READMOND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Board Meeting Minutes
Monday, April 23, 2018

Present: Bill Sutton, Bob Hannah, Rosalie Wiegand, Dell Weitzel, Lisa Fineout, Lance Talcott, Edith Kruskie
Absent: Jay Malott
Also Present: Gordie Kruskie - Township Supervisor, Sarah Krupa – Township Clerk

I. Chairman Sutton asked that the commission introduce themselves to those in attendance.

II. Meeting was called to order at 7:02pm by Chairman Sutton.

III. Motion made by Hannah to approve agenda as presented, seconded by Weitzel. All in favor, motion carried.

IV. Motion made by Hannah to approve the minutes from October 30, 2017 as presented. Seconded by Kruskie. All in favor, motion carried.

V. Public comment opened at 7:04pm. There was none. Closed at 7:05pm.

VI. Old Business

Replacement of Commissioner Peterson – Sutton asked Supervisor Kruskie and the rest of the commission if there were any prospects for a replacement. Weitzel would like to see a full commission and asked Supervisor Kruskie how long before someone would be appointed by the Board. Supervisor Kruskie stated that he felt within the month. Sutton mentioned John Merrill, and Commissioner Kruskie mentioned Cheryl True.

New Business

Review of Case #PSUP 18-002 William and Susan Klco Special Use Permit for Level II Home Occupation at 910 Lamkin Road, Good Hart.

Chairman Sutton set rules to this discussion.
A. He will present case with applicable laws.
B. Ask applicants to make presentation with handouts and will take questions.
C. Public Hearing will close.
D. The Board will discuss and ask their questions.

All discussion will go through Chairman Sutton.

All information is on Emmet County website. Sutton pointed out that there is very little difference between Level I and Level II Home Occupation. Klco’s property is zoned RR (Residential Recreational). Request asks to allow artists residence with studio opened to the public on 2 Saturdays per month May-October. Klco applied for Special Use Permit and has already been approved administratively. Building permits, site plans with driveway and setbacks, along with permits from the Road Commission, have all been approved by the County. Sutton then read from the site plan review checklist. He also laid the groundwork to Emmet County zoning. The Michigan Zoning Enabling Act 125.30204 allows for Level I Home Occupations by right. Subject to uses with supplemental regulations. This is why Tammy Doernenburg, Director of Emmet County Planning & Zoning, has already approved. Level II requires a Special Use Permit. Klco meet everything for the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act without question.

Sutton then read the facts of this case, as written in a zoning evaluation form dated 4/19/18, that will be presented at the Emmet County Planning & Zoning meeting. It is now the Commission’s job and responsibility to evaluate and determine whether a Special Use Permit will be awarded or denied based on the 5 items under Section 26.11.D. No questions at this time. Klcos handed out information and read letter about the Good Hart Artist Residency program and their plans for the 910 Lamkin Road.
property. They also addressed neighboring property owners' concerns. Chairman Sutton then asked for public questions.

Ernest Bouck, living "above" 910 Lamkin Road at 843 N. Lake Shore Dr., asked if this case was about rezoning. Chairman Sutton made it clear that it was NOT about rezoning. Mr. Bouck then asked if the SUP would be carried over to new property owners. Sutton stated that the SUP is granted to the Klcos and would NOT go with the ownership of the property. Sutton also stated that he understands that if there are any violations of the covenants that the SUP would be revoked. It was confirmed that the artists' studio would be located above the garage. The Boucks were told that the property in question would be used strictly as a residency. The Boucks would like to see the studio to remain at the Klcos' property at 1159 N. Lamkin Rd. as there is more parking space there. Mr. Bouck questioned whether the Jones and Alywards had trimming rights from above the property on Lake Shore Drive. Mr. Klco stated that the Jones and Alywards did NOT have trimming rights. The Boucks along with others would like to see the property remain strictly a residence. It was questioned who received a letter from the county about the Klcos' SUP request. Sutton stated that those property owners who own within 300 feet of the property lines received a letter. Sutton stated that Emmet County is careful about sending letters in a timely manner. Mr. Bouck didn't feel that some of the property owners received their letters in a timely fashion.

