EMMET COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING
THURSDAY JULY 11, 2019
7:30 PM
EMMET COUNTY BUILDING
COMMISSIONER’S ROOM
200 DIVISION ST
PETOSKEY, MI 49770

AGENDA

I Call to Order and Attendance

II Minutes of June 6, 2019

III Cases

CASES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

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

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

NEW CASES

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

4. PSPR19-004 Bryan Calnen, SITE PLAN REVIEW – Storage Buildings, 7319 Keystone Park Dr, Section 11, Littlefield Township

5. PSPR19-005 Jacquelyn Hall, SITE PLAN REVIEW – Amendment – Storage Buildings, 2020 Fochtman Industrial Park Dr, Section 26, Bear Creek Township

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

IV Public Comments

V Other Business
1. Housing – Density – Minimum Floor Area
2. Windsong Woods – administrative review
3. Enforcement Report
4. Emmet County Resilient Master Plan 2020 – survey

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

II Minutes of April 30, 2019 (Joint PC/Board) & May 2, 2019
Alexander made a motion supported by MacInnis to approve the minutes of the April 30, 2019 joint meeting as presented. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote of the members present. MacInnis made a motion supported by Alexander to approve the minutes of the May 2, 2019 meeting as presented. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote of the members present.

Doernenburg introduced our new member Lauri Hartmann.

The flyers for the upcoming Master Plan Public Input Open Houses are on the back counter and were shown on the PowerPoint. Doernenburg explained a bit about them and encouraged participation.

III Cases

1. Case PSPR 18-016 David Firman, SITE PLAN REVIEW - Amendment, 3529 Howard Rd, Section 20, Bear Creek Township

Legal Notice: A request by David Firman for a Site Plan Review - amendment to allow for outdoor storage accessory to the contractor's use on property located at 3529 Howard Road in Section 20 of Bear Creek Township. The property is zoned FF-1 Farm and Forest and is tax parcel 24-01-19-20-300-012. The request is per Sections 801-8 and 26.47 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Packet Items: 5/20/19 zoning evaluation, 5/22/19 site plan, BCPC minutes

Doernenburg presented this case. This has been on our agenda since March and has gone through several different site plans. When the contractors use was approved in 2012, the site was approximately 13 acres. Now it is over 30 acres. During routine zoning compliance checks, it was found that they were not in compliance with their approvals. The currently proposed plan adds additional screening from neighboring properties and the road. Some of the Bear Creek Township Board members met on the site. A three-sided building was discussed to help with the screening. This is the second revised site plan. It does add additional screening from both the neighboring property and the road. Requested is additional parking, a three sided storage building to help screen the parking, and outdoor storage of logs. The issues raised during the previous reviews have been addressed on this plan including dimensions on the site plan and notations regarding the wood processing. The township has recommended approval on the condition that the wood processing is limited to five consecutive days in any calendar year and only M-F between 8am and 5pm with no holiday operations. Photos of the site were shown. It is very well screened now. The drive has been approved by the Road Commission and will be brought up to their standards.

David Firman, applicant, was present for any questions.
MacInnis noted that there are differences between the Bear Creek Township minutes' motion and the staff report motion. Doernenburg explained that the minutes from the meeting came out after her zoning evaluation. The township added additional conditions to their recommended motion.

Urman stated that they have done everything that was asked of them. The trees are healthy and will be maintained with irrigation.

There was no public comment on this case.

Urman made a motion to approve Case #SPR18-016, David Firman, Site Plan Review amendment to allow an 80'x30' storage building, 10'x40' storage container, and outdoor storage as an accessory use to the approved contractor's use on property located at 3529 Howard Road, Section 20, Bear Creek Township, tax parcel 24-01-19-20-300-014. The approval is for the site plan dated Rev May 20, 2019 because the outdoor storage use is setback over 300 feet from public view and meets the standards of the Zoning Ordinance, adequate screening is provided and the trees must be a minimum of 8 feet in height and kept in a healthy state and planted by November 1, 2019. Approval is further on condition that the wood processing with a tub grinder may occur no more than 5 days per calendar year and between the hours of 8am and 5pm Monday thru Friday with no holidays, dust control will be applied as needed, and because the Bear Creek Township Planning Commission and Board both recommended approval. The motion was supported by Drier and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, MacInnis, Hartmann. No: None

Abs: Scott.

2. Case #SPUP19-003 David Coveyou/Coveyou Scenic Farm, SPECIAL USE

PERMIT-Accessory Farm Uses, 4160 US 131 Hwy, Sections 19 & 30, Bear Creek Township

Legal notice: A request by David Coveyou/Coveyou Scenic Farm for a Special Use Permit for accessory uses on a commercial farm to include social events on properties located within Section 19 and 30 of Bear Creek Township. The property is zoned FF-1 Farm and Forest and includes the following parcels: 24-01-19-30-100-006 (4160 US 131), 24-01-19-19-300-011 (3805 Cemetery Rd), and 24-01-19-30-100-002 (1565 Greg Rd). The request includes four areas accessed via US-131 Highway and Greg Road. The reviews will be per Articles 20, 21, 22 and Section 26.50 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Packet Items: applicant's May 2019 revised presentation, 5/16/19 letter from Coveyou Meadows Prop Owners Assoc, 5/20/19 zoning evaluation, 5/20/19 site plan, BCPC minutes, letter from Wroblewski's, letter from Doull's, letter from Denny Keiser regarding BC Board meeting.

Doernenburg presented this case. The location map was shown. The current proposal is for the single parcel on the west side of US 131 (4160 US 131). The aerial was shown. There is an existing barn on the site which is accessed from an existing MDOT approved driveway. Also on this site is a farmhouse and other farm use buildings. The property is actively used for agricultural uses. The revised site plan was shown. The zoning is FF-1 and SR along Walloon Lake. This parcel is approximately 150 acres of a 330-acre farm. The proposal is to allow social events as listed including farm-to-table dinners, catered meals using on-site produce, small weddings, and other social events. The actively farmed area appears to be over 20 acres in area. They would use the existing barn and attached deck for the social events. The applicants live on the farm on an adjacent parcel. The site is a mixture of farmland, pines, and hardwood trees. The adjacent uses are farming, residential, and mining across the highway. The applicant's detailed information was included in the packet. They propose 12 events per month which are broken down into different sized events. A revised site plan was submitted to address the questions of the Township and this board from past reviews. There will be no new permanent structures built. Fire Department review has been received. Gravel parking is provided for 50 cars and 14 staff. There is a space for 1 bus shown on the plan. The nearest off-premise residence is approximately 550' from the use. The Bear Creek Township Planning Commission recommended approval with conditions. The Bear Creek Township Board met last night and added an additional requirement of no amplified music on the deck as it is not the minimum 1,000' from dwellings. There
are four houses located within 1,000' of the barn. They also want the food truck parking space to meet the minimum front setback of 40'. The site plan, floor plan, and photos of the site were shown.

David Coveyou, applicant, stated that they really tried to work as well as they could to update the site plan to capture all of the details that the township and this board had asked for. It was covered relatively well at the township meeting. Their main goal is for intimate affairs and envision six of the twelve events to be small events and give them an opportunity to market their farm and produce. Three of the twelve events would be a little larger with some music; not a rock band but instrumental with small speakers. He stated that it is not in their character to have a 'party barn'. Three of the other events would be for weddings which would likely have music. The barn and deck has a maximum of 99 people. In regards to safety concerns, Coveyou stated that they have never had an accident from their farm. He referred to the data from Al Welsheimer, Fire Chief. There was one accident involving someone turning into the farm that was rear-ended. He doesn't feel that this is any different than any business along US131. There are better site distances from their driveway than from Pine Road or Greg Road. Everyone agrees that the Greg Road intersection is bad. He wouldn't be proposing this if he didn't think that people were safe. They have hayrides in the fall and have had 70 cars in their driveway and everyone got in and out just fine. There is history here. It is rare to have this much data for a business. He stated that he appreciates the concern but feels that people can get in and out safely. Coveyou stated that it was mentioned at a past meeting that this could turn into a large festival grounds. He wants to have a successful business and also wants the farm to continue. There are so many provisions in the ordinance that one would not be able to create such a festival including music cutoff times. He stated that the house that is 550' away hasn't been lived in in 15 years. He stated that he thinks that they have tried to do everything that they can to meet the ordinance. In regards to noise, he stated that they want to be good neighbors and does not envision a noise issue. He is happy to sign up for whatever decibel level is determined to be appropriate as long as it is reasonable and will allow them to operate as a business. He stated that he welcomes input on this. He appreciates the support for farms and what they are trying to do to keep their farm and homestead. They are fifth and sixth generation. We need this to keep operating.

Kathy Coveyou went over the types of events that they are looking at doing. They do a 100% top quality job at developing their business. The events would be high quality, tasteful, and refined. They appeal to a market that wants an authentic experience and have no desire to change it into circus kid land and be a noise place. No one will respect that more than they will. She stated that David is the sole reason that this is still a farm. They have an expense to meet in order to keep the farm. These refined events will be small; less than 100 people. She stated that she cannot emphasize enough that they will respect the neighbors. They have spoken with the neighbors about their plans. They have been enthusiastic and supportive. Several within the subdivision have said that they support them. Everyone understands where we are coming from and that it is good for the community. Does anyone think that a subdivision or duplexes should be put in here instead? She stated that another term for a failed farm is a subdivision or development.

Doernenburg noted that two additional support letters have come in since the packets and are on the desks tonight.

Maclnnis stated that he read through the memo from Denny Keiser regarding their board meeting. Do they want it to be deferred? Doernenburg stated that they recommended approval with the added conditions. D. Coveyou stated that he is happy to move the food truck closer to the barn. There are no trees to be cut down as stated at the township meeting. He added that during the township Planning Commission meeting (which he recused himself from) there was mention of wanting the events to be invitation only. He would like this to be reconsidered as there are many events that the general public is invited to. He is totally fine with controlling the numbers but to add invitations only is difficult on them and goes beyond what has ever happened with any other business. Maclnnis stated that the decibel level conversation is unclear. The township recommended no amplified music but there is a discussion on decibel levels. We would have to find out from the township what their intent was. Doernenburg stated that if you look at the ordinance and outside activities, the requirement is to either have amplified music completely within a fully enclosed building or be a minimum of 1000' from dwellings. The applicant can request a deduction in this distance if they can provide documentation that they can meet
the maximum 75dB at the property line. The concern here is that the minimum setback is not met and the applicant wants amplified music outside. The applicant’s documentation states that they measured 51.09dB from the barn to the property line. There was some discussion at the township meetings of holding the applicant to that level. This would be difficult to enforce. MacInnis asked if the enforcement difficulty was why they said no. Doernenburg stated that it was that plus once approved, we can’t go backwards. They may want to limit it now but potentially review in the future if necessary or requested.

Drier asked if there is a difference in opinion with the Bear Creek Township ordinance in asking for amplification. If there is a difference between what is asked for and what the ordinance says, that language should be accessible. Doernenburg stated that she thinks there is a misunderstanding. There isn’t a separate ordinance. The township is saying that 51.09dB is what the applicant says he can do, which is less than the 75dB allowed. D. Coveyou stated that he got that number by measuring to the Colestock house (4444 Pine Rd). Half of their events would go away without music. To put all of this investment into the project with no music doesn’t make sense. If it takes putting music in the barn, he’s ok with that too. The events wouldn’t happen while the farm market is open. They are trying to do this right and be good neighbors but still be able to run their business.

Drier asked Denny Keiser, Township Supervisor to comment. Keiser stated that when they read the Emmet County ordinance it says if there is amplified music outdoors they have to be 1000’ from dwellings. During the presentation at Bear Creek Township they had noted the 51.09dB, talked about some music, and some events. During the discussion, it was mentioned that it had to be less than 75dB. He stated that he called and asked Kathy Coveyou if they could use their number of 51.09dB in the language of their motion for the Board review. She said no; that they could either regulate them to death or vote no. Keiser stated that if it really is 51.09dB the neighborhood could live with it although he is not sure how it will be able to be regulated. All will hear sound differently. It will also depend on weather conditions and such. Noise is hard to judge and control. At the township level, if his language was used into the motion it would have been their motion. It was approved at the Planning Commission level but there are concerns. The Coveyou’s do a good job. We are really talking about the three events that could be 99 people. Keiser stated that a barn with large open doors is not an enclosed building; it would be a hall or something like this room. It is a beautiful property and they want to protect it, he gets that; but he wants to protect the neighbors as well. This is the first case reviewed under this ordinance. There is one more coming, possibly two. We can always go forward but cannot go back. They could always come back and ask for an increase if needed. They said that the events that were held last year were at 51.09dB and the neighbors didn’t know anything about them. Talking is supposed to be at 60dB. Keiser stated when he read the proposal it reads some music. To him, this is less than the whole.

MacInnis asked where the dB is measured. Doernenburg replied it’s at the property line. Keiser stated that if it is 51dB at the source it would be less at the property line. If he’s reading the packet correctly that measurement was at the source. MacInnis stated that although music has been mentioned and discussed, we are really talking about sound. Feels that this should be changed to sound. He is not sure he follows what the township wants. Keiser stated that the ordinance states that if you don’t meet the requirements you may ask to have them reduced. They have to show that they can meet 75dB. We asked, they said no. Keiser stated that ‘some music’ is less than 75dB.

D. Coveyou stated that they are hesitant on committing to 51dB because it could be over or under; noise is that way. Highway noise is 62dB; how can you know that the sound is being measured and not the noise on the highway. Coveyou stated “I’ll sign up for whatever number you think is the right number.”

Alexander stated that as far as sound goes, there is a difference between high and low frequency noise. A car can drive by with their windows up and all you will hear is the bass noise. This is low frequency and it does not dissipate; rather, it permeates and creates the irritation. D. Coveyou stated that their market is not a lot of bass heavy music. This is not what they are trying to do. Alexander stated that some issues can be alleviated by starting out at a lower allowed level and perhaps get more later. D. Coveyou asked what a fair number is. He stated that he is looking to get guidance from this
board. Alexander stated that he doesn't think that there is a fair number that we can come up with.

Drier stated that there is a dB number that they have revealed. There are potentially three weddings per month with 99 people. These likely will be on a Friday or Saturday. This means that every weekend a month except one would have amplified music.

Urman stated that he sat in the audience of the Township Board meeting last night. The board was looking for no amplification to start with. The applicants want soft music. He truly believes that they will want to keep the music down. The issue is that the approval goes with the property. A new owner could potentially have 12 events per month of 99 people. He doesn't think that the Coveyous are planning this but someone else may.

Eby opened the floor to public comments.

