EMMET COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
THURSDAY JULY 11, 2019, 7:30 P.M.
EMMET COUNTY BUILDING
200 DIVISION ST
PETOSKEY, MI 49770

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Eby, Toni Drier, David Laughbaum, James Kargol, Kelly Alexander, Tom Urman, Charles MacInnis, Lauri Hartmann, James Scott

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF: Tammy Doernenburg, Monica Linehan, Nancy Salar

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

II Minutes of June 6, 2019
Alexander made a motion supported by Kargol to approve the minutes of the June 6, 2019 meeting as presented. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote of the members.

III Cases

1. PPUD19-002 David McBride, PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT – Amendment, 7320 M-68 Hwy, Section 11, Littlefield Township

Legal Notice: A request by Dave McBride for an amendment to the Planned Unit Development (PUD) at 7320 M-68 Hwy, Section 11, Littlefield Township. The property is zoned FF-1 Farm and Forest with a PUD-1 overlay and is tax parcel 24-07-11-300-020. The request is to add to the Farm and Forest uses to allow storage buildings; outdoor storage; residential, commercial and condominium storage; commercial service businesses; and contractor's uses. The request is per Article 17 of the Zoning Ordinance.


Items distributed during meeting: Project Details provided by David McBride; Harbor Light newspaper article provide by Paul Mooradian

Salar presented this case. The location and aerial maps were shown. The request is on a 10-acre parcel which is part of a 20 acre PUD. The surrounding zoning is FF and there is another 20 acre PUD to the east. The proposal is to amend the south side of the PUD. The original and revised PUD plans were shown. Uses are to include mini storage and outdoor storage. Photos of the parcel were shown. There is outdoor storage currently allowed in the PUD to the east. The Master Plan and Future Land Use map both have this area designated as low density residential with mixed use along M-68. Salar noted that this is a preliminary request only with the final approval going to the Board of Commissioners. Littlefield Township has recommended approval and there have been two neighbor support letters received.

Doernenburg stated that the applicant had asked that the first graphic shown be provided that shows the two 20-acre PUDs side by side. She explained that the “Sid Baker” PUD northerly section was approved for commercial uses and the southerly section was approved for a preliminary PUD storage on the SE quadrant and potential residential on the SW quadrant. The original approval for the PUD in question allows for Astro Building which is currently there and outdoor display/storage along the northerly parcels. The southerly 10 acres is under review.

David McBride, applicant, passed out a summary of items that support this PUD amendment. He stated that they run a storage building near Bay Harbor and discussed the facts based on that location and impacts as it would be similar in nature to what they have proposed here. McBride read through the list of project
details. He pointed out that Doernenburg has advised him that the PUD is not set up for multi-family
development and therefore couldn’t be used for high-density low-income housing as was stated before. He
also noted that they have provided a four-acre buffer from the residential use to the south by increasing the
setbacks from the required 50’ to 250’ plus. He doesn’t think that anyone else would do that. He noted
that Littlefield Township recommended approval of the request at both of their meetings.

Eby stated that there is screening from the road but Littlefield had brought up the screening issues to the
residential development to the rear of the property. A lot of times these storage facilities can be used as a
buffer between commercial and residential uses. McBride stated that they can screen with fencing until the
trees grow. Screening is required between the uses and he has no issues putting that in where necessary.

Laughbaum asked if sewer would be run back to this parcel. If that was the case, would the residences
be forced to also hook up to the sewer? McBride stated that he did not have the answer to this.

Eby opened the floor to public comment.

Paul Mooradian stated that he has been able to share information on the ordinance, Master Plan, and the
M-68 corridor study. Since the last meeting he has done some further due diligence and stated that the
PUD to the east had mini storage as part of their original preliminary map in the original review. It is
referenced in the minutes as transitional due to the gravel pit next door. He stated that he respects
everything that McBride has said but it comes down to the guiding of the Master Plan. He shared a
copy of an article (Planning for You, June 19, 2019) from the Harbor Light newspaper that was written
by Charlie MacInnis as he thinks it really hits the point and talks about the planning process and the
Master Plan. He read the last paragraph of the article. Mooradian stated that the Master Plan does not
suggest this type of amendment.