Pat Dobson living at 1178 N. Lamkin Rd. stated that she belongs to the Good Hart Book Club that will sometimes meet at homes on Lamkin Rd. There are about 40 members. There are many cars that will park on Lamkin Road for at least 2 hours during June, July, and August. She felt that parking on Lamkin Road shouldn't be an issue to deny SUP request.

Ceci Bauer living at 1156 N. Lamkin Rd., which is right across the street from the Klcos' current residence. She has attended many of the events, and there has never been an issue with parking.

Sutton asked for any more input. Susan Klco stated that if there was ever an issue with parking, the Klcos would turn people away rather than cause a problem. Chairman Sutton then closed the oral discussion and said that he had received more correspondence regarding this case, than any other that he can recall. Five unfavorable letters, 3 of which came from neighbors above on Lake Shore Drive, 2 from Lamkin Road. Concerns were signs, parking, traffic, and zoning. There were 13 favorable letters. Most were general in nature, stating that they thought this would have a positive affect on the community. One letter, from a Lamkin Road resident, stated that the open hours are so few that it wouldn't be any more disruptive than having a private summer party or a book club meeting at their home. Sutton asked for any more input from the Klcos before the Commission discussed. Not at this time.

Gail Tomlinson, who lives at 237 Lake Shore Drive, asked about the off season. Susan Klco stated that they host only writers beginning at the Harbor Springs Festival of the Book. There are NO open houses during the winter months. There are open houses only May-October and none in July.

Chairman Sutton went over the 5 items under Section 26.11.D that need to be evaluated by the Commission. Each Commissioner present then had a chance to speak.

Hannah – Reminded everyone that Good Hart was a much busier area than it is now. He likes and supports the Klcos' idea.

Talcott – Questioned Section 26.11.B as it implies that the OWNERS will live there. There seemed to be some confusion between "Home Occupancy Permit" and "Home
Occupation” wording. It was already determined that there will be renters there 2-3 weeks at a time. The county has already approved.

Weitzel – Concerned with 2 Saturdays a month for public open houses and how busy it can become. He also questioned the interpretation of Section 26.11.B. Sutton reread part of the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act that states “any occupant”, it does not specify “owner occupant”, so he respectfully disagreed with Talcott and Weitzel interpretation. Other parts of the Act does specify “owner occupied”, and it does not in this case. Talcott was concerned that other owners may be able to run an operation off site, away from their domicile.

Wiegand – Tried to point out that the renter is the occupant in this case. Sutton pointed out that the SUP is personal to the applicant, and the applicant is the owner of the property. Wiegand went on to say that change happens, and we have a chance to make a positive impact on the community by expanding our arts programs. She reiterated that the wording that Sutton had gone over has been reviewed and checked. She likes and supports the Klcos’ idea.

Chairman Sutton read Section 26.11.D.1 “Lack an occupied residence on the property.” He stated again that nowhere does anything specify “home owner occupied”. Fineout tried to alleviate Talcott’s concern about an owner running an operation on a separate piece of property from where they live, by reading Section 26.11.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.” No Readmond Township property owner that owns 2 separate parcels would be allowed to conduct an operation on one parcel, and live on another. Hannah pointed out that parking and traffic at Middle Village Park can currently be problematic. Edith Kruskie asked about open houses at the Klcos’ residence having traffic/parking problems in the past. None that anyone is aware of.

Fineout – Questioned the Klcos letter that mentions one of the artists will engage in an activity with approximately 25 participants. Seemed contradictory to their statement of anticipating no more than 12 guests during open house hours. Susan Klco clarified that each artist is paired with a sponsor, and will conduct certain activities elsewhere. There will not be any large events at the studio.

Kruskie – Didn’t have any more questions at this time.