Alex Childress stated that he is a photographer in the area. The Coveyous are some of the first people he met when he moved here. He has done drone footage at their property and feels it is the most beautiful spot in south Petoskey. They struck up a friendship and he is probably at their property more than anyone else. He stated that he hasn't even heard a personal radio there that he thought would be too loud. There is no one else for 75% plus of this area. The closest people would be down a hill and in another area. He doesn't think that the Coveyous would want to be around the type of noise that is being discussed with their family and children. He stated that every time he goes over there, David is working. They work very hard and they want to try to make ends meet. He wants to see them succeed. This farm is a great spot on the main artery into Petoskey. He would like to see the farms/wineries in that area to be more connected. This is a worthwhile venture and he would like to see them succeed.

Justin Rashid stated that he is in support of the Coveyous' plans. This is a prime example of a farm family trying to succeed. They are hardworking. Farming is very important to his company, American Spoon Foods. They have used their produce to make many products that have won national awards. They trust and rely on them. It is very challenging to be a farmer here due to the short growing season. We need agri-tourism. This current model creates opportunities with events and visitors. This plan is a new source of revenue and can create new customers. There are many good reasons for zoning. There is a significant value of farms to the quality of life for the locals and visitors to the area. There are countless people that want the farm to stay. Barriers keep getting thrown up. Minor impacts of these activities need to be weighed against the importance of the viability of the farm.

Scott Smith stated that he is support of this request. He works with the Petoskey Harbor Springs food alliance and worked with the Coveyous 8-9 years ago through this program. Smith stated that he spent time going through the Master Plan and other documents for this area. The highest priorities were keeping the agricultural a rural character as part of our community. The only way that this will happen is that farming remain a viable option. This will only happen if farms go to higher products such as organic, enhancements of the environment, and diversity. Farmers are still having a hard time making it without this element. Smith stated that he knows that the ordinance has been looked at for the last couple of years. He feels that the Coveyou's proposal fits into this ordinance. We can look at the ordinance as a way to make these opportunities possible or as a way to obstruct. He hopes that the former is chosen. The 75dB level is in the ordinance. This seems nitpicky and beyond the scope of this level of review. The Coveyous have longstanding customers and he feels that their request merits support.

Cindy Kramer stated that she is the Harbor Springs Farm Market Master. She stated that she supports this request and feels that they are the gold standard of a farm family. They are committed to their family and the farming community. Farms have to have diversity or they will fail. They are not looking at something that will turn into Disney. She stated that she fought amplified music at the farmers' market. They now have full amplified music with no issues. They are talking about having independent or folky/country music. There are times at the farmers' market that you can't even hear the music even though it is amplified and only 250' away.

Brian Bates, Bear Creek Organic Farm, stated that he believes a lot in facts; to a fault. This proposal in
every level respects the ordinance. 20dB is the point in which sound can be discerned. 80dB is inside car noise. He stated that he used a meter on his phone and inside this room for this conversation, we have been at 87dB. Bates stated that 50% of farms have negative income. He understands that income/cost is not a factor in zoning decisions but it is used by the farmer to determine what they do on the farm. This is not going to be a party barn. We are losing farms at an alarming rate. We don’t see this as much because of where we are and because development pressure isn’t as high but it could happen. Emmet County has the highest direct farm sales in Michigan. This makes good sense in this community. We live in an area of high seasonal farming. If this kind of proposal is not allowed in our ordinance, then this is a problem with the ordinance rather than this proposal. Bates stated that 75dB was the level that was agreed on in the ordinance and we shouldn’t try to come up with a new one tonight. He noted that mega-farms are fully permissible everywhere without any zoning oversight.

Marie Lott stated that she has lived for 16 years in Petoskey. Her career is in marketing tourism. She was living in a historical ski town in which if the history wasn’t embraced, it wouldn’t have survived. She has had the opportunity to work with the Coveyous. She stated that they regulated themselves more than anyone. If there is anything that wouldn’t uphold their integrity they won’t do it; even to their detriment. The community has spent money on the Bear River and historical tourism to bring in more visitors. This is the right thing to do. Agri-tourism follows that path. The Coveyous will do this project in the most authentic way to honor the farm. They work with their hands and their hearts. This is what is leading this and it is what is going to save the farm. Bringing new people to the area to share will only help the community, farm, and the culture.

Larry Dyer stated that he has been following the process over the last couple of years. He stated that it isn’t surprising that this is a difficult process. He would like, in the midst of discussing dB levels, everyone to remember that the whole point here is to protect and promote farms. This needs to be looked at. Protections were put in the ordinance. He stated that he also feels that we can expect the neighbors to support farming. The residences were built in areas zoned for farming and it is reasonable to expect them to accommodate farming activities. They could have a large hog farm there. These activities requested are real farm activities. It is a new model of farming and is all about keeping the farm visible.

Jack Irey stated that he is in support of this request. He graduated from Petoskey High School and NCMC. The Coveyous are a part of our community and he wants to see our community succeed. This goes hand in hand with eco-tourism and attractions to the area. It is important to have these places. Tourism is a big part of Petoskey.

Dan Goldsmith stated that he lives ¼ mile south and owns a lot in the subdivision. He has lived there all of his life. The Coveyous do a superb top-notch job. He does have an objection to the amplified music. They are in a sound corridor and are times when they can hear the marching band at their house when the conditions are right. When the wedding events occur you will feel as well as hear the music. The Zoning office has a letter signed by 27 people that are against the amplified music. If approved, their quality of life and property values will change.

Carlin Smith, Petoskey Regional Chamber of Commerce, stated that he can hear the marching band as well and they enjoy it. The ordinance was designed to promote agri-tourism. This is talked about a lot in the industry. It is one of the key strategies of economic growth in the state and should be encouraged. The Coveyous are good people and good citizens. Smith stated that over 100 years ago one of their predecessors were a founding member of the Chamber. He is not worried about this request. It will be well handled. This should be embraced and made to happen.

Ruth Goldsmith stated that we are all in agreement about the Coveyous being great people. The issue for her and her neighbors is the noise levels. It is very difficult, if not impossible, to monitor music. Although they have outlined a plan that they want, it will not be able to be controlled in the future unless written in stone. We are talking about 12 events every month which could turn into wedding events. This could be three days a week each week from spring to fall with no guarantee of what could be. If a normal speaking voice is 60-70dB, that would mean that 12 nights per month with this level of noise would have to talk louder to be heard. She supports the farm, the Coveyous, and their project. She stated that she thinks that non-amplified music is supported. Goldsmith stated that when you are
introducing amplified music, proposed buses, food trucks, caterers, alcohol, you are not talking about a farm anymore but rather, an event barn. The noise from the highway people knew about before they moved in. If approved, this would be added to their neighborhood that they didn’t expect. Goldsmith stated that she is in full support of the events without the amplified music. She supports the small farm but doesn’t want to change the quality of life in her neighborhood or along the lake.

Denny Keiser stated that this is not about being anti-farm or denial vs. approval. The township recommended approval but just doesn’t know what the dB number should be. He stated that probably the township Planning Commission members and the Board members feel somewhat uncomfortable since this is a fellow board member. There was a suggestion to have the events held at different levels while out on the farm to see what dB readings they get; maybe this makes sense.

William Coveyou stated that that reality is that we have had a number of family events with amplified music and not once has there been a complaint or that neighbors were even aware they were happening as far as they know. There is a number in the ordinance and that number was arrived at after years of planning and looking into the numbers. There hasn’t been an issue. Setting a restriction of no amplified music goes beyond the bounds of the ordinance.

Kirk Rose, Petoskey KOA and Hearthside Grove, stated that he is in support of this request. It is a big deal to have these types of places to send visitors to. When Mrs. Coveyou spoke you could tell that they need this to happen for the farm to last. That property could be a thousand homes. This is not a threat, but it could happen. He supports the request and thinks it great that there is an ordinance to support it.

Wendy Wieland, MSU Extension, stated that there have been a lot of really good comments. She stated that noise from typical farming activities is covered under the Right-to-Farm Act. Although events are not covered, there are louder farming activities that would definitely affect the neighbors such as cherry spraying which is very loud and happens at night. There has been much work done on this ordinance. She read the intent ‘to promote and maintain local farming, preserve open space and farmland, maintain the cultural heritage and a rural character, maintain and promote tourism, and protect residential uses from negative impacts of commercial uses.’ Wieland thanked everyone that has worked so hard on this ordinance. This test case is where so much of her work comes together. She stated that without getting into political or emotional aspects, she has to sit down and try to tease out where the business opportunities are to help them assess and see if there is a competitive advantage to their plans or whether they should shift gears and re-invest. There are already farmers in Bear Creek and other areas of Emmet County that see this ordinance and what the intent is. They are concerned because a lot of money is on the line and she has to advise them factually where the best place to go is. Emmet County had a 234% increase in farm related income in the last agricultural census. As attractive as it has been, there are other places in Northern Michigan and the UP that they are looking into that have less restrictions.

Karla Buckmaster stated that she doesn’t live in the neighborhood. She knows that the Coveyous are good farmers and there is likely not anyone in this room that are against farming. They are talking about 12 events per month. How does amplified music have any reflection on a viable farm? As far as the dB levels go there have been several people in this room refer to it as speaking level. This is the level of the music on the neighbors’ porches. Buckmaster stated that it is easier to allow no amplification for the first case.

Kathy Coveyou stated that they have had multiple events with amplified music with no knowledge by the neighbors. Even acoustic guitar players use a speaker to plug into. An employee’s husband stated that he couldn’t play a wedding without plugging in his acoustic guitar. They want the ability to have a guitar plugged into a speaker. There is no desire for loud bass music on the farm. They wouldn’t book a wedding with a DJ.

Fred Hollerback stated that he appreciates the concern of noise levels as the approval goes with the property. He is not sure what the correct measurement is if someone is talking in their yard and can’t hardly hear on the porch. He stated that he thinks the request should be approved with a low amplified music level and adjust later if needed.
William Coveyou stated it is not 65dB on the deck, it was measured at the property line which is hundreds of feet away. This is not something that will be heard at your home. It is under the board’s control to limit to three large events. The reality is that three events will fund the other events. We need to have amplification. He stated that he is the next generation and in order to keep the farm viable, he appreciates all of the help in allowing a low level of amplified music to help him continue.

David Coveyou stated that the Goldsmith’s are about 1300’ down US 131 through 600-700’ of forest. He appreciates their concerns but would like that kept in mind when weighing this case out.

Hartmann stated if they are restricted too heavily we are setting them up to fail which is not what the ordinance is about. She is in support of the request.

Alexander stated that he wants to see them succeed too but doesn’t want to start this out wrong. He doesn’t want this to be a problem and they don’t want to make it a problem. This isn’t just about them it is about everyone after them as well. They can come back and ask for more if needed.

Drier stated that the woman from the Harbor Springs farmers market stated that they had no amplification at the start of their market and moved up from there. Let the community hear and see what they are doing and go from there. We need to bridge the gap between their request and the 26 neighbors’ concerns; she’s concerned about them too. She stated that she weighs heavily on township recommendations when making decisions. MacInnis stated that he does as well.

Laughbaum stated that he doesn’t want to tinker with the dB levels in the code. It is like someone coming in with a bigger building who feels that they have met the criteria of the code. When the music starts the crowd quiets down. People love music. It is 70-75dB inside the tractor and the driver listed to the radio twice as loud. Laughbaum stated that he doesn’t like noise at night and hates mosquitos. It is coming to an end at 10p.m. If you have ten houses and everyone went out to mow their grass at the same time, the neighbors would find that objectionable. Laughbaum stated that he feels that we have done our planning well and we are not going to make everyone happy. He gets tired of hearing about farmers going broke. Let these guys try something else.

Kargol stated that there are 26 people who have signed an affidavit stating that they don’t want to be affected by noise and the township have said they wanted no amplification. There are zoning regulations of 1000’ from dwellings. No one is against agri-tourism in this room but he also believes that the slow approach won’t hurt anything. Is 50dB or 75dB going to make or break events? No one is saying that the events can’t take place, it is the noise that affects the neighbors. When making decisions, they have to be respected too. We should start low and work up from there.

Urman stated that he believes that the applicant would be willing to keep all music in the building. D. Coveyou stated that they would but the people would be on the deck. Urman stated that they have addressed all safety issues and he appreciates it. When going back to the intent there are two big words, compatible and compatibility. We are trying to protect residential uses from the impact of commercial uses. This makes this a tough decision. He stated that he feels that we can start low and go up if needed. The neighbors have likely invested their life savings into their homes as well which has to be looked at too. Urman stated that he is all for farming and agri-tourism and he does not take this lightly. He has spent many hours on this case.

Eby stated that they do not meet the code as written. It says that the applicant may request a change to the requirements. They must have music either in a completely enclosed building or meet the 1000’ minimum from dwellings to meet the code.

Alexander asked if amplification is life or death for this project. D. Coveyou stated that very few musicians will play without amplification; this is the reality.

Drier stated that she would propose one year without amplification. D. Coveyou stated that would take out half of the events. Eby stated that amplified music could be in an enclosed building. D. Coveyou asked if they could have the musician in the barn with the doors open? Eby stated that this is not an enclosed building then. Drier stated that it would not be in compliance with what the ordinance states. D. Coveyou asked how many of the members have stood on the deck. (Two raised hands) How do
you make a decision without being there? Drier stated that the reality of the situation is that we don’t need to stand on the deck. The request is not in compliance and the neighbors have said amplified music will affect them. There are other cases coming in right after you. We have to take this slowly. D. Coveyou stated that he can appreciate the caution but we’ve been working two years on this ordinance. Eby stated that the ordinance is not being met.

MacInnis made a motion to approve Case #PSUP19-003, David Coveyou and Coveyou Farms LLC, for a Special Use Permit for one location, the existing barn/deck area for accessory uses on a commercial farm at 24-01-19-30-100-006 (4160 US 131), in Section 30, Bear Creek Township, as shown on the site plan and presentation dated Received May 20, 2019 with the following conditions: the site plan will be edited to designate the gravel parking areas, drives, and walkways, include split rail fence details, add distance to Greg Road to the site plan, add snow storage to the site plan, detail the events on the plan, tree sizes and types identified on the plan, one food truck per event to meet the zoning setbacks, no pyrotechnics, proper signage for parking areas, amplification system shall be within a completely enclosed structure as specified in the ordinance. Approval is based on the following reasons: the request meets the conditions of section 26.50 based on the facts presented in this case, and the township has recommended approval. The motion was supported by Drier and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, MacInnis, Hartmann. No: Laughbaum. Absent: Scott.

3. 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 24-07-17-11-300-020. 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.