Fred Hollerback asked about the area that is shown on the original PUD plan as ‘common area’. Why
was this in there? What will be done about it? He stated that he thinks it was developed this way to
gain the prior approvals. Does this disappear? It was supposed to be for all three parcels. Eby stated
that it may if the PUD amendment is approved.

Laughbaum read a sentence out of the 2001 land use plan which stated that there will probably be a
steady decrease in the amount of open space in the township due to its steady increase in residential
development. He stated that he thinks the zoning was right then but as Charlie has said, where are the
houses? There aren’t a lot of new houses in Emmet County period. This is somewhat holding the
applicant hostage waiting for something that hasn’t happened in the last 18 years to occur. Zoning has
to be proven as well. The fact that there is an increased setback in the rear of the property makes him
feel better about this. He drove back there; no one is farming, the timber likely won’t amount to that
much. If it is left the way it is, they would have to bank that someone will use it in the future. They
may want this as a residential area 20 years from now. Laughbaum stated that he asked his wife after
last month’s meeting if she’d rather have mini-storage or residential in this area if she lived there. She
stated that she would rather have storage because there’s not a lot of people and animals involved with
storage units. Laughbaum stated that he has not decided what he would vote on this case yet.

MacInnis stated that what his article also said and what it was leading to was the changing
demographics in our area. The population numbers for the last decade are essentially flat. The reality
of the situation is that the population is older than the average population in the state in general. The
median age in Emmet County is 45 years old. People are building retirement homes, not family homes.
He went to the property as well. The question from last month is still true; there aren’t any houses there.
He lives down from two storage facilities himself. They are quiet and are a revenue producing business.
This would produce taxes for the township and County and he is inclined to say that this is a reasonable
use for this property.

Kargol stated that the land to the south will have a 250’ buffer to a development that isn’t full. The Sid
Baker development isn’t full. There is always a need to support businesses if there is a place to put it. This would be a different conversation if there wasn’t land left to build houses.

Eby stated that he ran busses out there three years ago. All of the developments are waiting for people to build houses and they can’t get people to move in there. He noted also that the bus cannot allow children to cross M-68. Three of the five cases tonight are for storage buildings which shows what is wanted.

MacInnis made a motion to recommend approval to the Board of Commissioners of PPUD19-002, Dave McBride for Jim Temple for a Preliminary Planned Unit Development Rezoning on property located at 7320 M-68 Hwy, Section 11, Littlefield Township, tax parcel 07-17-11-300-020 as shown on the Proposed PUD – Preliminary Development Plans dated Received May 21, 2019 because the standards for the PUD and a Rezoning have been met. The uses include FF-1 Farm and Forest uses and storage buildings and outdoor storage as shown on the Preliminary PUD Plan. Approval is on condition that the development will be 250 feet or more from the back lot line. Approval is based on the facts presented in this case, the determination of the Planning Commission as discussed, and because the proposed rezoning is consistent with the Emmet County Master Plan, the uses are consistent with surrounding uses, there would not be an adverse impact on surrounding properties, it would not create a deterrent to the improvement of adjacent properties, access is via a shared drive, and Littlefield Township Planning Committee and Board recommended approval. The motion was supported by Scott.

Laughbaum asked if we should add the requirement to plant trees. Scott stated that it would more appropriate to do so during the site plan review rather than the preliminary PUD review.

The motion passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Scott, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, MacInnis, Hartmann. No: None.

2. PREZN19-01 Paul & Ann Mooradian, REZONING REQUEST, 7486 Keystone Park Dr & 7349 M-68 Hwy, Section 11, Littlefield Township

Legal Notice: A request by Paul and Ann Mooradian for rezoning of two parcels, 7486 Keystone Park Dr and 7349 M-68 Hwy, Section 11, Littlefield Township. The properties are tax parcels 24-07-17-127-130, zoned R-2 General Residential and I-1 Light Industrial & 24-07-17-1100-032, zoned R-2 General Residential and R-1 One & Two Family Dwelling. The proposal is to rezone both properties, in their entirety, to B-2 General Business.