Chairman Sutton started to discuss each line item for evaluation. Wiegand wanted to know how this request was any different than someone having a party at their house. Fineout pointed out that this would be open to the public. It’s not a private home party by invite only. It could become a traffic/parking problem on Saturdays 10am-2pm. Sutton stated that we could establish guidelines in the SUP that would be enforceable, and the SUP could be revoked if these are not met. Emmet County has an enforcement officer, Nancy Solar. Sutton reminded all again that the SUP is for the Klcos only, and does not follow the property ownership. He also went over the Home Occupation Permit granted by Tammy Doernenburg, Emmet County’ Zoning Administrator. After evaluating the 5 items in Section 26.11.D, Sutton concluded that the only concern was line 3 – parking. Can we place solutions to the parking issue in the SUP? Sutton and the Klcos looked at site plan again. Mr. Klco doesn’t want to see the removal of any more trees to make room for more parking. He doesn’t feel it would be in the neighborhood’s best interest, but they would if needed. Weitzel was still questioning Section 26.11.B. Sutton again referred Weitzel to the Emmet County Zoning Evaluation Form dated 4/19/2018 that States “Occupant is proposed to be a renter (2-3 weeks at a time). No outside employees proposed.” Fineout then questioned line 9 of the Home Occupation Permit submitted by
Tammy Doernenburg that states “Clients or customers shall not exceed an average of one person per day.” Is it an actual average over a month, year? Sutton stated that the county has determined that number by averaging it over a month. Two open houses a month would allow them 15 visitors each time.

Sutton asked for any more comments. None at this time.

Hannah made a motion to approve SUP. Sutton read the motion as: “Motion to approve Case #PSUP18-002, William and Susan Klco, Special Use Permit for a Home Occupation to operate an Artist Residency at 910 N. Lamkin Rd., Section 36, Readmond Township as outlined in the Home Occupation Use Plan dated 1/19/2018 and as shown on the site plan dated 1/23/2018 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, hours of operation may be as described in the Home Occupation Impact Statement, and no sign is permitted. Wiegand suggested to include an amendment that states “the SUP will be revoked if any of the Home Occupation Permit provisions, dated 1/23/2018, are violated.” Wiegand seconded. Sutton asked for a roll call vote. Kruskie – Yes, Fineout – Yes, Wiegand – Yes, Sutton – Yes, Weitzel – No, Talcott – No, Hannah – Yes. Motion carried with a 5-2 Yes vote. Sutton thanked all who came.

VIII. Public Comment opened at 8:29pm

Readmond Township Clerk, Sarah Krupa, thanked Chairman Bill Sutton for his excellent job of explaining this case to those in attendance.

IX. Weitzel made a motion to adjourn meeting, seconded by Wiegand. Meeting adjourned at 8:30pm.
April 25, 2018  Letter to the Emmet County Planning Commission

I would like the following letter to be read and entered into the Emmet County Planning Commission minutes at its meeting on May 3, 2018.

Case # PSUP18-002 A request from William and Susan Klco for a special use permit for a Level II Home Occupation at 910 N Lamkin Rd, Section 36, Readmond Township.

My wife and I are residents at 843 N. Lake Shore Drive, Harbor Springs, MI 49740 Box 402. We are on the bluff adjacent to the property listed above. When this property at 910 Lamkin was purchased by the Klcos we were given the impression that the property would be used as an Artist Residency. We only learned in the past week that the property would also be as an artist studio and a facility to present different art venues.

1. The Klcos applied for the change of variance in January 2018. The Readmond Township Planning Commission did not make us aware of this possible change until they sent out a letter dated April 11 which we were not aware of until April 18th. We had 5 days to respond to what appeared to be a rezoning of the property (a zoning that also appeared to be commercial). Our neighbors also received this late notice.

2. The late notice meant that only my wife and I were the only dissenters able to attend, I did address the commission members on our concerns. The Klcos had many supporters at the meeting – indicating they knew about the meeting well in advance of the April 11th letter.

3. There were 5 dissenting letters (from near or adjacent properties) and 2 letters in the positive. Only 1 letter was read aloud by Bill Sutton, one of the favorable ones. The dissenting letters were shared with the Klcos prior to the meeting [see materials dated April 23rd] Susan Klco read her response to the commission and public, claiming to refute all our concerns and saying we are not familiar with the artist residency program. Too bad the Klcos and/or the commission had not shared their plans and explanations with the residents nearest the property in a more timely fashion. We could then have made a more knowledgeable decision concerning this issue and sought legal counsel to determine the legality of the variance. Legal counsel may now have to be considered after your approval, if you should choose to approve it. I would suggest that a decision be postponed until the dissenters or the County Commission have the opportunity to consult legal counsel.