Packet Items: 5/22/19 zoning evaluation, zoning enabling act excerpt, 5/21/19 site plan, LF minutes

Salar presented this case. The property is located on the south side of M-68. An aerial photo was shown. The parcel is 10 acres of a 20 acre PUD. The 20 acres to the east are part of another PUD. The property is FF-1 zoned. The proposal is to amend the PUD to allow mini warehouses and outdoor storage. The PUD to the east allows for outdoor storage. This is the second hearing of this case. The proposal has been amended to remove all other contractor uses and service businesses. Photos of the site and the site plan were shown. There are some residential uses at the back of the property. The Master Plan and Future Land Use Map show this area as low density residential with mixed uses along M-68. Salar explained that this board’s recommendation would go to the Board of Commissioners for final approval. This is a preliminary review. The final review would come back to the Planning Commission. The township has recommended approval on the conditions that there be a 50’ perimeter greenbelt with trees and that there not be contractor’s uses allowed.

Doernenburg stated that during the last review there were some questions regarding the staff report. She gave a history of how PUDs have evolved. PUDs used to be overlay districts so the underlying district was what the density and uses were based on and they then were allowed to list the types of proposed uses in a mixed use PUD. There was also a re-zoning PUD which could allow for mixed uses as well but this wasn’t used as much. When this PUD was originally established the north half was established to allow for commercial uses such as Astro Building and outdoor display. This parcel was preliminarily approved for multi-family uses but never went through final approval. The applicant asked about amending the PUD which under our current ordinance is a rezoning. This would allow for the additional uses of mini storage and outdoor storage. When revising the ordinance, the Planning Commission and Board of Commissioners decided not to allow for conditional rezoning. There were
things pointed out from the Master Plan that are valid such as utilizing brownfields before Greenfields. The PUD to the east shows residential in the first quadrant and storage in the second quadrant. The corridor study adopted by Littlefield Township and the Planning Commission, limits commercial uses along M-68. Littlefield Township recommended approval at both the Planning Committee and Board levels.

Laughbaum asked if the Township is ok with commercial uses all of the way back. Doernenburg stated that they didn't want contractor's uses, only the storage uses. The plan the township saw listed all of the uses and allowed for the full parcel. This plan has been revised and scaled back.

David McBride stated that mini storage and outdoor storage is low impact/low traffic. They have a similar high-quality facility in Resort Township which is what is proposed for this site as well. After the township meeting, they were asked to revise the plan to include the bubble diagrams. This board asked them to define which uses were needed. They would come back for the area marked future development. The water retention area on the plan is not only good for drainage but it buffers the site from the residential uses as well. The PUD next to them was modified a number of years ago to allow for mini-storage. This existing PUD is 20 years old. They may have thought at that time that residential uses would come in here but he doesn't see that happening. McBride stated that they have listened to the township and the County and have given flexibility to the future development. Site plans will have to be provided for final approval.

Maclnnis asked McBride if he is ok with the conditions from the township. McBride said yes.

Kargol stated that it seems that the tree line goes back quite a ways and it seems to be concealed from the sides. McBride stated that there are similar uses on the next parcel. He would do screening as required. Doernenburg showed on the aerial where everything is proposed. She stated that this is preliminary review and the applicant could then come back with details on drainage, screening, etc.

Eby opened the floor to public comment.

Paul Mooradian stated that the front parcels are business use parcels of 5 acres and 660' deep. The tree line mentioned is on the back of Astro's parcel. The proposal is to remove all trees and dig out dirt for the mini storage and have outdoor storage in the open area. The back part is for future use. The neighboring PUD is the 660' 'magic line' and it should be the same tonight. He stated that he provided reasons to deny the request at the last meeting. Mooradian read from the 1999 minutes which stated that a greenbelt was to be added, existing trees to remain, and the east side to be open space. The recommendation was weighted on the corridor study. He stated that he was also involved in those meetings. He has a few pages of that plan which is the exact map as the Emmet County map and shows low density residential. The corridor study itself included comments from a survey including concerns about loud noises, storage, trailers, mining, campground uses, etc. There was no mini storage use specified. The study encouraged development close to the highway and to utilize currently zoned business areas before expanding and the plan to revisit when all available areas are built out. There is nothing in these documents that recommend mini storage be allowed. This is allowed in an industrial zone. Outdoor storage is allowed in FF zones but only if the parcel is a primary residence or home occupation. You can't have it by itself unless standards are waived. Mooradian stated that Fred Hollerbach's parcel is listed and it's vacant. He stated that he did research on the driveway easement through a title search. There is an ingress and egress easement only with no maintenance agreement. There is no utility easement so they wouldn't be able to get utilities to that site. He's not sure how this will affect the deal. On the updated zoning evaluation in the motion for recommending approval, it says that the proposed rezoning is consistent with the Emmet County Master Plan. He stated that Tracey Calnen is here and is under contract to build a mini-storage building within Keystone Industrial park.
Calnen stated that there is a demand for storage in the area and they are trying to facilitate that. They have looked at several pieces of property but they don’t comply with the zoning ordinance and they are trying to work within zoning.

Fred Hollerback stated that we should be careful in this decision as this takes away property that is needed for low income housing. There are plenty of other sites available in the area. He owns six other properties in the area.

Kurt Hoffman, lives on M-68, stated that to him this front property should all be commercial. He doesn’t understand how this can be approved for the rear property since there is commercial property available. It should remain residential until the highway frontage property is used.

McBride stated this ‘magic line’ doesn’t mean anything as there is approved mini storage on the parcel to the east. This can be modified. He has worked with the Zoning Department for months. He is trying to develop something positive. The title search isn’t part of the issue tonight. It is his issue.

Mooradian stated that there is only ingress/egress and no utilities. He also noted that the decision at the township was not unanimous as one member abstained.

Kargol asked where the easement runs. This was shown on the site plan. Is access a zoning issue? Doernenburg stated that the approved PUD plan does require shared access from M-68 but the easement issues would be a private matter.

Alexander asked if Mooradian’s concerns were brought up to the township. Mooradian stated that he challenges to show one arrow that points to this suggestion in the corridor study. He referred back to the points he read before regarding the public hearing and survey questions. He feels that the case should be postponed for further information due to new information.

Doernenburg stated that she attended the Littlefield Township Board meeting. There was discussion by the members. The members stated at the township board that this was an appropriate request and it was a perfect use for the area. The corridor study was referenced during that meeting. Those who voted supported the proposal for storage uses on the entire 10-acre parcel. The concerns were heard.

Laughbaum asked about the Future Land Use Map. Doernenburg stated that it shows low-density residential and commercial along M-68. Laughbaum asked how we got this wrong. Doernenburg stated that the map does not identify land uses by parcel lines and was purposely gradual to look at vicinity uses. This is something that could be discussed further. If you feel that the proposal is not appropriate, then vote accordingly. The question is whether the proposed uses are compatible with low density residential.

Kargol asked if the northerly parcel can have warehouses. Doernenburg stated that it is an approved use and would require final PUD and site plan review. There is room on the other two parcels to the north within the PUD.

Hartmann asked if the drive from M-68 is the only driveway in and if this was residential uses in the back, would people drive through the commercial uses to get to their homes. Doernenburg stated that this was the original plan. She explained that it is typical to try to limit access points within in a PUD.

Hollerback stated that there is a study being done next week with public comment regarding M-68. We should wait to see what comes from that.

Laughbaum stated that he is not convinced that this makes good zoning sense. We are creating more traffic flow. He wants people to be able to use their properties. PUDs are given with the assumption
that the community is getting something back. Planning has to have forethought or it’s just a scam. Mooradian’s comments stated the facts. When the facts are looked at we are either ahead or behind the curve. He stated that he would like to drive out to the site. Laughbaum made a motion to table this case. The motion failed for lack of support.

Kargol stated that if the east half of the southern property is approved for mini storage, then it is not consistent. They should have stopped at the half way point line. Maclnnis stated that they planned for low density housing which has not arrived. He noted that a mini storage facility near his home is full and there is still little to no traffic. It is very low impact in that regard. It is a quiet space full of people’s stuff, like a cemetery.

Maclnnis 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 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, and access is via a shared drive. The motion was supported by Alexander but failed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Drier, Alexander, Maclnnis, Hartmann. No: Eby, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargol. Absent: Scott.

Laughbaum made a motion to postpone the case until the next regular meeting to allow for review of the corridor study and site visits. This motion was supported by Urman and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargul, Alexander, Maclnnis, Hartmann. No: None. Absent: Scott.

4. PPTEXT19-01 Emmet County Planning Commission, Text Amendment, Section 19.01, Footnote J; Front & Rear Yard setback

Legal Notice: A request by Emmet County Planning Commission to amend the Emmet County Zoning Ordinance by adding a footnote J, to the Schedule of Regulations (Section 19.01) to read: “On a lot located within the Critical Dune Area regulated by the State of Michigan, in a recorded plat, fronting a private road, the minimum front yard setback standard shall be fifteen (15) feet. The rear yard setback of such lot may be reduced to 15 feet if the lot abuts property within the same plat.” The footnote should be added to the table in Section 19.00 within the RR Recreation Residential Zoning District Front and Rear Yard setback standards.

Packet Items: 5/22/19 zoning evaluation

Doernenburg presented this case. This is the second public hearing. The proposed changes would only affect specific areas in the County including some locations in Bear Creek and Cross Village Townships. Bear Creek Township has supported this text amendment. Maps of the impacted areas were displayed.

Tom Petzold, L'Arbre Croche, stated that due to when they platted their lots prior to zoning, they have all non-conforming lots and are further impacted by critical dunes. This would really help them out in their community.

Drier made a motion to recommend approval of PPTEXT19-01, Emmet County Planning Commission, to add a sentence to Section 19.01.j. Notes to the Schedule of Regulations, as proposed based on the facts presented in this case and the facts presented during the Planning Commission meetings of 11/01/2018, 12/6/2018 and 4/4/2019 and the Public Hearings held 5/2/2019 and 6/6/2019, the text is supported by the Emmet County Master Plan and will allow the desired flexibility within the areas defined by the text, and because the townships that responded recommended approval. The motion was supported by Hartmann and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier,
Due to the length of the agenda, the new cases were heard prior to these text amendments.

5. PPTEXT19-02 Emmet County Planning Commission, Text Amendment, Sections 4.01, 5.01, 6.1, 7.01, 8.01 & 26.51; Wineries

Legal notice: Attached

Packet items: Draft #10 red-line document, 5/23/19 zoning evaluation

Doernenburg presented this case explaining the proposed changes made since the last review. Additionally, a recommendation was made during the. This is the second public hearing. A new draft was put together following the comments of the first public hearing (Draft # 10) as well as a zoning evaluation and draft motions.

Urman asked if the active agriculture has to be grapes. No, agriculture or open space. There is a local winery that uses maple syrup for their wine. Also hard cider falls under this amendment.

There were no public comments on this case.

Maclellins made a motion to recommend approval of PPTEXT19-02 Emmet County Planning Commission, to add the uses of Wineries and Hard Cider Operations as proposed in Draft #10 incorporating the change to allow an attached or detached tasting room, based on the facts presented in this case and the facts presented during the Planning Commission meetings since June, 2017 and the Public Hearings held 5/2/2019 and 6/6/2019, the text is supported by the Emmet County Master Plan and will provide standards to allow for wineries on farms. The motion was supported by Hartmann and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, MacInnis, Hartmann. No: None Absent: Scott.

6. PPTEXT19-03 Emmet County Planning Commission, Text Amendment, Section 22.07, Signs

Legal Notice: Attached

Packet Items: 5/23/19 zoning evaluation

Doernenburg presented this case. This is the second public hearing. This proposal will eliminate the Sign & Lighting Committee and will allow for Zoning Administrator review of signs that meet ordinance standards. This also allows for temporary “real estate” type signs to be allowed without permits.

Laughbaum asked about the height of signs. Doernenburg stated that in a commercial district they can be 10’ in height, 8’ if in the right-of-way or in a residential zone. Signs in the road right-of-way require road agency approval.

There were no public comments on this case.

Kargol made a motion to recommend approval of PPTEXT19-03, Emmet County Planning Commission, to modify Section 22.07 Sign and Billboards to modify review procedures, modify the table to reflect some signs, as identified, not requiring permits, and allow for real-estate type signs without permits, as proposed in the draft. Approval is based on the facts presented in this case and the facts presented during the Planning Commission meetings since March 14, 2019 and the Public Hearings held 5/2/2019 and 6/6/2019, the text is not in conflict with the Emmet County Master Plan. The motion was supported by Urman and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, MacInnis, Hartmann. No: None Absent: Scott.
Packet Items: 5/23/19 zoning evaluation

Doernenburg presented this case. It is the second public hearing of this proposal. There are no changes to the actual requirements but does eliminate the requirement to house the IESNA standards.

Hartmann made a motion to recommend approval of PPTEXT19-04, Emmet County Planning Commission, to modify Section 22.06 Outdoor Lighting to eliminate the requirement to house the IESNA standards. No changes to the actual outdoor lighting requirements are proposed. Approval is based on the facts presented in this case and the facts presented during the Planning Commission meetings since March 14, 2019 and the Public Hearings held 5/2/2019 and 6/6/2019, the text is not in conflict with the Emmet County Master Plan. The motion was supported by Alexander and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, Maclnnis, Hartmann. No: None Absent: Scott.

8. PPTEXT19-05 Emmet County Planning Commission, Text Amendment, Section 27.09, Violations

Legal Notice: A request by Emmet County Planning Commission to amend the Emmet County Zoning Ordinance as follows: Add a sentence to the first paragraph of Section 27.09 to read: "A violation of a Consent Judgment is a violation of this Ordinance and is a nuisance per se."

Packet Items: 5/23/19 zoning evaluation

Doernenburg presented this case. This is the second public hearing. This amendment makes violations of a consent judgment a violation of this ordinance. This change was based on a recommendation from Civil Counsel.

There were no public comments on this case.

Alexander made a motion to recommend approval of PPTEXT19-05, Emmet County Planning Commission, to modify Section 27.09 Violations as proposed. Approval is based on the facts presented in this case and the facts presented during the Planning Commission meetings since March 14, 2019 and the Public Hearings held 5/2/2019 and 6/6/2019, the text is not in conflict with the Emmet County Master Plan and has been recommended by Civil Counsel. The motion was supported by Maclnnis and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, Maclnnis, Hartmann. No: Laughbaum. Absent: Scott.

9. PSUP19-007 Steve Potvin, EXCEPTION TO ACCESSORY BUILDING SIZE-MAIN USE, 7515 N Lake Shore Dr, Section 26, Cross Village Township

Legal Notice: A request by Steve Potvin for an exception to the size of an accessory building, currently proposed as a main use, at 7515 N Lake Shore Dr, Section 26, Cross Village Township. The property is zoned SR Scenic Resource and is tax parcel 24-05-04-26-200-006. The proposal is to allow construction of a 1,400 sq. ft. residential accessory building without a main use per Section 22.01 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Packet Items: Request & location map, tax parcel map, 4/10/19 site plan, elevations, rendering, 2/4/19 SE pending letter, driveway permit, septic & well permit, critical dunes permit, 5/21/19 zoning evaluation.