Packet Items: LFTwp minutes from 6/4/19, 5/22/19 letter from Haggard’s P&H

Doernenburg presented this case. The request encompasses two parcels on the north side of M-68 totaling 8.1 acres. The property includes R-1 and R-2 zoning. The request is to rezone both parcels to B-2. The parcels are both currently vacant with a 0.62-acre residential use parcel in the middle of one of the parcels. The parcels to the north are zoned I-1. Doernenburg noted that the land use matrix showing all the allowed uses in the B-2 zoning district was included in the packets. All uses must be considered. If approved they could then request a use that would be reviewed as a site plan review or special use permit with the Board of Commissioners having final approval on the rezoning. The aerial map and zoning maps along with photos of the properties were shown. The Future Land Use map shows this area as industrial. The township has recommended approval and a support letter has been received from Haggard’s Plumbing & Heating. Doernenburg noted that the cases that require Board of Commissioners review will be scheduled during their August meeting.

Paul Mooradian, applicant, stated that the Master Plan identifies the area as industrial but he doesn’t want that sort of intensity to the highway. The parcels are already fragmented in regards to zoning districts. This request feels like a proper request and follows the Master Plan.

Laughbaum asked what type of businesses we can expect here. Mooradian stated that his intent for these parcels 20 years ago was a model village for a home distributor. This can’t be done if the parcels are not B-2 zoned. This will allow general business and will allow the market to dictate what is done there.

Eby opened the floor to public comment.
David McBride stated that he thinks it is a logical change. He is not sure about having the residence in the middle of the parcel. He stated that Paul does a great job and will make sure that there are good quality businesses that move in there. It is a logical move.

Eby asked Mooradian if he controls the residence. Mooradian replied that he does not.

Laughbaum stated that this change makes sense. He drove through the industrial park and thinks it is an asset to the County and the people using it. Urman agreed.

Urman made a motion to recommend approval to the Board of Commissioners of PREZN19-01, Paul & Ann Mooradian to rezone property located at 7486 Keystone Park Dr and 7349 M-68 Hwy, Section 11, Littlefield Township, tax parcels 07-17-11-100-032 and 07-17-11-127-130 to B-2 General Business because the standards for rezoning have been met. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the Emmet County Master Plan, the uses are consistent with surrounding uses, there would not be an adverse impact on surrounding properties, it would not create a deterrent to the improvement of adjacent properties and because both the Littlefield Township Planning Committee and Board recommended approval. The motion was supported by Laughbaum and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Scott, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, MacInnis, Hartmann. No: None.

3. **PSPR19-003 Rob Hogerwerf, SITE PLAN REVIEW-Tourist home, 4721 Oden Rd, Section 17, Littlefield Township**

**Legal Notice:** A request by Rob and Beth Hogerwerf for Site Plan Review for a Tourist Home at 4721 Oden Rd, Section 17, Littlefield Township. The property is tax parcel 24-07-17-17-400-018 and is zoned B-1 Local Tourist Business. The review is per Articles 10 and 20 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**Packet Items:** Request & location map, application, site plan review checklist, impact statement, MDOT permit, drainage system cost email from Benchmark, 6/16/19 zoning evaluation, 6/17/19 site plan, LF Twp 7/2/19 recommendation, FD review

Salar presented this case. She explained that this is a non-conforming lot located on US-31. There was a cottage on the parcel that was removed in 2016 and currently there is only a garage on the parcel. The parcel is zoned B-1. The parcels on either side are used for residences and there are B-1 zoned parcels across the highway, the bike trail is to the north with residential uses beyond that. The proposal is to add a tourist cottage behind the existing garage. The proposed cottage meets all setback standards. MDOT has approved a gravel drive with some patching on the existing concrete portion. The parcel is serviced by an existing private well and sanitary sewer. The site plans and photos of the site were shown. The township has recommended approval.

Rob Hogerwerf, applicant, stated that the sewer is in place and the well from the previous cottage. They plan to fix up the garage and match the siding to the cottage. They have contractors hired to move the cottage and do the site work.

Drier asked the applicant if he would object to the condition being added to a motion that the siding on the garage be changed to match the cottage. Hogerwerf stated he has no objection and that they have other cottages in the area which are kept up. They want this to be a nice asset to the area and want it to look cute and something that people want to stay at.

Eby opened the floor to public comment.

Dennis Hoshield asked if this is for short term rentals. Hogerwerf replied that it is; it has to be either a tourist home or a business per the zoning district. It is a two bedroom, one bath cottage.

Urman asked if both township boards recommended approval. Doernenburg replied, yes.