4. The majority of the Readmond Planning Commission seemed to have decided this issue before the meeting. One member sang the praises of the Artist Residency as well as the Klcos. The final vote was 5 for the variance and 2 against. The 2 dissenters on the commission were concerned about the legality of the variance regarding the rule that an occupant artist must be resident and owner of the property. This will not be true as the artist are not the owners.

5. Other concerns: The Garage/Studio appears larger than the site plan. Parking for maximum of 3 cars for an Open House. Future variances that might allow different venues, additional parking areas, and possible sale of Artist works.

Ernie Bouck and Beverly Bouck  248-376-7310

843 N. Lake Shore Drive

Harbor Springs, Mi 49740  Box 402
April 29, 2018

Emmet County Planning Commission

pzcr@emmetcounty.org

Dear Emmet County Planning Commission,

On April 16th I received a letter from you regarding the property adjacent to us –
24-12-07-36-102-003 Case # PSUP18-002 910 N.Lamkin Rd., Readmond Township.

We had no knowledge of this zoning request from January for public use of the property at 910 N. Lamkin Rd. until your letter. With only a few days notice for the Readmond Township meeting we were unable to attend. I was assured that my letter would be read and considered. It was not. Readmond Township passed this quickly with out reading any of the letters of dissent or answering the questions in those letters.

Our property at 901 Lakeshore Dr. abuts the above property. Our house is very close to their lot. The proposed Saturday Open Houses would directly impact us. They estimate 12 cars in and out on each Saturday. Is that a cap?

The Goodhart Artist Residency has a beautiful Website, Facebook page, and is on Instagram. It looks terrific. They are already listing this address. It is hard to imagine that it will not grow in popularity, it should! Then what? It is a wonderful idea but an unsuitable location for the proximity of neighbors, parking and potential growth of the program.

Parking – N. Lamkin is barely a 2-lane road. It is busy on Saturdays not only with cars but also with walkers, runners and dog walkers. What kind of parking is required legally? Adding general public who will not have adequate parking on the lot seems dangerous.

What kind of signage would be allowed? On M119 also?

Is this setting a spot zoning precedent? What’s next?

If the variance is granted, the precedent is set, and the Studio is built, will there be any recourse if the Impact Statement is exceeded? Who would we call if it is?

We bought a single family home in an area that is zoned for single-family homes. This variance would not impact most supporters. They will have the option of peaceful Saturdays at home. Twice a month, we would not. If it were fine for everyone to have Open Houses to the public then they wouldn’t need a special use permit. How is it acceptable for others to say that they like the idea so we will just have to take one for the team? This proposal is for 2 Saturdays a month, forever.

We respectfully request that you do not grant this special use zoning variance.

Thank you,

Donna Scarpuzza-Jones

Donnasjones@mac.com 734 260 9958
April 30, 2018

Tammy Doernenburg
Director, Emmet County Planning & Zoning
Via Email: tdoernenburg@emmetcounty.org

Toni Drier, Emmet County Commissioner (District 1)
Via Email: tdrier@emmetcounty.org

Neil Ahrens, Emmet County Commissioner (District 2)
Via Email: nahrens@emmetcounty.org

Charlie Macinnis, Emmet County Commissioner (District 3)
Via Email: cmacinnis@emmetcounty.org

Bill Shorter, Emmet County Commissioner (District 4)
Via Email: bshorter@emmetcounty.org

Jonathan Scheel, Emmet County Commissioner (District 5)
Via Email: jscheel@emmetcounty.org

John Stakoe, Emmet County Commissioner (District 6)
Via Email: jstakoe@emmetcounty.org

Betsy White, Emmet County Commissioner (District 7)
Via Email: bwhite@emmetcounty.org

Dear County Officials:

This letter is in opposition to item #5 on your May 3, 2018 agenda, a request by my neighbors Susan and William Klco for a special use permit for their Lamkin Road property (lower).

While I am a strong supporter of the arts, and specifically of their current artist in residency program, I am entirely against the approval of a special use permit for their newly acquired property on the lower level of North Lamkin Road. Should they wish to expand their current operation at their home near M-119, I would likely be in favor.

My primary reason for opposing is that Lamkin Road is a narrow, residential county road which is 90%+ unpaved with no commercialization and no spot zoning. There have been no commercial entities in operation on the entire 5 mile road in my lifetime (age 45). I'd like this to stay constant.