Salar presented this case. The property is 2 acres and is well screened. It is SR zoned. The proposal is to allow construction of an accessory building with a plan to build a house in the future. The allowed size in this zoning district for an accessory building is 1,200sf. The applicant is requesting 1,400sf. The building meets all setback requirements. The site plan and elevations were shown. The Road Commission has approved the driveway. Photos were shown; it is well screened from the main road. The township has recommended approval.

Steve Potvin, applicant, stated that they would like to build the accessory building first as they are building a timber-frame home and are doing the majority of the construction themselves. Currently, they are living in Lansing and would have to haul materials and tools up here to do the construction.
work. This would allow them a place to store these items on site. His wife will be retiring in the next
two years and they will then be able to devote more time to the construction. This is custom work and
will take time to complete. The renderings that were provided show that they plan to have the pole
barn look like the house. They are putting in 2 full-sized garage doors and a 16’ wide entry door. They
would like to keep the 30’ depth. The building will likely end up being between 1,360-1,380sf.

There was no public comment on this case.

Maclnnis made a motion to approve Case #PSUP19-007, Steve Potvin for a Special Use Permit for a
Customary Accessory Building without a main use and an Exception to the size standards of an
accessory building on property located at 7517 North Lake Shore Drive, Section 4 of Cross Village
Township on tax parcel 24-05-04-25-200-006, as shown on the site plan dated Received April 10, 2019
because the standards of Section 2102-17 have been met based on the facts presented in this case
and no good purpose would be served by strict compliance with the size standards of the Ordinance
and on condition that the building be used for personal use, and an affidavit of use be filed with the
Register of Deeds prior to issuance of a zoning permit, and the township has recommended approval.
The motion was supported by Alexander and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier,

10. PSPR19-002 BF Properties, LLC, SITE PLAN REVIEW-AMENDMENT, 5692 US 131 Hwy,
Section 32, Bear Creek Township

Legal Notice: A request by BF Properties, LLC for site plan review amendment at 5692 US 131 Hwy,
Section 32, Bear Creek Township. The property is zoned I-1 Light Industrial and is tax parcel 24-01-19-
32-300-005 owned by 5G Properties LLC. The request is to add a freezer and connector addition to the
existing distribution building.

Packet Items: Request & location map, tax parcel map, application, site plan review checklist, impact
statement, email from Benchmark Eng regarding stormwater estimated costs, 5/20/19 zoning evaluation,
RBCFD approval, 5/10/19 site plan (existing & proposed), grading & drainage plans, elevations

Salar presented this case. The property is zoned I-1, light industrial. There are three buildings on this
property. The surrounding zoning is FF. The proposal is to add an addition for a freezer addition. The
previously approved site plan and aerial photos were shown. The addition meets the setback
requirements. The access will remain the same and there are no parking changes proposed. The
addition falls within the currently approved stormwater retention area but it has been modified and
meets the ordinance standards. Additional screening is proposed along the south and west. Photos of
the site were shown. This construction will be in two phases. The Fire Department has approved the
plan and the Township has recommended approval.

Joe Audia, representing Kilwin’s Quality Confections stated that they operate a distribution center on
Division and have now purchased this complex. They currently pay a third party downstate to store
their ice cream products. This addition will allow them to store it at this site instead.

Doernenburg stated that we have $48,000.00 performance guarantee for the drainage because of a
previously approved building on the north end of the joint property, so the $20,000.00 for this project
could be waived if desired.

Urman stated that the applicant will work with staff on the tree types and sizes for the additional
screening.

Kargol made a motion to approve Case #PSPR19-002, BF Properties LLC for current owner Jim
Fabiano II for Site Plan Review – amendment for an addition for commercial freezer storage to be
completed in 2 phases, on property located at 5692 US 131 Highway, Section 32, Bear Creek
Township, tax parcel 24-01-19-32-300-005, as shown on the site plan dated Received May 10, 2019
because the standards of Article 10 and 20 have been met, and on condition that any exterior lighting be reviewed by the Sign and Lighting Committee and a performance guarantee in the amount of $20,000 be submitted prior to issuance of a zoning permit, and screening can be evergreen trees instead of cedar as marked on the plan. The motion was supported by Drier and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, MacInnis, Hartmann. No: None. Absent: Scott.

11. 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 24-07-17-11-127-130, zoned R-2 General Residential and I-1 Light Industrial & 24-07-17-11-100-032, 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: Request & location map, tax parcel map, application, zoning maps, 5/22/19 zoning evaluation, land use matrix excerpt

Doernenburg presented this case. The property is zoned R-2 and I-1. The request is to rezone the parcels in their entirety to B-2. The Future Land Use Map shows this area as Industrial. The Township Planning Committee requested postponement however their Board approved 4-1. The aerial was shown. There is a residential parcel with a dwelling in which these parcels surround. There is currently screening around the residential property. The rezoning maps provided by the applicant were shown. This is consistent with the Emmet County Master Plan and Littlefield Township Corridor Study. Photos of the site were shown. The residential parcel is .62 acres. The land use matrix was provided. This case will go to the Board of Commissioners. This is the first hearing on this case and it is policy for two hearings in a rezoning case.

Paul Mooradian stated that the reasons for his request include that the parcels have been zoned this way for 20 plus years. There is plenty of acreage available for industrial projects. The residence is non-conforming as it is. It was the home of the person that used to own the surrounding property. It's time to rezone and is business use in the corridor study and Master Plan. The economy is coming back. Both parcels have split zoning. The corridor study draws the line. There is business use across the road. The township has acknowledged that residences are not being built here. All arrows point towards this rezoning when you review the studies and the Master Plan. It is a good request.

Laughbaum asked if this is the highest and best use of the land or is there a particular project in mind. Mooradian stated that he is just looking for B-2 zoning and not to be handcuffed by a PUD allowing the market to decide the use. These are fragmented parcels. There are very limited B zoned properties. These are the bookends of the corridor. He is not asking for I-1, doesn't want mini-storage 200' from the highway, keep it where it belongs. Laughbaum asked if there is access there already. Mooradian said this is a tough question. He showed the original access stating that he would want another entrance off of M-68 if approvable. He could also do an interior road that feeds this property. The idea is to transition and clean up fractured zoning. It was built to use one driveway and can do that if needed. Kargol stated that he likes the idea of a service drive behind as it helps get congestion off of the highway.

Hearing no public comment on this case, Eby closed the first public hearing.

This case will be heard again at the next regular Planning Commission meeting.

12. PSUP19-008 Sun Communities Inc, SPECIAL USE PERMIT-RV Resort/Campground Expansion, 1720 N US 31 Hwy, Section 26, Bear Creek Township

Legal Notice: A request by Sun Communities Inc for a Special Use Permit for an RV Resort/Campground Expansion at 1720 N US 31 Hwy in Section 26, Bear Creek Township. The property is tax parcel 24-01-16-26-300-029, is zoned B-2 General Business and FF-1 Farm and Forest, and is owned by Rose Holding LLC.
Packet Items: Request & location map, tax parcel map, application, site plan review checklist, impact statement, RBCFD approval, 5/20/19 zoning evaluation, 5/13/19 site plan packet (cover, site layout, grading/drainage, elevations, bldg. sections)

Doernenburg presented this case. The property is located on the south side of US 31. There was a car dealership there and building that was a funeral home but is currently vacant. The existing KOA campground is the adjacent parcel to the east. The property is zoned B-2 and FF-1 with surrounding zoning of FF-1 to the east and west, B-2 to the north, and R-1 to the south. The site plan and aerials were shown. The access to the parcel would be via the current KOA approved access from US31. The site is buffered by topography to the south side. The proposal is to add expand the campground to include an additional 67 sites. These sites would have to be approved through the State of Michigan for a campground. They are required to not be visible from the public road, which due to topography and the existing building, they wouldn't be. Also proposed is a 725sf bathhouse. No dumpster is proposed. The zoning map and photos were shown. The township has recommended approval. Fire Department review has been received with no additional requirements. MDOT, Health Dept., and EGLE approvals are pending. The exterior lighting on the existing building does not currently conform to ordinance standards and will need to be changed. A support letter was received from Haggard's Plumbing & Heating.

Justin Vrabel was present.

Eby opened the floor to public comment.

Karla Buckmaster stated that she spoke at the township level. She stated that she is not saying that their request shouldn't be approved but the property does butt up to a residence on Pickerel Lake Road. Right now, KOA has 100 sites which means 100 campfires. They now want 67 more. Buckmaster stated that on summer evenings she cannot open her windows due to the smoke. Is there an ordinance to control this? She finds this to be a serious health concern and it needs to be addressed. She stated that she has talked to Kirk Rose about it. Perhaps signage stating the type of wood allowed or to prevent garbage being burned in campfires would help. She stated that this ruins summer for her. Imagine 167 campfires blowing in your windows. She stated that she has spoken many times with Doernenburg about rules for property notification. There is one residence between the KOA property and Pickerel Lake Road. It is '290' to the road. Her property is on the other side of the road. She didn't receive a notification of this case and the only reason she knew it was on the agenda is because she attends meetings.

MacInnis asked if there is any way that the campfire issue can be addressed? Vrabel stated that camping comes with fires. To his knowledge, there have been no other complaints in the last 20 years. It is part and parcel to the operation. Buckmaster stated that she understands there have been other complaints. She asked if that was correct stating that she doesn't want to say something that is untrue. Laughbaum asked if there is a limit on what type of wood can be burned. He stated that there is a fungus in red pine that you’re not supposed to burn as it’s not supposed to be good to breathe. MacInnis stated that the permits from the State likely don’t include air quality reports.

Urman made a motion to approve Case #PSUP19-008, Sun Communities Inc for Rose Holding LLC for a Special Use Permit for a RV Resort/Campground Expansion on property located at 1720 N US 31 Highway, Section 26, Bear Creek Township, tax parcel 24-01-16-26-300-029, as shown on the site plan dated Received May 13, 2019 because the standards for Article 21 and Section 26.29 have been met, and on condition any exterior lighting meet the standards of the Zoning Ordinance and a performance guarantee in the amount of $63,266.00 be submitted prior to issuance of a zoning permit, and on condition that other agency approvals are granted. Bear Creek Township Planning Commission
and Board recommended approval. The motion was supported by Alexander and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, MacInnis, Hartmann. No: None. Absent: Scott.

13. PPTEXT19-06 Emmet County Planning Commission, Text Amendment, Section 19.01, Section 19.00, Multiple Family Dwelling Density

Legal Notice: Attached
Packet Items: 5/23/19 memo, zoning ordinance excerpt from repealed ordinance, zoning ordinance excerpt from current ordinance, 5/20/19 Springvale Twp minutes, 5/15/19 email from Karla Buckmaster

Doernenburg presented this case. This is the first public hearing on this issue. This amendment would allow higher densities to R-2 zoned properties with public sewer. The increase table comes from the previous ordinance standards repealed in its entirety in 2015. The current ordinance does now provide a density bonus when public sewer is available. Bear Creek and Littlefield Townships have recommended approval, and would be the townships affected by this change.

Doernenburg noted that Karla Buckmaster had shared a concern with her regarding property on the corner of Pickerel Lake Road and US 31. This is a dangerous intersection. The property is zoned R-2 but currently does not have public sewer. She is concerned that if it ever is run there, it will only increase the dangerous intersection with more traffic.

Eby opened the floor to public comment.

Dennis Hoshield stated that he thinks it's great and is a simple proposal to address the Emmet County housing crisis.

MacInnis made a motion, supported by Alexander to waive the second hearing due to the fact that the affected townships are in support of the amendment. The motion passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, MacInnis, Hartmann. No: None Absent: Scott.

MacInnis then made a motion to recommend approval of PPTEXT19-06, Emmet County Planning Commission, to modify Section 19.01 and Section 19.00, Multiple Family Dwelling Density as proposed. Approval is based on the facts presented in this case and the facts presented during the Planning Commission meetings since May 2, 2019 and the Public Hearing held 6/6/2019, the text is not in conflict with the Emmet County Master Plan, Bear Creek and Littlefield Townships have recommended approval, and the amendment directly addresses the housing crisis issue. The motion was supported by MacInnis and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, MacInnis, Hartmann. No: Laughbaum. Absent: Scott.

IV Public Comments: None

V Other Business:

1. Enforcement Report- distributed, no discussion
2. Emmet County Resilient Master Plan 2020: discussion on survey and public meetings
3. PC By-laws: no discussion

VI Adjournment

There being no other business Eby called the meeting adjourned at 11:35 p.m.

James Scott, Secretary

Emmet County Planning Commission 06/06/2019
FYI

Received this AM

Dave

Dave McBride, C.G.R.
Owner
McBride Construction, Inc.
2125 M-119
Petoskey, MI 49770
(P) 231.348.2749
(F) 231.348.2748
(C) 231.838.2897
www.mcbrideconstructioninc.com

From: Larry Ginop [mailto:larry@ginopsales.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 13, 2019 10:55 AM
To: Dave McBride <dave@mcbrideconstructioninc.com>
Subject: RE: Tammy Doernenburg - Emmet County Planning & Zoning

Dave McBride & Emmet County Planning & Zoning

To all,... it is my position and feelings as a Business owner and Property owner next to the Property, I am in full agreement to Have David McBride Build & Proceed with storage Buildings on this property.

Thank you for your time & consideration

Larry Ginop

Ginop Sales Inc
11274 W M-68
Alanson, Mi. 49706
231-548-2272-Phone
231-548-2278-Fax
Reviewing PPTEXT 19-02
The Township has no problems with the changes to this Text.
Vote: Yes 5, No 0

The Township reviewed and approved our Littlefield Township Corridor Studies of 2012. We are looking at updating it this year 2019.
Vote: Yes 5, No 0

Case #PREZN19-01 Request by Paul and Ann Mooradian for rezoning of two parcels. At 7486 Keystone Park Dr. and 7349 M-68 Hwy.
The committee tabled this Case so we would have time to review it and see what the Township feels about rezoning some of M68 corridor.
The Township recommendation is to approve this case and would like all the neighbors to be notify again.
Vote: Yes 4, No 1,

PPTEXT-19-06 Proposed increase in density, on properties zoned R-2 General Residential, with public sewer.
The Committee had no problem adding a new text for R-2 Density Table.
Vote: Yes 5, No 0,

The Township is looking at rezoning the Area from Moore Ave to Rose St. back half of Cincinnati St. in Oden. The Zoning right now is B-1 and we want to change it to R-2 General Residential
Date: May 22, 2019

To: Office of Planning & Zoning
    3434 Harbor-Petoskey Rd. Suite E.
    Harbor Springs, MI 49740

RE: Request by Paul and Ann Mooradian for a rezoning of two parcels at 7486 Keystone Park Dr. and 7349 M-68 HWY, Section 11, little field Twp. Parcel#24-07-11-127-130 & 24-07-11-100-032

To Whom it May Concern,

Upon reviewing the above Notice, I would like to express my view with the above case's requests. Haggard’s Plumbing & Heating is not opposed to the changes of the property and/or the request to the Zoning Board. If a property owner is fortunate enough to have the ability and the resources in this time of economical struggles to either build and/or improve their existing property, we could like to see their request granted. It would prove positive for the local, county and state to do all we can to improve and promote growth in anyways possible.

