size, yard space, density and all other requirements as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance, unless otherwise provided.

Buildings are existing. No new buildings proposed.

B. Vehicular and Pedestrian Circulation
Safe, convenient, uncontested, and well-defined vehicular and pedestrian circulation shall be provided for ingress/egress points and within the site. A pedestrian circulation system shall be provided and shall be as insulated as completely as reasonably possible from the vehicular circulation system. Drives, streets and other circulation routes shall be designed to promote safe and efficient traffic operations within the site and at ingress/egress points. The arrangement of public or common ways for vehicular and pedestrian circulation shall respect the pattern of existing or planned streets and pedestrian or bicycle pathways in the area. Streets and drives which are part of an existing or planned street pattern which serves the project area shall be capable of safely and effectively accommodating the traffic volume and pattern proposed by the project. Where possible, shared commercial access drives shall be encouraged.

This standard would appear to be met.

1. Walkways from parking areas to building entrances

a. Internal pedestrian walkways shall be developed for persons who need access to the building(s) from internal parking areas. The walkways shall be located within the parking areas and shall be designed to provide access from these areas to the entrances of the building(s).

b. The walkways shall be designed to separate people from moving vehicles.

c. These walkways shall have a minimum width of five (5) feet with no car overhang or other obstruction.

d. The walkways must be designed in accordance with the Michigan Barrier Free Design Standards.

e. The walkways shall be distinguished from the parking and driving areas by use of any of the following materials: special pavers, bricks, raised elevation or scored concrete. Other materials may be used if they are appropriate to the overall design of the site and building and acceptable to the review authority.

C. Emergency Vehicle Access
All buildings or groups of buildings shall be so arranged as to permit emergency vehicle access by some practical means to all sides.

This condition appears to be met.

D. Loading and Storage
All loading and unloading areas and outside storage areas which face or are visible from residential districts or public thoroughfares, shall be screened, by a vertical screen consisting of structural or plant materials of sufficient height to obscure the direct view from adjacent first floor elevations. The site plan shall provide for adequate storage space for the use therein.

This condition appears to be met. Site screened with natural vegetation

E. Snow Storage
Proper snow storage areas shall be provided so to not adversely affect neighboring properties, vehicular and pedestrian clear vision, and parking area capacity.

Adequate snow storage provided.
F. Buffers
To provide reasonable visual and sound privacy, buffer techniques, screening, fences, walls, greenbelts, and landscaping may be required by the Planning Commission in pursuance of the objectives of this Section and/or as a condition of the establishment of the proposed use. Natural screening provided with existing vegetation.

G. Drainage
Storm water drainage plans shall address flows onto the site from adjacent sites and roads, storm water impact on the site (soils, impervious surfaces, potential impervious surface, retention ponds, detention ponds, and related management facilities as appropriate), and the storm water outfall, or flow control into adjacent drainage courses, ditches and the like. Stormwater drainage not required. No new impervious surfaces proposed.

H. Spaces, Rights-Of-Way, Easements
Spaces, rights-of-way, easements, and related site plan elements needed to serve the proposed use or development for such services as fire protection, sanitary sewers, water supplies, solid waste, storm drainage systems, and related.

Draft Motions:

To approve PPUDF17-001, Aaron Miller for a Final Planned Unit Development and Site Review on property located at 1912 Plains Road, Section11, Maple River Township, tax parcel 24-09-14-11-400-002, as shown on the Proposed PUD – Final Development Plans dated November 10, 2017, because the standards for the PUD have been met. The uses include all FF Farm and Forest uses, portable shed construction, wood working businesses and other similar family occupations. The approval includes a modification of the perimeter setback only for the existing building as shown on the site plan dated November 10, 2017.