If approving this request, the doors would then be opened for other requests, certainly some far less favorable than an art studio/gallery and housing. Approval would further set precedence that I am not in support of at this time. Operating a gallery/studio is in fact a commercial venture.
As a full time, year round resident of Good Hart, owning homes on both M-119 as well as Lamkin Road, I do not want to see spot zoning/special use permits approved on Lamkin at this time without additional information on this matter. Will parking be required? Will signage be visible? What plans are in place for increased traffic? Is there a clear vision for the business proposed? I ask these questions as the person most familiar with Good Hart's most recent residential/commercial zoning controversy back in 2011 when the property next to me on Lake Shore Drive was approved for a business development without clear vision. Since work began in 2011, an actual viable business, contributing to the landscape of our area has never evolved. Random signage has included a coffee shop, art gallery, real estate office, and antiques store – all advertising businesses which never actually came to any sort of fruition. Best I can tell, the owners of said property are on and off living in the quarters while renting their own home. In summary, they have contributed nothing to our business community, while causing nothing but irritation for neighboring residents in the process.

While I don't believe this scenario would be duplicated with the request by the Kico family, I still would require that several specific questions be answered before I would entertain supporting this major change to the current zoning on Lamkin Road. With the information presented, I am not in favor.

Please feel free to contact me with questions. I hope that our commissioners and the P&Z committee will value the opinions of neighboring residents on this matter.

Best Wishes,

[Signature]

Ami Woods
amiwoods.com
I am against this special permit. Judith Greenberg 855 Lamkin Road Good Hart. 248 258-1144.

Sent from my iPad
We oppose the Spot Rezoning of this property.

Our Property is directly above this property and our land wraps down the bluff and touches this property.

I have sent a few emails, and this attached letter.

Spot zoning is the application of zoning to a specific parcel or parcels of land within a larger zoned area when the rezoning is usually at odds with a city's master plan and current zoning restrictions. Spot zoning may be ruled invalid as an "arbitrary, capricious and unreasonable treatment" of a limited parcel of land by a local zoning ordinance. While zoning regulates the land use in whole districts, spot zoning makes unjustified exceptions for a parcel or parcels within a district.

The small size of the parcel is not the sole defining characteristic of a spot zone. Rather, the defining characteristic is the narrowness and unjustified nature of the benefit to the particular property owner, to the detriment of a general land use plan or public goals. The rezoning may provide unjustified special treatment that benefits a particular owner, while undermining the pre-existing rights and uses of adjacent property owners. This would be called an instance of spot zoning.

Regards
Jeff
Jeffrey M Jones
jeffmjones@me.com
7342167740
Monica Linehan

From: Nan Thomas <nantomas@msn.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 01, 2018 3:08 PM
To: PZCR
Cc: Wil Thomas
Subject: Objection to Special Use Permit (Case No. PSUP 18-002
Attachments: Emmet County Objection to Use Permit_0001.pdf, Signed Objection to Use Permit_0001.pdf

Dear Emmet County Planning Commission:

Attached, please find our objection to the request for a special use permit with regard to Case No. PSUP 18-002. We respectfully request that the Commission make the attached objection part of the official record for the hearing scheduled this coming Thursday, May 3, 2018.

To make sure this email is received and our objection will be part of the record, could you please confirm receipt of this email and the attached.

If you have any questions or need any further information, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Nancy Thomas
202-254-6565

Confirmation of the objection sent to and received by Readmond Township (letter attached):

Nan Thomas:

I am in receipt of your correspondence, and it will be incorporated into the record for our hearing.

Any questions, please let me know.

Bill Sutton, Chairman
Readmond Township Planning Commission

231-838-0199

From: Readmond Township [mailto:readmond6034@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, April 20, 2018 3:49 PM
To: Bill Sutton Personal Email <billsutton@racc2000.com>
Subject: Fwd: Objection to Request for Special Use Permit (Case No. PSUP 18-002

1
May 1, 2018

Via Email
Emmet County Department of Planning,
Zoning, & Construction Resources
Emmet County Planning Commission
3434 Harbor Pesokey Rd., Ste. E
Harbor Springs, MI 49740
pzer@emmetcounty.org

Re: 12-07-36-100-008
Case No. PSUP 18-002
Objection to Request for Special Use Permit
By William and Susan Klco

Dear Commissioners:

My name is Nancy Thomas and I am the owner of 860 N. Lamkin Rd., Good Hart, Michigan, in Readmond Township. Our property is directly adjacent to the property in question, 910 N. Lamkin Rd. With respect to the request for a Special Use Permit by our new neighbors William and Susan Klco, I respectfully submit this objection to that request for consideration by the Commission and ask that it be read into the record at the Commissions May 3, 2018 meeting.