Sincerely,

JOHN HAGGARD
REQUEST

PSPR19-003
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.

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

---

**DATE RECEIVED**  
**APPLICATION #**  

**FEE**  
**DATE PAID**

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

**APPLICATION**  
**DATE PAID**

**FEE**  

**APPLICATION**  
**DATE PAID**

---

**Applicant’s Name** Rob and Beth Hogerwerf  
**Phone** 616-730-1616

**Applicant’s Address** 1238 Peony Ave. Wayland, MI 49348

**Applicant’s Email Address** rhogerwerf@gmail.com

**Owner’s Name** Rob and Beth Hogerwerf  
**Phone** 616-730-1616

**Owner’s Address** 1238 Peony Ave. Wayland, MI 49348

**Owner’s Email Address** rhogerwerf@gmail.com

---

**JOB SITE LOCATION:**  
Township: Littlefield  
**Address:** 4721 Oden Rd, Alanson, MI 49706

---

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

**Describe Request:**  
Move a cottage to this lot by Nick at J & R Building Movers (231) 348-9571 (lot formerly had a home on it)

---

**REQUIRED USE INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ground floor area main building:</th>
<th>662 Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area accessory building:</td>
<td>584 Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot/Parcel Size:</td>
<td>.15 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6,550 Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Site/Plot Plan required**

- 2 full sized & 14 reduced sized (max 11“x17”)
- site plans required for Planning Commission cases.

---

**Date Submitted**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elevation Drawing</th>
<th>06/13/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineered Drainage Plan</td>
<td>06/13/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Erosion Permit</td>
<td>Talked to Nancy Fuller 5-31-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Dept. Approval</td>
<td>Talked to Michele &amp; Megan 5-2-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Taps</td>
<td>19 No system evaluation needed as lot has city sewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date Submitted**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Inventory</th>
<th>☐</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Dept Approval</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.A. Lot is R&amp;B soil</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetlands Permit</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Chief has reviewed</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Commission</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDOT Approval</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Fisher at MDOT gave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>permit to patch driveway &amp; remove driveway grass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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:

**Date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Printed Name of Applicant</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rob Hogerwerf</td>
<td>06/13/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Signature of Applicant**

**Printed Name of Property Owner**

**Date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Name of Property Owner</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rob Hogerwerf</td>
<td>06/13/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# SITE PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST

**Subject Property Address:** 4721 Oden Rd. Alanson, MI 49706  
**Subdivision and Lot Number (if Applicable):**  
**Tax Parcel Number:** 24-07-17-17-000-018  
**Township:** Littlefield  
**Proposed Use of Property:** Residential cottage to vacation rent to tourists and use for our family use and vacation  
**Proposed Number of Employees:** 0

<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>noted on site plan</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>noted on site plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Zoning Information</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Zoning setback lines -Building (including the eave) Setbacks: Front 25' Side 10' Side 14.5' Rear/Water 20'</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></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) = 25.5' x 26' Total sq. ft. = 662 sq ft.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Proposed building elevations (to scale) Max. Height = 14.5'</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 = 1 , composition (efficiency, one bedroom, two, three)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 bedrooms 1 bathroom cottage home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Surrounding zoning (properties immediate to subject site)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td>R2 bike path</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Lot coverage of proposed buildings = 662 sq ft.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Natural Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Boundaries of existing natural features (trees, lakes, ponds, streams, rock outcroppings, severe topography, wetlands, woodlands, etc.). Woods are on other side of bike trail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td>Has a wetland permit been applied for? Not wetlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing topography Slight slope back to front</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soil analysis Is it in a Critical Dune Area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Site Inventory provided?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Are there scenic view considerations?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Drainage / Parking / Roads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access drives, internal roads (note public or private) service roads. Width of Right-of-Way = MDOT ROW 60'. No internal roads. Cement driveway to MDOT ROW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td>Loading/unloading, service areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sidewalks, paths, and trails (internal and public within road right-of-ways).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acceleration/deceleration lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td>Road agency approval? MDOT allows patching driveway with permit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking areas (dimensioned typical parking space, maneuvering lanes) Can park 1 car in garage and 2 cars on side of garage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>✅</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parking spaces required², parking spaces actual³, Handicap parking location and number na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Required landscaping in parking areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Snow storage/snow management plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dumpster location, screening indication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing easements (utility, access) within site limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Location of Water/well, Sewer/septic, and stormwater drainage plan on Site Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>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 shown on site plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed retention/detention sedimentation ponds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other Site Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed landscaping (required greenbelts, plant materials/size and type, fences, retaining walls, earthberms, etc.)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add a row of Arborvitae green shrubs along side lot lines 2 down lights back of cottage &amp; 1 back of garage, 1 front of cottage &amp; 1 front of garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of outdoor lights, pole heights, bollards, building attached, luminary shielding techniques*</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 down lights back of cottage &amp; 1 back of garage, 1 front of cottage &amp; 1 front of garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of sign(s)*</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No sign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site amenities (play area, pools, beaches, tennis courts, etc.)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Statement attached?</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fire Chief said he will do what twp. wants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Department approval?</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MDOT gave permit to patch cement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire hydrants and fire vehicle access.</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Talked to Michele &amp; Megan 5-2-19 No system evaluation needed as lot has city sewer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Agency approval?</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not DEQ protected land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health agency approval?</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not DEQ protected land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Corps of Engineers approval?</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not DEQ protected land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan Department of Environmental Quality approval?</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not DEQ protected land</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:**

---

**Applicants Signature:**

Robert J Hagerwerf

**Date:**

06/13/2019
IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW

APPLICANT'S
NAME Rob Hogerwerf ____________________ CASE#

PHONE NUMBER 616-730-1616 ____________________ DATE 06/13/2019 __________

PROJECT TITLE 4721 Oden Rd Cottage

PROPERTY TAX ID # 24-07-17-400-018 ______________ 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.

Site Area is a 50'x131' lot that had a cottage home torn down on it in back of the existing garage. Population is made up of mostly cottages and some homes and a multi unit apartment house next door and a manufactured home on other side of bike bath behind. We want to move a cottage to the lot to replace the old cottage that was torn down in back. We would keep the existing garage and proposed plan is for putting the replacement cottage in back of lot behind garage where old cottage use to be approximately but within proper setbacks. We would move it. Richies Construction can put in the block wall foundation and footings and rod and concrete floor and water proof the outside walls 5 or 6 blocks tall with approximately 1.5 to 2.5 blocks showing above ground. We would have geotec fabric or visqueme under neath floor of foundation. We would be using an excavator (such as Wade Williams or Jacks Trucking) to level lot and plant lawn grass and for as needed for foundation and drainage plan. Vehicle traffic of 1 to 3 cars to use the cottage at a time. We would build a ground level deck on back of cottage and a deck entrance on front of cottage. We are not planning on using the schools there as this would be a tourist vacation rental cottage and for our family to use and vacation at.
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):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Sanitary Services</td>
<td>lot has existing city sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Domestic Water</td>
<td>Lot has existing well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Traffic Volumes</td>
<td>1-3 cars at a time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Schools</td>
<td>Vacation cottage, not using schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Fire Protection</td>
<td>Not a business but will be meeting Fire Chief and Littlefield / Alanson fire department requirements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Soil Erosion</td>
<td>Talked to County Soil Erosion Officer May 1, 2019 and she said to say I talked to her and she doesn't see a problem for that lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Storm Drainage</td>
<td>Lot has drain ditch at road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Shoreline Protection</td>
<td>Not on a shoreline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Wildlife</td>
<td>NA 50x 131 lot on Oden Rd US-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Air Pollution</td>
<td>2 bed and 1 bath cottage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Water Pollution</td>
<td>2 bed and 1 bath cottage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Noise</td>
<td>No excessive business or industrial noise as it will just be a cottage.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**INDIVIDUAL CONSTRUCTION PERMIT**
For Operations within State Highway Right-of-Way

**Issued To:**
Robert J. Hogerwerf
1238 peony ave
Wayland MI 49348

**Contact:**
Rob Hogerwerf
616-730-1616(O)
rhogerwerf@gmail.com

**Permit Number:** 24011-063162-19-052819
**Permit Type:** Individual Application
**Permit Fee:** $15.00
**Effective Date:** May 28, 2019 to May 28, 2020
**Bond Numbers:**
**Liability Insurance Expiration Date:**

---

**THIS PERMIT IS VALID ONLY FOR THE FOLLOWING PROPOSED OPERATIONS:**

**PURPOSE:**
Patching existing driveway and cleaning off grass from approach 4721 Oden Rd. Alanson MI

**STATE ROUTE:** US-31  **TOWNSHIP OF:** Littlefield  **COUNTY:** Emmet County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEAREST INTERSECTION</th>
<th>SIDE OF ROAD</th>
<th>DISTANCE TO NEAREST INTERSECTION</th>
<th>DIRECTION TO NEAREST INTERSECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati St</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>West</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONTROL SECTION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MILE POINT FROM</th>
<th>MILE POINT TO</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24011 15.470</td>
<td>15.470</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REQUISITION NUMBER:**
**WORK ORDER NUMBER:**
**MDOT JOB NUMBER:**
**ORG JOB NUMBER:**
This permit is incomplete without "General Conditions and Supplemental Specifications"

I certify that I accept the following:

1. I am the legal owner of this property or facility, the owner's authorized representative, or have statutory authority to work within state highway Right-of-Way.
2. Commencement of work set forth in the permit application constitutes acceptance of the permit as issued.
3. Failure to object, within ten (10) days, to the permit as issued constitutes acceptance of the permit as issued.
4. If this permit is accepted by either of the above methods, I will comply with the provisions of the permit.
5. I agree that Advance Notice for Permitted Activities for shall be submitted 5 days prior to the commencement of the proposed work.
   I agree that Advance Notice for Permitted Utility Tree Trimming and Tree Removal Activities shall be submitted 15 days prior to the commencement of the proposed work for an annual permit.

CAUTION

Work shall NOT begin until the Advance Notice has been approved.
Failure to submit the advance notice may result in a Stop Work Order.

Robert J. Hogerwerf              Scott Fisher
MDOT                               

May 28, 2019                        Approved Date

TSC Contact Info                Gaylord TSC

(989) 731-5090

THE STANDARD ATTACHMENTS, ATTACHMENTS AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS MARKED BELOW ARE A PART OF THIS PERMIT.

STANDARD ATTACHMENTS:
1. General Conditions for Permit (General Conditions)
2. ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS FOR ACTIVITIES WITHIN MDOT RIGHT-OF-WAY (2486)

ADDITIONAL ATTACHMENTS:
1. Work Outside Shoulder.pdf
2. Driveway Profile - Residential.pdf
3. Driveway Surfacing.pdf

AMENDMENT ATTACHMENTS:
Tammy

For Calnen, I would estimate the grading to create the retention areas to be $3,000.00. Grading is needed to create the pads for the buildings, so how much is attributable to stormwater is up for interpretation.

For Hogerwerf, I would say $1,500.00.

Let me know if you have any other questions.

Bryan Nolan, P.E.

BENCHMARK ENGINEERING INC.
SURVEYORS * ENGINEERS
607 E. Lake St. Harbor Springs, MI 49740
Ph:(231) 526-2119 benchmark607@gmail.com

Hi Bryan,

Would you be able to provide estimated cost for the drainage systems for the Calnen project at 7319 Keystone Park Dr and the Hogerwerf project at 4721 Oden Rd?

Thank you.

Tammy

Tammy Doernenburg
Planning and Zoning Director
Emmet County
3434 Harbor-Petoskey Rd, Suite E
Harbor Springs, MI 49740
(o) 231.439.8998
(f) 231.439.8933
emmetcounty.org
tdoernenburg@emmetcounty.org
www.emmetcounty.org
DATE: 06/19/2019  CASE #: PSPR19-003

APPLICANT: HOGERWERF ROBERT & BETHANY J

PROPERTY: 4721 ODEN RD

TOWNSHIP: LITTLEFIELD

REQUEST: Site Plan Review – Tourist home

FACTS:
- The property is zoned B-1 Local Tourist Business.
- The property is non-conforming lot (created in 1989) 0.18 acres in area.
- Currently there is an existing residential garage on lot. Proposal is to add a tourist rental cottage behind the garage.
- A cottage was located on the property in the past (demolished in 2016).
- The proposed building meets the setback standards of the Zoning District.
- Proposed cottage is 25.5‘ x 26’.
- Parking appears to meet Zoning Ordinance standards.
- Drive and parking area proposed to be gravel in addition to existing concrete section of drive. Sealed drainage plan provided. Estimated cost of drainage system is not provided.
- A private well is used for the site. The site is served by sanitary sewer.
- The North Western State trail borders the parcel on the north.
- Properties to the north are zoned R-2, parcels to the east and west are zoned B-1 and are primarily residential, across the highway is zoned B-1 with a cabin court and RR with single family residence
- Ample snow storage area shown on plan.
- MDOT has issued a drive permit for maintenance of existing drive.

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.

Setback standards met. Building height 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.

1. Walkways from parking areas to building entrances  
   *Walkway shown on plan from parking area to cottage.*

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.  
   *Site Plan submitted 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.  
   *No loading dock or outside storage proposed*

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.  
   *No screening proposed.*

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 1/2" 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.

Plan submitted. Estimated cost = $1,500.

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.

I. WASTE RECEP TACLES: Waste receptacle and enclosure requirements

None shown.

J. MECHANICAL OR ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT: Mechanical or electrical equipment requirements.

None shown.

Draft Motions:

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, and on condition that any exterior lighting be compliant with the Emmet County Zoning ordinance and a performance guarantee in the amount of $1,500 be submitted prior to issuance of a zoning permit, and (other conditions or statement of facts may be inserted here).