To deny PPUDF17-001, Aaron Miller for a Final Planned Unit Development and Site Review on property located at 1912 Plains Road, Section11, Maple River Township, tax parcel 24-09-14-11-400-002; as shown on the Proposed PUD – Final Development Plans dated November 10, 2017, because
Hay Field

Property dimensions:
150' x 50' - 7.5 Acre

Area of wooded area:
Approx. 2 acres

This is R1-2 zoning

Senior citizen

Bed and breakfast

Proposed parking: 6

Deforested parking requested
To: Emmet County Planning Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals & Board of Commissioners
From: Planning, Zoning & Ordinance Enforcement, Tammy Doernenburg Director
Date: Prepared for Emmet County Planning Commission December 2017 meeting
Subject: Status of Enforcement Issues


2. **Maple River - 1526 Plains Rd** – Three horses on 1.25 acre property reported by Township Supervisor 8/1/2016. Investigated, sent letter 8/16/16. Received email … owner trying to lease or buy enough land in the vicinity to meet Ordinance standards. Second letter sent 11/21/2016. Received a call from owner working toward commercial farm to that the farm use would be exempt from zoning. Owner contacted office for options 1/23/2017. No change as of 4/6/2017. 5/1/2017 received email from property occupant who has purchased land for the horses and will be moving them within a month or two. Will follow-up mid-June. Horses still located on property on 7/6/2017. Sent email to horse owner asking for an update 9/12/2017.

3. **Bear Creek - 2325 Summit Park** – Complaint 12/8/2016 – Wall pack lights installed without shields. Letter sent 12/6/16, call received. Ordinance sent to staff at owner’s office. Follow-up done 12/21/2016 – no change. Follow-up letter sent 12/30/2016. Received call and met twice with business owner. Owner identified other non-shielded lights within the vicinity and is reluctant to change non-compliant fixtures. Working toward a resolution. Owner seems reluctant to comply. Met with Civil Counsel to discuss. Final letter sent 3/7/17. Thirty days given for compliance. 4/11/2017 met with Civil Counsel to discuss next steps. Re-inspection conducted 4/18/2017 – no change. 5/15/2017 completed research on surrounding lighting approvals or status. 5/17/2017 left message for Civil Counsel requesting permission to move to next step (NOV). 5/19/2017 issued NOV to 2 property owners. 5/24/2017 One owner replied with a letter requesting dismissal. 5/30/2017 that NOV dismissed. 5/31/2017 received a letter from the other owner requesting dismissal. 6/5/2017 follow-up letter sent not dismissing the responsible party. 6/9/2017 received phone call requesting information regarding an informal hearing. 6/5/2017 sent request to legal counsel to seek direction. 6/12/2017 received word from legal counsel that citation will need to be issued from P&Z office. 6/12/2017 left message with office at 2325 Summit Park. No response to date. Called back and spoke with representative on 6/20/2017. Issued Citation on 6/21/2017. No response to Citation. Civil Counsel notified. Need to issue Notice to Appear for formal hearing in District Court. Met with Civil Counsel 7/24/2017 who will prepare legal documents related to default. Default notice was sent 7/12/2017 by District Court. Staff is watching court records for Formal Hearing date. Hearing date had been scheduled for 10/11/2017, however, owner paid ticket, so court dismissed violation. Observed violation again on 10/10/2017 and 10/13/2017 – NTA/Citation issued, court date set for 11/8/2017. Fine increased to $250. Meeting scheduled with owner 10/23/2017. Owner agreed to a stipulation and given until 12/13/2017 to
correct violation.

4. **Bear Creek - 4/14/2017** – complaint of dead trees and trash at 1201 Lears Rd (Meijer). Investigated, sent letter via email and mail requesting immediate pick-up of trash and trees replaced by 5/31/2017. 4/21/2017 spoke with landscaper who is ordering trees and hoping to have them planted by end of May, might need a few extra weeks if local stock not available. 5/11/2017 received follow-up email from neighbor indicating that trash had been picked up, not to their satisfaction. They picked up remaining trash. 5/12/2017 - Forwarded email to Meijer. 7/18/2017 received email from neighbor. Site visit needed. Visited site with township supervisor 8/1/2017 - met with neighboring property owner - walked site. Follow-up call made to landscape contractor who will be replacing dead trees in fall 2017. Received email from neighbor and followed-up with a site visit on 11/10/2017. Two trees have been replaced. Will contact landscaper to schedule meeting and discuss condition of remaining trees.