I sent a similar objection to the Readmond Township Planning Commission (the "Township") prior to its April 23, 2018 meeting regarding the immediate request (See 4/19/2018 Email and Letter, attached hereto). Although I was unable to attend in person, I was informed by those who did attend that my letter and those of other close neighbors who submitted objections in absentia were not read into the record as requested and were merely paraphrased by the Township. My hope is that the Commission considers the points of objection outlined below – and those that will be proffered by other close neighbors – and gives legitimate weight to all of those in this community who oppose this request. I respectfully request that the Commission overrule the initial determination of the Township and deny the request for a special use permit.

My family first came to Good Hart in 1974 as visitors and then as property owners when we built the same home that still stands today. Over that time, many things have changed in this world. One thing that has remained consistent throughout, and that has never been disrupted, is the character of this residential community. That character is built on serenity and reticence, an enclave of peace afar from the commerce and distraction of everyday life. This community is a beacon for what life in Northern Michigan represents: a place where family and friends can surrender to the tranquility that this area presents and forget about everything else. For the past 36 years my family, our friends, and our neighbors have enjoyed our home and the surrounding community specifically for its character. Over that time, our family has spread out across the country as far as Kansas, Colorado, California, and Washington. In spite of the distance some of our family members have to this home that has never stopped them from returning back year after year. The reason they do so is that they truly love this area, what it provides, and the fact that it never changes.
Another aspect of this community that has never been disrupted over the last 36 years—and even longer than that I am sure—is that it is has been exclusively a residential community. However, the request before the Commission not only seeks to change that history but presents a real danger of undermining the character of this community for the worse.

From my understanding, the Klcos’ moved to Good Hart several years ago. Although their intentions with respect to this request may be honest, they are new to this Lower Shore Road community and do not have the requisite history or appreciation for what their request signifies. Allowing a commercial venture into the heart of this residential community will increase traffic and congestion on our one-lane road, bring more noise and pollution to our homes, and will honestly disrupt (if not ruin) the Up North experience that we and our neighbors have enjoyed for so many years. I assume that the Klcos’ were not striving to cause any of that, but that is the realistic impact of what would result if their request is granted.

Our home has been in our family for two generations and my intention is to pass this to my children, so they and their children can continue to enjoy this for generations to come. My family and I do not want to live next door to a commercial venture that will disrupt what we have enjoyed over these last 36 years. Other owners, family members, guests, and renters return to this community every year because of its character. Injecting a commercial venture will present a real deterrent for those considering staying or returning. This will not only drive people away, but also has the realistic possibility of driving down property values. This too will make it harder to keep our community intact.

The gravest danger this request presents, however, is the precedent that it sets. By granting this request, nothing will stop other individuals in the future from coming into this community, buying property, and setting up a business of their own. Such individuals will be able to rely upon the precedent of this request to compel future Commissions to allow similar special use requests. Granting this request is a bell that cannot be unrung. By opening the door to commercial enterprises, our community will never be the same and it will present a genuine and realistic threat to the sanctity of our community. With respect to the Klcos’ request, there is little if any benefit to our community. The points in opposition brought forth in this letter, as well as those from other neighbors, far outweigh the nominal benefits, if any, that may exist from granting this request. As such, the only equitable solution is to deny this request.