To deny 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 for the following reasons: (list reasons).
REQUEST

CASE #PSPR19-004
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.
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

JUN 1 3 2019
DATE RECEIVED $150.00

APPLICATION # JUN 1 3 2019
DATE PAID

PLeASE MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO: EMMET COUNTY

Applicant’s Name: Bryan & Tracey Cahen
Phone: 231-539-8147

Applicant’s Address: 2750 Lakeside Lake Rd, Pellston, MI 49769

Applicant’s Email Address: Pole Barn Highway.net @

Owner’s Name: Paul & Annie Mooradian
Phone: 231-878-3722

Owner’s Address: PO Box 534 H.S. MI 49740

Owner’s Email Address: jheck@keysarecells.com @

JOB SITE LOCATION:
Township: Littlefield Tax Parcel #: 24-07-12-11-127-119
Address: 1319 Keystone Park Dr. #19, Alanson

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: 14160 Sq. Ft.
Floor Area accessory building: ☐
Lot/Parcel Size: 1.6 Acres 157000 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 6-13-19
Engineered Drainage Plan 6-13-19
Soil Erosion Permit ☐
Health Dept. Approval ☐
Sewer Taps ☐

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-
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

*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.
### SITE PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST

**Case #:** PSPR19-004  
**Date Received:** JUN 13 2019

**Subject Property Address:** 7319 Keystone Park Dr  
**Subdivision and Lot Number (If Applicable):** Unit 19  
**Tax Parcel Number:** 24-07-11-127-119  
**Township:** Hebron  
**Proposed Use of Property:** Storage Building  
**Proposed Number of Employees:** N/A

### 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

| Zoning setback lines - Building (including the eave) Setbacks: Front 50 Side 10 Side 10 Rear/Water 20 | ✓ | | | |
| Location of new buildings and general floor plan Dimensions of bldg (s) = \( \frac{\text{WxL}}{2} \) Total sq ft.  
See Attached Plan | ✓ | | | 2 Building per plan |
<p>| Proposed building elevations (to scale) Max. Height = 24' | ✓ | | | |
| All existing structures (labeled) within 100 feet of perimeter property lines | ✓ | | | |
| Multiple housing units - Number of units = ________, composition (efficiency, one bedroom, two, three) | ✓ | | | |
| Surrounding zoning (properties immediate to subject site) | ✓ | | | All J-1 |
| Lot coverage of proposed buildings = 33°70 | ✓ | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Features</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>14</strong> Boundaries of existing natural features (trees, lakes, ponds, streams, rock out-croppings, severe topography, wetlands, woodlands, etc.).</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15</strong> Has a wetland permit been applied for?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16</strong> Existing topography</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17</strong> Soil analysis Is it in a Critical Dune Area?</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18</strong> Site Inventory provided?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Open Site</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19</strong> 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><strong>20</strong> Access drives, internal roads (note public or private) service roads. Width of Right-of-Way = <strong>60 ft</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Private Road</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21</strong> Loading/unloading, service areas</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22</strong> Sidewalks, paths, and trails (internal and public within road right-of-ways)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23</strong> Acceleration/deceleration lanes</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24</strong> Road agency approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25</strong> Parking areas (dimensioned typical parking space, maneuvering lanes)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26</strong> Parking spaces required <strong>9</strong>, parking spaces actual <strong>22</strong>, Handicap parking location and number ****</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27</strong> Required landscaping in parking areas</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28</strong> Snow storage/snow management plan</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29</strong> Dumpster location, screening indication</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30</strong> Existing easements (utility, access) within site limits</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>31</strong> Location of Waterwell, Sewer, septic, and stormwater</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>32</strong> 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>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33</strong> 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>per plan</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>ND well- sewage</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: 6-13-19
IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW

APPLICANT'S NAME Bryan & Tracy Calhoun
CASE# PSPR19-004

PHONE NUMBER 231-539-8147 DATE 6-9-19

PROJECT TITLE Keystone Unit #19

PROPERTY TAX ID # 24.07.17-11-127-119 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.

The project will include the construction of two pole buildings for cold storage. Each building is proposed to be 7000 square feet. There will be no adverse effects to the surrounding properties.
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     | N/A |
| c. Traffic Volumes    | Typical of other properties throughout the commercial park. |
| d. Schools            | N/A |
| e. Fire Protection    | Littlefield/Alamoson Fire Dept. |

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

| a. Soil Erosion          | Flat level site |
| b. Storm Drainage        | Per engineered drawing |
| c. Shoreline Protection  | N/A |
| d. Wildlife              | N/A |
| e. Air Pollution         | N/A |
| f. Water Pollution       | N/A |
| g. Noise                 | Minimal |
Tammy Doernenburg

From: Benchmark Engineering <benchmark607@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2019 2:47 PM
To: Tammy Doernenburg
Subject: Re: Questions for Bryan

Tammy

For Calnen, I would estimate the grading to create the retention areas to be $3,000.00. Grading is needed to create the pads for the buildings, so how much is attributable to stormwater is up for interpretation.

For Hogerwerf, I would say $1,500.00.

Let me know if you have any other questions.

Bryan Nolan, P.E.

BENCHMARK ENGINEERING INC.
SURVEYORS * ENGINEERS
607 E. Lake St. Harbor Springs, MI 49740
Ph:(231) 526-2119 benchmark607@gmail.com

From: Tammy Doernenburg
Sent: Wednesday, June 19, 2019 2:12 PM
To: Benchmark Engineering
Subject: Questions for Bryan

Hi Bryan,

Would you be able to provide estimated cost for the drainage systems for the Calnen project at 7319 Keystone Park Dr and the Hogerwerf project at 4721 Oden Rd?

Thank you.

Tammy

Tammy Doernenburg
Planning and Zoning Director
Emmet County
3434 Harbor-Petoskey Rd, Suite E
Harbor Springs, MI 49740
(o) 231.439.8998
(f) 231.439.8933
tdoernenburg@emmetcounty.org
www.emmetcounty.org
DATE: 06/19/2019                CASE #: PSPR19-004

APPLICANT: CALNEN, BRYAN PATRICK

PROPERTY: 7319 KEYSTONE PARK DR

TOWNSHIP: LITTLEFIELD

REQUEST: Site Plan Review – Storage building

FACTS:
- The property is zoned I-1 Light Industrial. Adjacent properties all zoned I-1.
- The property is 1.02 acres in area.
- The property is currently vacant.
- Site is located within an Industrial Park.
- Parcels to the north, south and east are currently vacant with commercial uses across the road to the west.
- The proposal is for 2 mini-storage buildings 30/32' x 228' each (7080sq. ft.)
- The proposed buildings and driveway meets the setback standards of the Zoning District.
- The use of mini-storage is a Permitted* use in the I-1 zoning district. Supplemental standards apply.
- Emmet County Road Commission approval not required due to access from private road off M-68.
- Parking proposed to be gravel. Sealed drainage plan provided. Estimated cost of drainage system $3,000.
- Parking spaces proposed to be provided in front of each unit.
- No Health Department approval required.
- Building meets height standard (20’)
- No dumpster proposed.
- Snow storage area shown on plan at entrance to parcel and at rear of buildings.
- No outdoor lighting proposed, no details provided.
- Buildings are situated perpendicular to the road.
- Fire Department approval pending.

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. Setback standards, height standard 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. Parking provided in front of each storage unit.

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. Site Plan submitted 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. No loading dock proposed.

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. No residential uses adjacent. No screening required or provided.

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.

Plan submitted. Estimated cost $3,000

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. N/A

I. WASTE RECEPTACLES: Waste receptacle and enclosure requirements
None shown.

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

Draft Motions:

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 24-07-11-127-119, 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, 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 (other conditions or statement of facts may be inserted here).

To deny 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 24-07-11-127-119, as shown on the site plan dated Received June 13, 20196 for the following reasons: (list reasons).

To postpone 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 24-07-11-127-119, as shown on the site plan dated Received June 13, 20196 for the following reasons: (list reasons).
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REQUEST

PSPR19-005

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.

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:**

---

**Date Received:** 6/14/19

**Applicant’s Name:** Jacqueelyn Hall

**Phone:** 231-487-03918

**Applicant’s Address:** 5040 Rosada St, Petoskey 231-622-1580

**Applicant’s Email Address:** Conway Storage inc @ gmail.com

---

**Owner’s Name:**

**Owner’s Address:**

**Owner’s Email Address:** @

---

**Job Site Location:**

**Township:** Bear Creek

**Tax Parcel #:** 24-01-16-275-103

**Address:** 2020 Fotchman Drive

---

**Zoning Request:**

---

**Planning Commission:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Use Permit</th>
<th>Site Plan Review</th>
<th>Planned Unit Development</th>
<th>Zoning Map Change</th>
<th>Zoning Text Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Required Use Information:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ground floor area main building:</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area accessory building:</td>
<td>Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot/Parcel Size:</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Site/Plot Plan required:**

2 full sized & 14 reduced sized (max 11”x17”)

Site plans required for Planning Commission cases.

---

**Date Submitted:** 6/14/2019

**Certified by:**

**Authorizations:**

- Site Inventory [X] 6/14/2019
- Fire Dept Approval □
- Wetlands Permit □
- Road Commission/ □
- MDOT Approval □

---

**Other:**

As owner/and or applicant representing the owner, I do 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:** 6/14/19

---

**Signature of Property Owner:**

**Printed Name of Property Owner:**

**Date:**
# SITE PLAN REVIEW CHECKLIST

**Case #: pSPR 19-005**  
**Date Received: 6-14-19**

## Subject Property Address
2020 Fotchman Industrial Drive

## Subdivision and Lot Number (If Applicable)

## Tax Parcel Number:
24-61-16-26-275-103

## Township
Bear Creek

## Proposed Use of Property
Storage Buildings

## Proposed Number of Employees
0

---

### 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 30' Side 10' Side 10' Rear/Water 20' | ✓   |    |     |          |
| 7. Distance between buildings (nearest point to nearest point)                         | ✓   |    |     |          |
| 8. Location of new buildings and general floor plan Dimensions of bldg.(s) = 40' x 120' Total sq.ft. = 4,800 SF | ✓   |    |     |          |
| 9. Proposed building elevations (to scale) Max. Height = 10'                           | ✓   |    |     |          |
| 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) | ✓   |    |     |          |
| 12. Surrounding zoning (properties immediate to subject site)                         | ✓   |    |     |          |
| 13. Lot coverage of proposed buildings = 21%                                           | ✓   |    |     |          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Natural Features</strong></th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</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></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>
</tbody>
</table>

**Drainage / Parking/ Roads**

<p>| 20 Access drives, internal roads (note public or private) service roads. Width of | ✓   |    |    |          |
| Right-of-Way = <em><strong>100'</strong></em>_                                                    |
| 21 Loading/unloading, service areas                                             |     |    |    |          |
| 22 Sidewalks, paths, and trails (internal and public within road right-of-ways). |     |    |    |          |
| 23 Acceleration/deceleration lanes                                             |     |    |    |          |
| 24 Road agency approval?                                                         | ✓   |    |    |          |
| 25 Parking areas (dimensioned typical parking space, maneuvering lanes)         | ✓   |    |    |          |
| 26 Parking spaces required______, parking spaces actual______, Handicap parking  | ✓   |    |    |          |
| location and number______                                                         |
| 27 Required landscaping in parking areas                                        | ✓   |    |    |          |
| 28 Snow storage/snow management plan                                            | ✓   |    |    |          |
| 29 Dumpster location, screening indication                                       | ✓   |    |    |          |
| 30 Existing easements (utility, access) within site limits                      | ✓   |    |    |          |
| 31 Location of Water/well, Sewer/septic, and stormwater                         | ✓   |    |    |          |
| 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.                                       |     |    |    |          |
| 33 Proposed retention/detention sedimentation ponds                              | ✓   |    |    |          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Site Requirements</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34 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>35 Location of outdoor lights, pole heights, bollards, building attached, luminary shielding techniques*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Location of sign(s)*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Site amenities (play area, pools, beaches, tennis courts, etc.)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Impact Statement attached?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Fire Department approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Fire hydrants and fire vehicle access.</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Road Agency approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Health agency approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Army Corps of Engineers approval?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 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:**

Cost of Site drainage/retention area is $800.00

Applicants Signature: [Signature]

Date: 6/4/19
IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW

APPLICANT'S NAME ___________________________ CASE# _______________________

PHONE NUMBER ___________________ DATE ___________

PROJECT TITLE ____________________________

PROPERTY TAX ID # ___________________________ TOWNSHIP ________________________

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.

This project includes the construction of a third and fourth storage building. Each building is 40' x 120' and will have 360 self storage units. The drive areas will be gravel. The storm water run-off will drain to the Northwest. A silt fence will be placed along the property lines during construction.
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
   Self storage generates minimal traffic of 2-3 cars per day. The impact on local streets is low.

d. Schools
   None

e. Fire Protection - Minimal Impact. The buildings have a 100% open perimeter to allow fire department access.

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

a. Soil Erosion
   A silt fence will be placed along the property lines during construction.

b. Storm Drainage
   All storm water will drain to the Northwest.

c. Shoreline Protection
   N/A

d. Wildlife
   Will not be disturbed

e. Air Pollution
   None

f. Water Pollution
   None

g. Noise
   Minimal noise from people accessing their units.
TO: BEAR CREEK PLANNING COMMISSION
FROM: CHIEF ALFRED L. WELSHEIMER
SUBJECT: SITE PLAN REVIEW

I HAVE REVIEWED THE PLAN ISSUE DATED: 6-13-2019

FOR: Conway Storage IV Building C and D

LOCATION: 2020 Fochtman Park Dr.

After reviewing the plan dated June 13, 2019 found no issues with plan.

June 14, 2019

Alfred L. Welsheimer
Fire Chief
DATE: 06/17/2019  CASE #: PSPR19-005

APPLICANT: JACQUELYN HALL

PROPERTY: 2020 FOCHTMAN INDUSTRIAL PK DR

TOWNSHIP: BEAR CREEK

REQUEST: SITE PLAN REVIEW - AMENDMENT- STORAGE BUILDINGS

FACTS:
- The property is zoned I-1 Light Industrial. Adjacent properties all zoned I-1.
- The property is approximately 1.13 acres in area.
- The property has 2 storage buildings completed in 2017 and 2018.
- Site is located within an Industrial Park.
- The site is adjacent to an approved propane storage facility to the south; open space for the Hearthside Development to the east, vacant to the north, and commercial uses across the road to the west.
- The proposal is for two mini-storage buildings, each measuring 40'x120' (4,800 sq. ft.).
- The proposed buildings meet the setback standards of the Zoning District.
- The use of mini-storage is a Permitted* use in the I-1 zoning district. Supplemental standards apply.
- One curb cut is approved and the access drive is in place. Driveway Permit has been issued by the Emmet County Road Commission.
- Parking proposed to be gravel. Drainage plan provided – not sealed by a Michigan Licensed Architect. Estimated cost of drainage system is $800.
- Parking area provided in front of each unit. No allocated parking provided as noted on the plan.
- No Health Department approval required.
- Buildings meet height standard (9'6").
- No dumpster proposed.
- Ample snow storage area shown on plan at rear of buildings.
- Outdoor lighting on buildings only. Fully shielded lighting proposed as on the existing buildings.
- Fire department review provided, indicates no issues.
- Screening provided around perimeter of site and along road.
- Building is situated perpendicular to the road.