6. **Littlefield - 5/26/2017** – 3656 Oden Rd. Reports of property being used in violation of PUD. 6/14/2017 – after confirmation and photos received, sent letter to owner and adjacent owners. 6/19/2017 received call from one adjacent owner. 7/7/2017-7/8/2017 received photos from adjacent owner. Follow-up letter needs to be sent. Discussed with Civil Counsel 7/24/2017. Follow-up letter sent 8/22/2017. Received call from owner’s legal counsel on Aug 30, 2017. Owner was to contact office to discuss options for “putting property into productive use.” No additional contact to date. 9/21/2017 – emailed legal counsel for property owner. Meeting scheduled for 10/17/2017. Owner looking at options for submission to ZBA (Temp Use) or Planning Commission.

7. **Littlefield - 8746 Littlefield Ln - 8/7/2017 (prior violation)** – application received for addition. Site inspection conducted and proposed addition found to be in setback. No permits issued. 8/17/2017 – inspection conducted – no construction had begun. 8/29/2017 – report of work without a permit. 8/30/2017 – site inspection done. 8/30/2017 letter sent - stop work. 9/1/2017 – follow-up inspection conducted. Found corner markers – addition in violation of front setback. 9/11/2017 – met with owner in office and on site. ZBA variance requested 9/11/2017. Posted Stop Work Order on 9/14/2017 as construction appeared to have continued without permits. 10/17/2017 ZBA denied request. 10/19/2017 staff met with property owner to discuss options. Indicated that he would need to address the issue and keep lines of communication open and make progress toward compliance. Owner contacted office to indicate he’s trying to contact a surveyor to survey his property. Time allotted for compliance.

8. **Carp Lake - 9/12/2017** – Sent letter to 7963 Reed Rd (SW corner Reed and Schmalzierd). Stock piles are too close to property lines and road rights-of-way. (Site Plan violation.) Application received for site plan amendment 10/9/2017. PC approved site plan 11/2/2017 – compliance achieved.

9. **Littlefield - 9/11/2017** – Sent letter to 6760 South Prospect – mobile home located at or in road right-of-way on US-31 N of Alanson. Received call from owner that trailer had been moved 10/12/2017. 10/30/2017 – trailer has been moved, but does not appear to be compliant. Site inspection needed.

10. **Maple River - 9/11/2017** – Sent letter to 2526 Gregory Rd – accessory building without a main use – no SUP. House was to be started within 2 years, no house. Accessory building is not completed.


12. **Bear Creek - 9/21/2107** – Sent letter to 895 Linwood Ln – residential accessory building placed 15 feet from shore of Walloon Lake. Received call from owner 10/2/2017 – building will be moved when ground is solid (gave until December 31 to move).


For more information or to report a violation, contact the Department of Planning and Zoning. 231-348-1735.
TOWNSHIP OF READMOND  
EMMET COUNTY, MICHIGAN  

RESOLUTION REGARDING MEDICAL MARIHUANA FACILITIES  
AUTHORIZED BY PA 281 OF 2016  

RESOLUTION NO. 11-01-17  
DATED: NOVEMBER 1, 2017  

WHEREAS, Public Act 281 of 2016 (MCL 333.27101 et. seq.) authorizes the State of Michigan to license five different types of facilities related to medical marihuana (grower, processor, secure transporter, provisioning center, and safety compliance facility); and  

WHEREAS, Section 205 of PA 281 of 2016 (MCL 333.27205) provides that “[a] marihuana facility shall not operate in a municipality unless the municipality has adopted an ordinance that authorizes that type of facility”; and  

WHEREAS, Section 205 of PA 281 of 2016 further provides that “[a] municipality may adopt other ordinances relating to marihuana facilities within its jurisdiction, including zoning regulations”; and  

WHEREAS, Section 205 of PA 281 of 2016 requires a municipality to respond to the State of Michigan, Medical Marihuana Licensing Board, within 90 days after the municipality receives notification from the applicant that a license for one of the five types of medical marihuana facilities authorized by PA 281 of 2016 has been applied for; and  

WHEREAS, the Township Board of Readmond Township, Emmet County, Michigan is cognizant of its authority to adopt an ordinance or ordinances to authorize the operation of one or more of the five types of medical marihuana facilities authorized by PA 281 of 2016 but desires to not do so.  