Furthermore, denying this request does not foreclose the Klcos from living in our community and establishing their business in this area. There are numerous places within a reasonable distance of their home that are already zoned for commercial use: on 119 next to the Good Hart General Store, in downtown Cross Village, in Harbor Springs, and numerous other places in between. Denying their request and proposing they seek an alternative site for their business in an existing commercial zone presents a win-win solution for all involved. The residents of this community can continue to enjoy their homes without disruption, the character of this community can remain intact, and the Klcos can stay part of our community while starting a business in reasonable proximity to their home. This solution not only presents a reasonable alternative that benefits the residents and Klcos alike, but it will maintain our community and its character and remove any of the issues presented by granting the request.
Based on the foregoing, my family and I respectfully request that the Commission deny the immediate request and overrule the initial determination made by the Township. We hope the Commission takes to heart the concerns outlined in this letter and truly considers the impact and future of our community with respect to this request. If the Commission has any questions or would like any further comments with respect to this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Very Truly Yours,

Nancy Thomas

860 N. Lamkin Rd.
(720) 254-6565
nanthomas@msn.com
Tammy and County planning,
I am in support for the KLco's having the new Apt Studio on Lamkin Rd for artist in residency. I have met wonderful artists and enjoyed viewing there works of art after there stay in Good Hart. Small and quaint and what a neat way for us to enjoy the arts. I am in favor of this happening soon.

Thank you,
Annette Moriarty
Sent from my iPhone
Dear Planning Commission,

Thank you for your recent letter regarding 24-12-07-36-102-003, Case # PSUP18-002, 910 N. Lamkin Rd.

My family and I own property on 951 N. Lakeshore Drive that extends down the bluff to Lamkin road. We also own an easement just down the hill from the artist studio on Lamkin road (parcels 12-07-26-400-024 and 12-07-25-300-038.) We are concerned with the parking situation the zoning request could bring. The artist studio is located on a sharp, hilly blind turn on Lamkin road. We are concerned about on street parking on that stretch of Lamkin as well as spillover parking that could happen next to our properties further down the hill. If this proposal were to go forward, we request that parking should be provided off-street.

Thank you for your consideration,

Emily Fox, Patricia McKay and Ted Fox
From: Peg Bodt <pegbodt@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 02, 2018 7:32 PM
To: PZCR
Subject: Proposal by Sue and Bill Kiso

We are Lamkin Road neighbors of Sue and Bill Kiso. We are in favor of their project at 910 Lamkin Road. They are an asset to our community and their support of the arts benefits all of us in Good Hart. Thank you for your consideration.

John and Mary Bodt
Meeting was called to order by Damien Henning: Board Sondra Festerling, Kim Shomin, Dean Morford and Katie Derrohn

Case#PSUP18-003 Request by Jason Smith for a contractor’s use on Powers Rd. Property is FF-1 and owned by Griffin Family Trust. Article 8, 21, and Section 26.32 of the Emmet County Zoning Ordinance.

Case# PSUP18-003 was tabled for clearer information on driveway and placement of Pole Barn. See note from Township.

Case#PSUP18-001 Request by Patrick Leitelt for ML68 Properties LLC for contractor’s use at 8737 M-68 Hwy. Property is zoned FF-1. Articles 8,19,20,21, & 22 and Section 26.32 of the Emmet County Zoning Ordinance.

Township approved Case#PSUP18-001 with conditions: If he has a dumpster it must be screened. Outside storage must be screened. Will not have more than three buildings on property. One house 720 sq., one office 30x40 and pole barn 1680 sq. ft. Applicant has agreed to have Planning & Zoning from the County come on to property to see where the pole barn is going because we are not sure now from drawing. No overhead elect. To the pole barn from pole at the gate. No sign or lighting at this time.

Vote:  5 yes-0 no

Case#PSUP18-003 Committee by phone OK this case after going to the county for more and clearer information about driveway and building. The Township agreed to approve this case with conditions. The Deed of Sale
with the easement will have the dominions of drive way going into property and to site of building which will be recorded and then given to the County (P&Z). The 3200 sq. ft. Pole Barn has enough screening from Luce St. and Powers. Asking to have roof of Barn green. Dumpster will be screened. All outdoor storage has to be screened and he has agreeded to a Knox Box. Hours of operation Monday through Friday 8:00am to 6:00pm and Sat. 8am to 5pm Sun. if needed 10:00am to 3:00pm. Applicant has agreed to a grading easement over the North portion of the property to improve sight distance on Powers Rd. If this takes place will the County agreed to allow a left turn on to Powers Rd. from Property driveway?

Vote: 5 Yes 0 No

The Township has questions about this property. We would like the County to look into the permit for the mine business. The Bem facing Luce St has been under cut and in part is no long there. The dumping of materials on sight and who is reclaiming property?