ZONING ORDINANCE STANDARDS:

SECTION 22.05 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.

B. Vehicular and Pedestrian Circulation
Parking areas provided in front of each unit. One access provided at approved location. Vehicles
generated approximately 3-4 per day.

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.

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.

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.

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 \( \frac{1}{2} \)" 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.

Calculations provided. Plan is sealed by a Licensed Architect. Estimated cost of drainage system $800.

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. "Easement along the front of the property is 30 feet wide and there is no construction proposed within that area. Utility easement shown on the side of the new buildings, no construction in this location.

I. Waste Receptacles
Waste receptacle and enclosure requirements
None provided on the site plan.

J. Mechanical or Electrical Equipment
Mechanical or electrical equipment requirements.
None shown.

Section 26.43 Storage Uses (including Mini)
A. All proposed buildings nearest to the primary access road shall be site planned to be perpendicular to the road, or be positioned to the rear of other approved non-storage or non-warehouse buildings, or be setback at least three-hundred (300) feet from public road right-of-way lines. Buildings are perpendicular to the road.

B. Intense, all season landscape screening, to effectively shield storage buildings from bordering public
roads, per an approved Landscape Planting Plan which achieves screening upon installation of proposed plant materials.

Screening from US-31 and around perimeter of the site is provided. Screening existing along public road.

Draft Motions:

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 14, 2019 because the standards of Sections 14.01, 22.05, and 26.43 have been met. 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 (other conditions or statement of facts may be inserted here).

To deny 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 14, 2019 for the following reasons: (list reasons).

To postpone 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 14, 2019 for the following reasons:
REQUEST

PSPR19-006
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.

LOCATION
Tammy Doernenburg, Zoning Administrator
Emmet County Office of Planning and Zoning

Dear Tammy:

Enclosed is our request for a Site Plan Amendment to change the King House located at 144 N. Lamkin Road 9 aka Lot 8 Wagaumuckasee from RR to Historic Restoration. The enclosed material includes the same information that we are concurrently submitting to the Readmond Township Planning Commission.

We are hopefully that the Emmet County Planning Commission will be able to consider our request at their next meeting on Thursday, July 11, 2019. We are prepared to attend the meeting to answer any questions.

Additional background information regarding the King House, its historical significance and our future plans is available and will be brought to the meeting.

Please advise me if you have any questions or wish to have additional material submitted before the meeting.

Thank you for your consideration of this request.

Respectfully,

Jim Clarke, Chair
King House Association

kinghouseassociation.org · facebook.com/kinghouseassociation

The purpose of The King House Association is to purchase, restore and maintain the mid-19th century King home in Middle Village/Good Hart in tribute to the rich cultural history of this beautiful area.
**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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE RECEIVED</th>
<th>FEE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6-17-19</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PLEASE MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO: EMMET COUNTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant’s Name</th>
<th>Jim Clarke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>485-659-9886 - mobile</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant’s Address</th>
<th>391 N. Lannik Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>231-526-1209 - Home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant’s Email Address</th>
<th>JimClarke519 @ AOL . COM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner’s Name</th>
<th>King House Association</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner’s Address</th>
<th>P.O. Box 942, Good Hart, MI 49737</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner’s Email Address</th>
<th>King House Association @ Gmail . COM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**JOB SITE LOCATION:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Readmurd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Parcel #:</td>
<td>24-12-07-36-351-012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>144 N Lannik Rd Harbor Springs, MI 49740</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ZONING REQUEST:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Commission:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Use Permit:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan Review:</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Unit Development:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Map Change:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning Text Change:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REQUIRED USE INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ground floor area main building:</th>
<th>240 Sq. Ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floor Area accessory building:</td>
<td>N/A Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot/Parcel Size:</td>
<td>10.905 Acres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site/Plot Plan required*

| 2 full sized & 14 reduced sized (max 11"x17") site plans required for Planning Commission cases. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Submitted</th>
<th>Site Inventory</th>
<th>Fire Dept Approval</th>
<th>Soil Erosion Permit</th>
<th>Wetlands Permit</th>
<th>Health Dept. Approval/ Madot Approval</th>
<th>Road Commission/ Madot Approval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Describe Request:**

- Site Plan Amendment

- Historic Restoration

*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 **X** 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**

**Signature of Property Owner**

**Printed Name of Property Owner**

**Date**
### Basic Map Information

1. Proposed site location map (indicate sufficient area reference to locate site). May use plat map, Google map or other map to identify parcel.

   - **Yes**: ✓
   - **No**: 
   - **N/A**: 
   - **Comments**: 

2. Appropriate scale

   - **Yes**: 
   - **No**: ✓
   - **N/A**: 
   - **Comments**: 

3. Date, North Arrow, Street Names (existing and proposed right-of-ways).

   - **Yes**: ✓
   - **No**: 
   - **N/A**: 
   - **Comments**: 

4. Name, Address and Phone Number of person preparing plan

   - **Yes**: ✓
   - **No**: 
   - **N/A**: 
   - **Comments**: 

5. Property line dimensions

   - **Yes**: ✓
   - **No**: 
   - **N/A**: 
   - **Comments**: 

### Basic Zoning Information

6. Zoning setback lines -Building (including the eave) Setbacks:
   - Front ______ Side ______ Side ______ Rear/Water ______

   - **Yes**: ✓
   - **No**: 
   - **N/A**: 
   - **Comments**: 

7. Distance between buildings (nearest point to nearest point)

   - **Yes**: 
   - **No**: ✓
   - **N/A**: 
   - **Comments**: 

8. Location of new buildings and general floor plan Dimensions of bldg.(s) = ______ x ______ Total sq.ft. = ______

   - **Yes**: ✓
   - **No**: 
   - **N/A**: 
   - **Comments**: 

9. Proposed building elevations (to scale) Max. Height = ______

   - **Yes**: ✓
   - **No**: 
   - **N/A**: 
   - **Comments**: 

10. All existing structures (labeled) within 100 feet of perimeter property lines

    - **Yes**: ✓
    - **No**: 
    - **N/A**: 
    - **Comments**: 

11. Multiple housing units -Number of units = ______, composition (efficiency, one bedroom, two, three)

    - **Yes**: ✓
    - **No**: 
    - **N/A**: 
    - **Comments**: 

12. Surrounding zoning (properties immediate to subject site)

    - **Yes**: ✓
    - **No**: RR
    - **N/A**: 
    - **Comments**: 

13. Lot coverage of proposed buildings = ______

    - **Yes**: 
    - **No**: ✓
    - **N/A**: 
    - **Comments**: 

---

**Subject Property Address**: 391 W Lamkin Road

**Subdivision and Lot Number (If Applicable)**: Lot 8

**Tax Parcel Number**: 24-12-07-66-361-12

**Township**: Readmond Township

**Proposed Use of Property**: Historical Restoration

**Proposed Number of Property Employees**: None

**Site Plan Review Checklist**

**Case #**: PSPR 19-001

**Date Received**: 6-17-19
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Features</th>
<th>yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 Boundaries of existing natural features (trees, lakes, ponds, streams, rock out-croppings, 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><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 Right-of-Way = __________</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 <em>-0--</em>, parking spaces actual <em>-0--</em>. Handicap parking location and number <em>-0--</em></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, roads, parking lots, curbs, sidewalks and finished grades at building facades) 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, 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></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

Date 6/12/2019
IMPACT STATEMENT FOR SITE PLAN REVIEW

APPLICANT'S NAME  Jim Clarke  CASE#  FSPR 19-006

PHONE  231-526-1209  Home
NUMBER  435-659-9886  Cell  DATE  6-17-19

PROJECT TITLE
Change of Use - RR to Historical Restoration

PROPERTY TAX ID
#12-09-36-351-012  TOWNSHIP  Readmond

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.

Planned Future Use
See Attached
Impact Statement Addendum
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
  None
- d. Schools
  None
- e. Fire Protection
  No Increase

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

- a. Soil Erosion
  None
- b. Storm Drainage
  None
- c. Shoreline Protection
  None
- d. Wildlife
  None
- e. Air Pollution
  None
- f. Water Pollution
  None
- g. Noise
  None
Impact Statement Addendum
144 N. Lamkin Road

The King House, an historic timber-wall home, was built in the mid-1800s along Lake Michigan in an Odawa settlement known as Wagaumuckasee or Middle Village. This area now consists of cottages and seasonal homes zoned RR Recreational Residential.

King family members occupied the home until around 1940 after which it was vacant. Descendants of the King family retained ownership of the home until 2015 when it was acquired by The King House Association (KHA), a local non-profit. It was acquired with the understanding that KHA would restore and preserve the house as an asset for the community.

A careful restoration of the dwelling, consistent with the historic photographic record and the national standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties, was completed in the fall of 2018. We intend to submit an application for inclusion of this historic home on the National Registry of Historic Places and expect it will be approved.

Historical restoration use, including the "displays of historical artifacts related to the premise" is Permitted by right under Article 6 (attached) for houses located in RR Recreational Residential Districts. Based on this right, KHA requests approval of a Site Plan Amendment changing the use from "Residential" to "Historical Restoration". The future use will include:

1. Wall-mounted displays of text and photos, which tell the story of the area from pre-history to the present day, will be placed on the interior walls of the House. Some archeological artifacts dug from the lot may also be displayed.

2. The House will be open to the public during daylight hours from late-May until mid-October on the same schedule as the nearby St. Ignatius Church and locked at night. The House would not be open during winter and spring. Visitors can take a self-guided tour of the wall displays on the first floor of the home. Most days there will be no attendant on site.

3. Parking will not be available on site and will be discouraged on Lamkin Road. A sign will direct visitors to the parking lot in Middle Village Park located 335 feet south on Lamkin Road adjacent to the Church. Restroom facilities are available in the Park.

4. One to three educational events could take place at the King House site each year. They will be scheduled to avoid the peak tourist season.

5. Daily visits are expected to be few in number consisting of individuals and families who are most likely visitors to the St. Ignatius Church, beach-goers at the Middle Village Park and local residents and renters walking on Lamkin Road.
Recreational Residential District

**Article 6**

**Recreational Residential District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Pg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>Intent</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>Principal Uses &amp; Special Uses Permitted</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>District Development Standards</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 6.00 Intent**

The Recreational Residential District is designed to accommodate cottage and seasonal home developments. It is intended that the seasonal home areas be reasonably homogeneous by discouraging the mixing of recreation home areas with commercial resorts, business services and community services.

**Section 6.01 Principal Uses & Special Uses Permitted**

No building or land shall be used and no building shall be erected except for one or more of the following specified uses (also shown in Article 18: Land Use Matrix):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>RR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Camps, Recreation Lodges, &amp; Resorts (for profit)</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farms, domestic</td>
<td>P*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Launching Pads and Minor Accessory Facilities</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campgrounds</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country Clubs</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Parks, Playgrounds, Recreation Areas including accessory</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shelters and apparatus, &amp; public lands</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services Religion</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Institutions</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Care &amp; Social Assistance</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Child Care Home (6 or less)</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Child Care Home (7-12)</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter for Battered Women and Children (in a residence)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State-Licensed Residential Facilities (Adult Foster Care - 6 or less adults)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessory Buildings &amp; Uses Incidental to Main Permitted Uses</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customary Accessory Buildings (200 sq. ft. and greater) without a Main Use</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical restoration or renovation projects including historic communities, archaeological excavations and displays of historical artifacts related to the premises</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottages and Recreation Homes</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Occupations Level 1</td>
<td>P*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Occupations Level 2</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Television/Radio Reception Tower</td>
<td>P*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Family Dwelling</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities &amp; Energy</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utility Facilities (without storage yards)</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Site Assessment Systems</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Energy Systems, On-Site, greater than 60' in height</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind Energy Systems, On-Site, up to 60' in height</td>
<td>S*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VERIFY WITH TWP. ZONING REQUIREMENTS

ZONING DISTRICT = RA
MINIMUM LOT WIDTH = 100'
MINIMUM LOT AREA = 2,000 SQFT
SETBACKS: FRONT = 40'
REAR = 35'
SIDE = 10'

EMMET COUNTY PLANNING & ZONING

LOCATION SURVEY
KING HOUSE PROPERTY
LOT 8, WA-DAW-MUCK-A-SEE,
SECTION 36, T.37N, R.7W
READING TOWNSHIP, EMMET COUNTY, MICHIGAN

NOTE:
The only intent of this map is to show the location of the existing King house. Field work for this drawing was done in Oct. 2015 and map or may not reflect current field conditions.
The property description was furnished, and no check of title relative to ownership, gaps, overlaps or exception has been performed as part of this sheet.
The location of the property boundaries and their corresponding bearings and distance depicted herein, are based solely upon the provided legal description. If a property survey is eventually conducted utilizing appropriate boundaries for principles governed by the facts and evidence gathered and evaluated during the course of this survey, these boundaries and divisions may ultimately be considerably different.
ZONING EVALUATION FORM
Office of Planning and Zoning
Emmet County, MI

DATE: 06/19/2019 CASE #: PSPR19-006

APPLICANT: Jim Clarke – King House Association

PROPERTY: 144 N LAMKIN RD

TOWNSHIP: READMOND

REQUEST: Site Plan Review – Amendment

FACTS:
- The property is zoned RR Recreational Residential.
- The property is Lot 8 in the Plat of Wagaumuckasee (0.24 acre in area).
- The property is the site of an historical dwelling which was restored in 2018.
- The location of the building is non-conforming as to setbacks (front and side).
- No driveway proposed to the site. Proposal to use off-site parking. No parking proposed on-site. No parking agreement provided.
- Existing building is 240 sq. ft. No additional construction proposed.
- Traffic to site expected to be light.
- Use is a permitted use in the zoning district.
- No septic or well located on the site.
- Properties to the north, south, and west are zoned RR Recreational Residential. Parcel to the east zoned SR Scenic Resource.
- Adjacent uses include residential and vacant properties.
- No dumpster is proposed.
- No snow storage area shown on plan. Proposal for use to be seasonal.
- No outdoor lighting proposed. Any signs or lights would require review and approval prior installation.
- Road Commission review does not appear to be needed.
- Health Department review does not appear to be needed.

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. *Building is existing – no new construction 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.

1. Walkways from parking areas to building entrances
   *No parking areas proposed.*

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.
   *Site Plan submitted to Fire Chief for review.*

D. LOADING AND STORAGE:
   *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.
   *N/A*

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.
   *No screening proposed. No changes to site plan proposed. Change in use proposed only.*

G. DRAINAGE: *N/A*

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.
   *N/A*

I. WASTE RECEPTACLES: Waste receptacle and enclosure requirements
   *None shown.*
J. MECHANICAL OR ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT: Mechanical or electrical equipment requirements.