NOW THEREFORE it is hereby resolved as follows:  

1. Readmond Township, Emmet County, Michigan declines to adopt an ordinance authorizing any of the five types of medical marihuana facilities within the Township authorized by PA 281 of 2016; and  

2. As a result of the Township’s declination to adopt an ordinance authorizing any of the five types of medical marihuana facilities authorized by PA 281 of 2016, a “marihuana facility shall not operate in the Township”; and  

3. The Township Clerk and/or the Township Zoning Administrator is authorized to provide a copy of this resolution to the State of Michigan, Medical Marihuana Licensing Board in response to a request to locate a medical marijuana facility authorized by PA 281 of 2016 within the Township or for any other reason authorized by or in response to a request from State of Michigan, Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs or its successor agency or the Medical Marihuana Licensing Board; and  

4. The Township Clerk and/or the Township Zoning Administrator is authorized to provide a copy of this Resolution to any applicant requesting the ability to locate a medical marihuana grower, processor, secure transporter, provisioning center or safety compliance facility in the Township as evidence that the same shall not be allowed in the Township; and  

5. All resolutions in conflict herewith are repealed; and  

6. This resolution is effective immediately upon adoption and shall remain in full force and effect until repealed by the Township Board.
This RESOLUTION was offered by Board member Robert Kozla, supported by Board member Lisa Emerton at a meeting on November 1, 2017. The members of the Township Board voted as follows:

☐ Yes
☐ No

The TOWNSHIP SUPERVISOR declared the RESOLUTION duly adopted.

Sarah Krupa, Township Clerk

CERTIFICATE
I hereby certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and complete copy of a resolution adopted at a regular meeting of the Readmond Township Board held on November 1, 2017; that the meeting was conducted and public notice of the meeting was given pursuant to and in compliance with the Michigan Open Meetings Act; that a quorum of the Board was present and voted in favor of the resolution; and that the minutes of the meeting will be or have been made available as required by the Open Meetings Act.

Sarah Krupa, Clerk
Township of Readmond
Emmet County, Michigan
TOWNSHIP OF CENTER
EMMET COUNTY, MICHIGAN

RESOLUTION REGARDING MEDICAL MARIHUANA FACILITIES
AUTHORIZED BY PA 281 OF 2016

RESOLUTION NO. 2/2
DATED: 10-3, 2017

WHEREAS, Public Act 281 of 2016 (MCL 333.27101 et. seq.) authorizes the State of Michigan to license five different types of facilities related to medical marihuana (grower, processor, secure transporter, provisioning center, and safety compliance facility); and

WHEREAS, Section 205 of PA 281 of 2016 (MCL 333.27205) provides that "[a] marihuana facility shall not operate in a municipality unless the municipality has adopted an ordinance that authorizes that type of facility"; and

WHEREAS, Section 205 of PA 281 of 2016 further provides that "[a] municipality may adopt other ordinances relating to marihuana facilities within its jurisdiction, including zoning regulations..."; and

WHEREAS, Section 205 of PA 281 of 2016 requires a municipality to respond to the State of Michigan, Medical Marihuana Licensing Board, within 90 days after the municipality receives notification from the applicant that a license for one of the five types of medical marihuana facilities authorized by PA 281 of 2016 has been applied for; and

WHEREAS, the Township Board of CENTER Township, EMMET County, Michigan is cognizant of its authority to adopt an ordinance or ordinances to authorize the operation of one or more of the five types of medical marihuana facilities authorized by PA 281 of 2016 but desires to not do so.