Scott made a motion to approve Case #PSPR19-003, Rob and Beth Hogerwerf for Site Plan Review – for a tourist home rental business on property located at 4721 Oden Rd, Section 17, Littlefield Township, tax parcel 24-07-17-17-400-018, as shown on the site plan dated Received June 17, 2019 because the standards of Article 10 and 20 have been met, the Littlefield Township Planning Committee, Board, and Fire Department have recommended approval, and on condition that any exterior lighting be compliant with the Emmet County Zoning ordinance, a performance guarantee in the amount of $1,500 be submitted prior to issuance of a zoning permit, and that the existing garage will be re-sided to match the cottage. The motion was supported by Drier and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Scott, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, MacInnis, Hartmann. No: None.
4. PSPR19-004  Bryan Calnen, SITE PLAN REVIEW-Storage buildings, 7319 Keystone Park Dr, Section 11, Littlefield Township

**Legal Notice:** A request by Bryan and Tracey Calnen for Site Plan Review for storage buildings at 7319 Keystone Park Drive, Section 11, Littlefield Township. The property is tax parcel 24-07-17-11-127-119 and is zoned I-1 Light Industrial. The review is per Articles 14 and 20 and Section 26.43 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**Packet Items:** Request & location map, aerial, application, site plan review checklist, impact statement, drainage cost email from Benchmark, 6/19/19 zoning evaluation, 6/13/19 elevations & site plan, LF Twp 7/2/19 recommendation, FD review

Doernenburg presented this case. The parcel is zoned I-1 and is located within Keystone Industrial park. It is currently a vacant 1.02-acre parcel. The aerial was shown. Uses across the private road are all commercial with industrial and business type uses. There is outdoor storage and storage warehousing in this area. The proposal is for two mini storage buildings. The site plan was shown. The buildings would total 7,080sf and meet setback and all other ordinance standards for mini storage. There is no Road Commission approval needed as it is on a private road. The drainage estimate is $3,000. There will be gravel parking in front of units. They meet the height standard at 20’, there is no dumpster proposed. The buildings are proposed to be perpendicular to the road. No lighting is proposed but if so, would have to meet the zoning ordinance standards. Littlefield Township Planning Committee, Board, and Fire Department have recommended approval. Elevations and photos were shown. The proposed sign meets requirements but would need a permit.

Tracy Calnen stated that their proposal meets all of the requirements and it seems pretty cut and dry.

Scott asked about the width of Keystone Park Drive. Paul Mooradian stated that the paved surface is 24’ wide. Scott asked how a semi would access the site. This is typically an issue that we look at. Mooradian stated that it is a private drive and typically semis don’t come into mini storage. There are semis that come in to some of the lots there without issue. Last year the township moved large storage buildings and they weren’t questioned about semi access then. He stated that he doesn’t think it has a bearing on a private road. Scott asked if there is a turnaround. Mooradian stated that there is a temporary one now due to the road not being finished yet. Nate Hall stated that they don’t allow semis at any of their mini storage facilities. They typically shuttle with a rental truck such as U-Haul. The drivers know this. Tim Davis added that they typically call ahead as well. Sysco trucks access the Sysco lots without issue within the park. The road is appropriate for it.

Kargol made a motion to approve Case #PSPR19-004, Bryan and Tracey Calnen for Site Plan Review – two mini storage buildings, on property located at 7319 Keystone Park Drive, Section 11, Littlefield Township, tax parcel 24-07-17-11-127-119, as shown on the site plan dated Received June 13, 2019 because the standards of Article 14 and 20 and Section 26.43 have been met, because Littlefield Township Planning Committee, Board, and Fire Department have recommended approval, and on condition that any signs and exterior lighting be compliant with Zoning Ordinance and reviewed by the zoning administrator and a performance guarantee in the amount of $3,000 be submitted prior to issuance of a zoning permit, and an as-built drainage plan will be required upon completion of the building. The motion was supported by Drier and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Scott, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, MacInnis, Hartmann. No: None.