None shown.

Draft Motions:

To **approve** Case #PSPR19-006, Jim Clarke for King House Association for Site Plan Review – amendment for an Historical Restoration or renovation project including ...displays of historical artifacts related to the premises at 144 N Lamkin Rd, Section 36, Readmond Township, tax parcel 24-12-07-36-351-012, as shown on the survey dated Received June 17, 2019 because the standards of Articles 6 and 20 have been met, and on condition that any exterior lighting be reviewed as required by the Zoning Ordinance standards, and a parking agreement for parking within 400 feet be provided prior issuance of the zoning permit *(other conditions or statement of facts may be inserted here)*.

To **deny** Case #PSPR19-006, Jim Clarke for King House Association for Site Plan Review – amendment for an Historical Restoration or renovation project including ...displays of historical artifacts related to the premises at 144 N Lamkin Rd, Section 36, Readmond Township, tax parcel 24-12-07-36-351-012, as shown on the survey dated Received June 17, 2019 for the following reasons: *(list reasons)*.

To **postpone** Case #PSPR19-006, Jim Clarke for King House Association for Site Plan Review – amendment for an Historical Restoration or renovation project including ...displays of historical artifacts related to the premises at 144 N Lamkin Rd, Section 36, Readmond Township, tax parcel 24-12-07-36-351-012, as shown on the survey dated Received June 17, 2019 for the following reasons:
To:  
Emmet County Planning Commission, Zoning Board of Appeals & Board of Commissioners  
From:  
Planning & Zoning, Tammy Doernenburg Director  
Date:  
Prepared for Emmet County Planning Commission July 2019 meeting  
Subject:  
Status of Enforcement Issues

1. 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 sent follow up letter to owner and adjacent owners. 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. 12/13/2017 - sent letter to owner requesting application for compliance by mid-January 2018. Received two calls from parties interested in resolution. Received FOIA request on 12/29/2017 for entire file. Continued conversations with adjacent land owners. Will continue to follow-up as necessary. 5/21/2018 - sent letter requesting compliance. Same day received photos showing violation of parking. 7/9/2018 - issued NOV for continued violation of site plan. 7/11/2018 - became aware of sale of property. Dismissed NOV. 7/12/2018 - met with new property owner. Advised of options for compliance. 7/18/2018 - received request by new owner for an interpretation of the PUD. 7/20/18 received ZBA application for a Temporary Use Permit. 7/30/2018 Property owners have met - township board member working toward PUD amendment and resolution by owners. 8/2/2018 Applicant requested postponement of ZBA case after meeting with township Planning Committee. Possible PUD amendment to be pursued. New owners have been in contact regarding their intentions. Existing owner of docks have been submitting photos of parking in violation of the PUD. Components of a PUD amendment application received. No complete application received to date, but one is expected. PPUDF18-02 on November PC agenda. Case postponed, scheduled for 12/6/2018. Case postponed, scheduled for 11/10/2019. Case requested to be postponed, scheduled for 2/7/2019. Meeting canceled, now scheduled for 3/14/2019. Civil Counsel review requested on 3/20/2019. 4/4/2019 PC conditionally approved. Will need to monitor conditions and site. 5/22/2019 PUD Agreement approved by Civil Counsel. 5/23/2019 PUD Agreement sent to property owner for signatures.

2. 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 complete. 11/28/2017 sent letter requesting compliance. 12/20/2017 No response to date. 1/12/2018 - site not accessible. 5/9/2018 sent letter to owner. 5/24/2018 SUP applied for - will be on the August 2018 PC agenda. SUP denied at 8/2/2018 PC meeting. Letter sent to owner requesting removal of structure. Follow-up needed after snow melt. 5/16/2019 confirmed violation still exists - sent violation letter requesting building be removed.

3. Littlefield - 4700 Oden Rd / 4653 Pangbuin St - 4/17/2018 - during ZBA case review of neighboring property, discovered encroachment from this subject property. Staff to investigate further. 5/21/2018 - letter sent to owner. Received call 5/24/2018 from owner who is meeting with association Memorial Day weekend. Will explore options. 6/6/2018 received call from property owner within association. Still exploring options with neighboring property owner and road vacating. 6/26/2018 - received call from property owner - meeting with township regarding vacating platted roads. 8/9/2018 - owners met with township Board to discuss options regarding platted roads. MDOT consulted regarding claim of state right-of-way for one platted road - determination made MDOT does not claim rights to either platted road 8/20/2018. Owners seem to be working toward compliance. 11/15/2018 received email of status - owner attempting to abandon roads and convey to appropriate adjacent properties to allow mobile home to remain at its current location. 11/20/2018 spoke with property owner representative and requested update in 30 days. Working toward resolution. 12/21/2018 - meeting with Civil Counsel to work toward next steps. 1/2/2019 letter sent to both the property owner and mobile home owner. No response from mobile home owner, property owner claimed no responsibility. Violation letter sent 1/23/2019. No response from mobile home owner to date. Property owner at 4653 Pangbuin St has sent responses. 2/7/2019 Sent Final Notice. 3/6/2019 Notice of Violation issued. 3/8/2019 corresponded with attorney for Bussingham. Provided options. 3/15/2019 received proposed lot split plans. 3/20/2019 Advised attorney of options for compliance. Communication continues with attorney and surveyor. 5/22/2019 ZBA reviewed variance requests. Variances denied. Violation continues.

4. Bear Creek - 3529 Howard Rd - Complaint regarding site plan violation. Investigated site 5/4/2018. Found site to be in violation of approved site plan and screening has died. Sent enforcement letter 5/18/2018. 6/2/2018 - no response to date. 7/18/2018 - visited site. Trees have been planted, but site not in compliance with approved site plan. Piles of debris (trees) and parking in areas not identified for such uses on site plan. 8/20/2018 - sent follow-up letter regarding site violations. 9/19/2018 - business staff have been communicating with office staff. They plan to apply for an amendment to their site plan. 11/18/2018 new plans submitted to date. 12/19/2018 - revised plan and application submitted. Application incomplete. Applicant contacted and additional information received. 2/6/2019 complete application received, scheduled for 3/14/2019 meeting. Township requested postponement due to inadequate site plan 2/27/2019. 3/21/2019 spoke with representative for applicant, requested postponement. Expect review during May ECPC meeting. 5/22/2019 - received revised site plan for review by Bear Creek Township and Emmet County Planning Commissions. Site Plan approved 6/6/2019 - compliance achieved.
5. Bear Creek - 1700 Anderson Rd - 6/27/2018 - complaint of outdoor storage/sales in unauthorized area. 6/29/2018 - contacted Fire Chief regarding display/storage in fire-lane. He indicated he'd contact the store and asked that I address storage in back of store. 7/16/2018 - Sent letter. Received call from manager indicating store is now in compliance. Requested a site visit. Site visit conducted 8/16/2018 - called manager, not in. Follow-up needed. 12/20/2018 - site visited. Letter to property owner prepared to address development as a whole. 2/8/2019 received email from property manager. Met with property manager for adjacent parcels. Need to reach out to different property manager for this property.

6. Carp Lake - 8772 Paradise Tr - 6/25/2018 - received phone call of too tall sign. Investigated and found new sign - no permits. Sent letter same day. 7/10/2018 - received phone call from owner. Sign was installed, is too tall, is in road right-of-way and is too large in area. Gave options to owner and asked for compliance. 7/20/2018 - owner applied for ZBA review. 8/6/2018 ECRC denied road commission permit application for sign located in road right-of-way. 8/6/2018 - owner withdrew ZBA request. 8/20/2018 - sign still at same location. Sent follow-up letter to owner requesting removal of sign. 9/10/2018 - sign has been moved, but is still visible from the road. Follow-up needed. Received call regarding outdoor lighting installed on cottages with glare onto neighboring property. Visited site 1/18/2019. Letter to be sent. 2/7/2019 - follow-up letter sent. Received call from owner who claimed harassment. Sent information for sign variance and lighting standards. 3/4/2019 received complaint from owner regarding enforcement. Advised by owner not to enter property. 3/20/2019 visited site from neighboring property and road. Lights are out of compliance and glare onto neighboring property. 4/5/2019 received follow-up letter from owners. 4/11/2019 sent response letter inviting ZBA application. 5/13/2019 received ZBA application. Visited site 5/17/2019 - unable to determine compliance of the sign. Will visit after dark. Site visited 5/24/2019 - one light compliant, one light not compliant. Sign area approved by ZBA, sign height not approved.

7. Bear Creek - 1264 US 31 N - 8/2/2018 - report of sign in disrepair. Letter sent to owners 8/23/2018. Will follow-up with new owner. 12/10/2018 - letter sent to new owner. Received phone call 1/11/2019 regarding sign. Owner wishes to use the sign. 2/7/2019 spoke with owner - new use may be known within 30 days. 3/21/2019 Have received many calls and emails regarding potential use. Follow-up needed. 5/14/2019 sent letter to owner requesting sign be brought into compliance. No response to date.

8. Bear Creek - 3500 Click Rd - 1/25/2019 - complaint of structure too close to right-of-way. 1/28/2019 - site visit scheduled. 1/29/2019 - visited site. Property lines not identified. Location is temporary, but appears to meet setback standards. Follow-up will occur in spring. Met with property owners 4/5/2019 - building to be moved as soon as weather permits. 5/2/2019 - visited site - no change.

9. Bear Creek - 5322 Evergreen Tr - 4/26/2019 report of RV being used in front yard. RVs may be occupied for 60 days in a calendar year. Will monitor.

10. Bear Creek - 1057 Cedar Valley Rd - possible business from residence. Site visit conducted. Additional investigation needed.

11. Bear Creek - 1475 Cedar Valley Rd - possible business from residence. Site visit conducted. Additional investigation needed. 6/19/2019 - confirmed DBA at the subject property.

12. Bear Creek - 2153 Cedar Valley Rd - observed outdoor storage in violation of Home Occupation. Follow-up needed.

13. Bear Creek - 1191 N US 31 Hwy, lighting installed on building which shines upward. Emailed electrical contractor and property owner. Received email from contractor and phone call from owner. Contractor working on solution with general contractor. Lighting has been brought into compliance. Freestanding sign found to be replaced in violation of Zoning Ordinance (internally lit - white background - not opaque). 6/20/2019 letter sent to owner, sign company, and business district manager.


16. Wawatam Twp - 4791 Straits View Dr. Park Model installed without permits. 4/26/2019 delivered letter to owner. 5/8/2019 received zoning permit application. 5/17/2019 visited site - setback from waterfront not met. 5/22/2019 - met with property owner - gave options for compliance.

17. Littlefield Twp - 4386 Oden Rd, 2/12/2019 complaint of porch too close to property line. Visited site twice in winter, not accessible due to snow. Follow-up visit conducted 3/16/2019 - observed property. Unable to determine if violation exists. Aerial photos not clear. Porch appears to be non-conforming.

Introduction:
Emmet County and northwest Michigan is experiencing a well-documented housing shortage – particularly rental housing – that is affordable to a broad range of income levels. The short supply of available and affordable housing leaves many families with few choices but to live in deteriorating, inadequate, unsafe, or unaffordable homes. Conversely, families and young people may choose to live elsewhere, limiting our workforce and harming businesses. Businesses struggle to find employees that can afford to live in the County and often lose employees to businesses where more affordable housing options are available. Quality housing means quality employees.

Without spending significant resources, local governments and communities can help by ensuring that a variety of housing options are available throughout the county that meet the needs of all income levels. Local and county governments can work in partnership with developers and community organizations and businesses to support housing goals and projects.

Planning Commissioners Role:
Planning commissioners are responsible for making decisions about zoning and development in Cities, Villages and Townships in Emmet County. This means you are essentially the ‘gate keeper’ for directing and determining what type, how much, and where workforce housing is built in your community. No other authority in the county regarding these issues exists, so whatever regulations you create are the final say.

Communities can consider zoning changes that, for instance: allow multi-family housing construction such as apartments or townhomes; consider regulations for short-term rentals (VRBO, Air B&B, etc.); create opportunities to add small homes to existing neighborhoods, though techniques such as cottage zoning or accessory dwelling units; rehabbing existing abandoned buildings and properties; plan higher densities in areas with infrastructure and access to nearby services and employment; providing zoning incentives or bonuses; or allow for more mixed-use zoning (commercial/residential).

Housing Providers/Housing Developers Role:
If you want to attract workforce housing development to your community, you should ask yourself this question; are your policies and procedures fair, timely and predictable enough for a developer to begin a dialogue with you and to consider developing housing in your community?

Cursory review of the County’s 16 Townships 2 Cities and 3 Villages, regulatory documents and procedures revealed that language pertaining to workforce housing was limited or non-existent. For example, we looked for language pertaining to allowing higher densities, smaller building lots, and houses with smaller square footage and found very few examples.

Why are these documents so important? Because without proper regulations and policies, developers are forced to pursue expensive, time consuming rezoning or variance requests interfering with project schedules, creating project uncertainty, and often, litigation, and/or abandonment of their project.
**Housing Ready Checklist:**

To help you determine if your community is capable of attracting housing developers, the following checklist was developed to conduct an “ARE YOU READY” self-assessment. It is not a comprehensive checklist but indicators to ascertain if you have key regulations and policies in place.

**Do policies, decisions, goals, and regulations in your community enhance or deter housing access?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consideration</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do your Master Plan and Zoning Regulations advocate the promotion, creation, and preservation of housing which responds to the needs of the resident population not served by or met by market rate housing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there definitions in your zoning ordinance for “workforce housing” and “community housing”?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do your zoning regulations provide for a variety of densities to allow housing units such as: multi-family dwellings (ex. apartments, townhomes, condos, small homes, duplexes, or fourplexes, etc.); mixed-use buildings; accessory dwelling units; and small homes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your community have a “Purpose Clause” making a clear statement of public policy in favor of workforce housing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your community offer any incentives and opportunities to promote workforce housing in your community? (ex. density bonuses, parking relief, tax breaks, discounts or reduced fees, subsidized/abandoned properties, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you recently reviewed your development processes, fees, and regulations to ensure simplicity, ease, and understanding?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your community established a map delineating available and “priority” development sites for workforce housing and, thereafter, considered the “Pre-Permitting” of selected sites within the designated area?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does your current infrastructure support increased housing density?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you reviewed your zoning regulations in relation to building code regulations? For example: height limitations?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there opportunities in your community to rehab deteriorated, abandoned, or unused buildings or properties?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there available housing in your community that is affordable to low- to moderate-income families in the workforce?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you like to learn more? Would you like a more detailed presentation or assistance in your community? If so, please contact us. We would love to hear from you.

**Little Traverse Bay Housing Partnership**

rachel@harborinc.org; 231-881-0122; PO Box 112 Harbor Springs, MI 49740