NOW THEREFORE it is hereby resolved as follows:

1. CENTER Township, EMMET County, Michigan (Township) declines to adopt an ordinance authorizing any of the five types of medical marihuana facilities within the Township authorized by PA 281 of 2016; and

2. As a result of the Township’s declination to adopt an ordinance authorizing any of the five types of medical marihuana facilities authorized by PA 281 of 2016, a "marihuana facility shall not operate in the Township"; and

3. The Township Clerk and/or the Township Zoning Administrator is authorized to provide a copy of this resolution to the State of Michigan, Medical Marihuana Licensing Board in response to a request to locate a medical marihuana facility authorized by PA 281 of 2016 within the Township or for any other reason authorized by or in response to a request from State of Michigan, Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs or its successor agency or the Medical Marihuana Licensing Board; and

4. The Township Clerk and/or the Township Zoning Administrator is authorized to provide a copy of this Resolution to any applicant requesting the ability to locate a medical marihuana grower, processor, secure transporter, provisioning center or safety compliance facility in the Township as evidence that the same shall not be allowed in the Township; and

5. All resolutions in conflict herewith are repealed; and

6. This resolution is effective immediately upon adoption and shall remain in full force and effect until repealed by the Township Board.
This RESOLUTION was offered by Board member Susan St. Amour, supported by Board member Judy Van Avery at a meeting on 10-3, 2017. The members of the Township Board voted as follows:

The TOWNSHIP SUPERVISOR declared the RESOLUTION duly adopted.

(NAME), Township Clerk

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing constitutes a true and complete copy of a resolution adopted at a regular meeting of the Center Township Board held on 10-3, 2017; that the meeting was conducted and public notice of the meeting was given pursuant to and in compliance with the Michigan Open Meetings Act; that a quorum of the Board was present and voted in favor of the resolution; and that the minutes of the meeting will be or have been made available as required by the Open Meetings Act.

Clerk

Township of Center

Emmet County, Michigan
Section 26.32 Commercial Accessory Uses in FF-1 or FF-2

26.32.1 FF-1 or FF-2 District

Specified commercial accessory uses may be permitted subject to the following standards including Planning Commission review:

A. Permitted Accessory Uses
   The uses permitted pursuant to this Section may include one or more of the following:

1. Social events which may include weddings, receptions, and similar social activities operated or intended to be operated as a commercial operation.

2. Concerts and Festivals operated or intended to be operated as a commercial operation.

B. Outside Activities
   All primary activities which involve sound systems or amplification systems shall be within a completely enclosed structure.

C. Owner Occupancy
   Buildings and uses permitted shall only be approved on properties occupied by the owner and be the primary place of the owner’s residence.

D.C. Site Size and Setback
   The minimum property size shall be twenty (20) acres or larger by description, having at least 600 ft. of lot width and at least 600 ft. of lot depth. The accessory use shall be setback a minimum of 100 ft. from the side and rear property line and meet the front yard setback standard of the Zoning Ordinance. Setback standards shall apply to the accessory use, parking, and structures associated with the accessory use.

E. Hours of Operation
   The Accessory Use shall be limited to the hours of 8AM to 10PM one day per calendar week, but not more than three (3) per calendar month, except that a Festival may be held one time per calendar year and be limited to three days.

F. Building Limitations
   The ground floor area of proposed buildings associated with the uses permitted shall not exceed an area of 2,200 sq. ft.

G. Parking
   Parking spaces shall be provided in accordance with the standards of Section 22.02 of this Ordinance except that parking areas shall be setback a minimum of 100 feet from the side and rear property lines and 40 feet from the road right-of-way.

H. Screening
   The accessory use shall be effectively screened from adjacent properties in accordance with the standards of Section 22.04.2.

I. Lighting
   Lighting shall meet the Standards of Section 22.06 of this Ordinance.

J. Signs
   Accessory signs shall follow the Standards of Section 22.07 of this Ordinance.

Modifications to the standards listed in items B thru J above may be approved by the Planning Commission, if the intent of Article 8 FF-1 and FF-2 Farm and Forest is kept and the surrounding properties are protected from nuisances. These standards shall not apply to similar uses on residential properties which occur on an occasional basis (four times per year or less).
### Planning Commission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>Planning Commission</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 4, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>7:30 p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 5, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 3, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 5, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 6, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 4, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 1, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 6, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ZBA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting Date</th>
<th>ZBA</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January 16, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td>6:00 p.m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 20, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 20, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 17, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 19, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 21, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 18, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 20, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 18, 2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dates subject to change; please confirm with office: 231-348-1735