5. PSPR 19-005  Jacquelyn Hall, SITE PLAN REVIEW-Amendment-Storage buildings, 2020 Fochtman Industrial Park Dr, Section 26, Bear Creek Township

**Legal Notice:** A request by Jacquelyn Hall for Site Plan Review – Amendment, for two storage buildings at 2020 Fochtman Industrial Pk Dr located in Section 26 of Bear Creek Township. The property is zoned I-1 Light Industrial and includes tax parcels 24-01-16-26-275-103 & 102. The review is per Articles 14 and 20 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**Packet Items:** Request & location map, application, site plan review checklist, impact statement, FD review, 6/17/19 zoning evaluation, 6/17/19 site plan

Salar presented this case. The parcels are zoned I-1. An aerial was shown. The neighboring uses are propane storage facility, open space for Hearthside, and business across the street. The request is for two mini storage buildings which meet setback and height standards. The Road Commission has approved the curb cut. The drive is gravel and parking will be in front of the units. There is no Health Department approval required and there is no dumpster proposed. Snow storage is provided. Outdoor lighting will be similar to what they have on their other buildings and would need to meet ordinance standards. The lot is
somewhat screened with trees. The buildings will be perpendicular to the road. The site plan was shown.

Bear Creek Township Planning Commission and Board have recommended approval.

Nate Hall, applicant, stated that he and his wife own several storage buildings here and property in between. He wanted to ask if there was anything that this board could do about a runoff issue that they have on their site from the propane storage facility parcel. They have $10,000 tied up in drain line to drain the water that is coming through their site. He has been told that they tentatively will be paving the road but that it may be put off until 2020. The ditches there haven’t been maintained in at least 20 years.

Urman stated that Denny Keiser made the recommendation to go to the Road Commission Board meeting at the Township meeting. Kargol stated that the culvert is high at that drive. Urman stated that what the Halls have done looks nice and has worked. He also recommended going to the Road Commission Board meeting to have this discussion. Doernenburg stated that we can’t fix these issues but that she would look into what was approved for drainage on that parcel to make sure that it was installed as proposed/approved. MacInnis suggested contacting the drain commissioner as well.

There was no public comment on this case.

Urman made a motion to approve Case #PSPR19-005, Jacquelyn Hall for Site Plan Review - amendment for third and fourth storage buildings at 2020 Fochtman Industrial Park Dr, Section 26, Bear Creek Township, tax parcel 24-01-16-26-275-103 & 102, as shown on the site plan dated Received Jun 17, 2019 because the standards of Sections 14.01 22.05, and 26.43 have been met and Bear Creek Township Planning Committee and Board recommended approval. Approval is on condition that the exterior lighting be full-cut off/wall mounted only as shown on the plan, and a performance guarantee in the amount of $800 be submitted prior to issuance of a zoning permit, also, the Planning Commission waives the requirement for a Michigan Registered Professional Civil Engineer due to the soils and site conditions. The motion was supported by Alexander and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Scott, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, MacInnis, Hartmann. No: None.

6. PSPR19-006 Jim Clarke for the King House Association-SITE PLAN REVIEW-Historical Restoration, 144 N Lamkin Dr, Section 36, Readmond Township

Legal Notice: A request by Jim Clarke for King House Association for Site Plan Review - amendment for 144 N Lamkin Rd, Section 36, Readmond Township. The property is tax parcel 24-12-07-36-351-012 and is zoned RR Recreational Residential. The request is to permit an Historical Restoration or renovation project including ...displays of historical artifacts related to the premises. Review is per Articles 6 and 20 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Packet Items: Request & location map, 6/14/19 letter from applicant, 6/17/19 application, site plan review checklist, impact statement & addendum, ZO Article 6 page, 6/17/19 site plan, 6/19/19 zoning evaluation

The applicant has requested postponement of this case. The case will be placed on the August agenda.

IV Public Comments: None

V Other Business:

1. Housing-Density-Minimum Floor Area: Doernenburg stated that she has no specific proposal for amendments but wanted to have a conversation to see which direction this board wanted to go. She noted that recently she, as well as some from this board, attended a presentation on housing. Discussed was the cost of new housing versus housing that is available that the average population can afford. It has been commented that our density standards are too low for affordable housing. This is something that we should discuss. Perhaps we could increase in areas that have public water/sewer. A PUD could be created that is residential in nature. We could talk about giving density bonuses for doing certain things. Doernenburg stated that there is a concept plan that has been presented by a property owner at the Bear Creek Township meeting as an affordable housing option. There are options to think about. Other topics to discuss would be the potential to add residential units in commercial zones and to allow tiny homes of some sort. These items were brought up during the Master Plan open houses. She would like to not have zoning be a stumbling block when people are trying to develop. MacInnis asked if this would be a re-zoning. Doernenburg stated that it could be. Areas could
be targeted to change the zoning and/or density. Eby stated that after the presentation at the Bear Creek Township meeting we need to be careful that what we may pass for a certain area in the County doesn’t create issue in other parts of the County. Drier agreed stating that whatever changes we make will be County-wide changes and we have to be very careful about that. Eby asked about tiny houses. Should they be a special use permit? He can point to several issues in the past and doesn’t want to cause further issues. Density could be changed and multiple cute houses placed on an acre but we could also end up with another development like Hearthside that has ridiculous prices which doesn’t help the housing issue. These developments if put in place could also be sold to someone who has alternate plans. Doernenburg stated that Hearthside actually started as an affordable housing community which failed and converted into what it is now. Laughbaum stated that he is not sure it’s not just a catch word to save land by having smaller lots. Are we going to end up with social problems with tiny houses since more people in a tighter area can lead to this? How small do we want them? Zoning is used to create distance between certain areas and uses. Doernenburg stated that minimum floor area is also something that needs to be discussed. Too small of a house can be a health hazard. Kargol stated that we probably want to be careful to not lower it down to the size of the Amish-built buildings so we don’t have people setting these up and moving into them. Drier stated that there could be issues with more than one tiny house on an acre of land. How many are too many? People are trying to live more inexpensively. MacInnis stated that they can look nice and be useable, they can be rentals or upscale housing as well. This is no longer workforce housing. People moving to our area are retirees, the workforce is small. Scott stated that maybe the ordinance needs to limit and regulate rentals. Doernenburg stated that we have interpreted the ordinance to allow short-term rentals as long as they are used as single-family dwellings. She added that her family has a cabin that they use as a short-term rental. Scott stated that the concern he has is that this is eroding the availability of housing in the area changing a high percentage into short-term rentals rather than being on the market. Kargol stated that they can make more money as short-term rentals. Drier stated that the Board of Commissioners recently received a letter asking why Emmet County isn’t collecting lodging taxes like other communities. Doernenburg asked if there was an interest in reducing the minimum floor area. Scott suggested 500sf. He asked if we can limit the number of occupants. He noted that smaller units can be factory built modular units which can cut costs. Tim Davis stated that El Rancho has units that are mostly 399sf (have to be under 400sf) and are a pretty tiny space for a family to live year round. Usually they attract retirees with no more than two people living there. Fred Hollerback stated that he’s been on the Fire Department and EMS for years and they have had to make doorways wider in a small building and can be a real safety issue. Scott stated that pre-fabs can be designed to be whatever you want and can be built more efficiently under controlled conditions. Davis added that when adapting products outside of what is typically standard, the price goes up. Eby stated that the private market should come to us and ask for this if it is desired. He would like to see people that have an issue with the minimum floor area come forward. Hartmann stated that from a building standpoint, the Michigan Association of Builders state that there is a shortage of builders and we lost a million builders in the state around 2008. She asked what systematically is seen as being a zoning problem. She stated that she is not sure that there are builders that have time and want to build these type of homes. Doernenburg stated that this is a multi-faceted issue and doesn’t think we’d want to do this in all areas of the County. Laughbaum stated that the building code makes people do things they don’t want to do because it doesn’t allow them to build a two-story building and live in one story of it. This adds cost. He stated that he does think that a line could be crossed and have too many people in too little of a space. More work is needed on this topic.

2. **Windsong Woods-Admin review:** Doernenburg explained that the original approval for this had an existing storage building that was for community use. They brought in a revised site plan and she administratively approved an individual to own the building as long as they filled out an
affidavit of use and the building is used for personal storage for an owner within the development.

3. **Resort Township Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment-ZCC:** Doernenburg explained the Zoning Coordinating Committee’s role. Resort Township is proposing a text amendment. The memo that was drafted was discussed. Scott made a motion to approve the Chair to sign the memo. The motion was supported by Urman and passed by a unanimous voice vote of the members.

4. **Enforcement Report:** distributed, no discussion

5. **Emmet County Resilient Master Plan 2020:** Doernenburg gave dates for upcoming focus groups and public meetings as well as the availability of the online survey.

VI Adjournment

There being no other business Eby called the meeting adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

__________________________________________  ______________________
James Scott, Secretary                        Date