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

MEMBERS ABSENT: None

STAFF: Tammy Doernenburg, Monica Linehan, Nancy Salar

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

II  Minutes of August 1, 2019
MacInnis made a motion supported by Kargol, to approve the minutes of the August 1, 2019 meeting as presented. The motion passed unanimously by voice vote of the members.

III  Cases

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

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

   *Packet Items:* postponement email

   Doernenburg reported that this board had some concerns with the site plan last month. The applicant has requested postponement and anticipates being ready with a revised site plan by our next month’s meeting. The request for postponement was included in the packets along with a letter questioning the notification process for this case. Doernenburg explained that this is a site plan review which is not advertised to the neighbors per the procedures outlined by the Zoning Enabling Act and the Zoning Ordinance.

2. PREZN19-03  Flynn & Behan, REZONING R-2 to B-2, 1597 & 1663 N US 31 Hwy, Section 27, Bear Creek Township

   *Legal Notice:* A request by McBride Development to rezone two parcels from R-2 General Residential to B-2 General Business at 1597 & 1663 N US 31 Hwy, Section 7, Bear Creek Township. The property includes tax parcels 01-16-27-400-029 & 030. The review will be per the Emmet County Zoning Ordinance Section 27.11 Amendments. The properties are owned by Flynn and Behan.

   *Packet Items:* No new items

   Doernenburg explained that the applicant on this case has been changed from David McBride who requested that the case be withdrawn, to the owners, Flynn and Behan who signed the application and requested that the rezoning request move forward as advertised. Since the zoning on the property
runs with the land, Legal Counsel has said that it is proper to continue with the review this way.

The property is located on US-31 west of Shaw Road. The location map was shown as well as the aerial and the existing commercial access points were shown. The site plan that shows the parcels being requested for rezoning was shown as was the zoning map and the Future Land Use map which designates the area as commercial with mixed use to the north. Photos of the site were presented. Doernenburg pointed out that there are wetlands on the property that have been delineated based on a previous review. Previously the properties were approved for a PUD and that approved site plan was shown. This PUD has since expired. It was approved under Bear Creek Township’s zoning in 2000. The township has recommended approval for the current request. Tonight’s decision would be a recommendation to the Board of Commissioners for their September 19, 2019 meeting.

Steve Shuman, Real Estate One, was present for the applicants. He explained that there is an offer on the piece to the north which leaves the piece on the highway isolated at this point. He stated that he thought it would have made a great industrial park area. After discussion, they settled into requesting a B-2 designation. There is not much residential being built right on the highway. David McBride had an offer on the property for some time but is no longer involved with this request. Richard Behan and Mike Flynn, owners, would like to proceed with the request.

Drier stated that she needs to recuse herself from this case. She didn’t realize until the names were changed that she would have a conflict but she has financial dealings with Mike Flynn. She left the room.

Urman stated that McBride had said that he was going to have potential storage buildings on the property when he was involved. Doernenburg stated that we have to look at all potential B-2 uses for the property not just a proposal.

There was no public comment on this case.

Urman made a motion to recommend approval of Case #PREZN19-03, Mike Flynn & Richard Behan for Rezoning from R-2 General Residential to B-2 General Business on property owned by Behan and Flynn located at 1597 & 1663 N US 31 HWY, Section 27, Bear Creek Township, tax parcels 24-01-16-27-400-029 & 400-030, as proposed on the zoning map dated Received Jul 5, 2019 because the standards for rezoning have been met. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the Emmet County Master Plan, the uses are consistent with surrounding uses, there would not be an adverse impact on surrounding properties, it would not create a deterrent to the improvement of adjacent properties, and Bear Creek Township Planning Commission and Board recommended approval. The motion was supported by MacInnis and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Scott, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, MacInnis, Hartmann. No: None. Recused: Drier.

3. **PSUP19-009**

   **John Plichta, SPECIAL USE PERMIT-WINERY/TASTING ROOM, 8450 Channel Rd, Section 21, Springvale Township**

   **Legal Notice:** A request by John Plichta for a Special Use Permit for a winery and tasting room at 8450 Channel Rd, Section 21, Springvale Township. The property is zoned Planned Unit Development (PUD) and is tax parcel 24-14-17-21-400-006. The request is to allow a winery and tasting room per Articles 20 & 21 and Section 26.50 of the Zoning Ordinance.

   **Packet Items:** Request & location map, tax parcel map, application, site plan review checklist, impact statement, PUD agreement, 8/19/19 zoning evaluation, Section 26.51 ordinance standards-wineries, 7/22/19 site plan, letter from Haggard’s P&H

   This case has been withdrawn by the applicant.
4. **PSPR19-007**  
John Hover for Highlander Golf LLC, SITE PLAN REVIEW
AMENDMENT-PAVILION, 2500 True North Dr, Section 13,  
Friendship Township

**Legal Notice:** A request by John Hover for Highlander Golf LLC (True North Golf Club) for an amendment to the Site Plan to allow a pavilion at 2500 True North Dr in Section 13 of Friendship Township. The property is tax parcel 24-06-12-13-100-015 and is zoned FF-2 Farm and Forest with a Planned Unit Development overlay. The request is to be reviewed per Article 20 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**Packet Items:** Request & location map, tax parcel map, aerial, application, impact statement, site plan review checklist, 8/22/19 zoning evaluation, 8/7/19 site plan, building, and elevation plans, letter from Haggard’s P&H, Friendship Township minutes & email,

Salar presented this case. The parcel is part of a 320 acre PUD which is zoned FF-1 with the PUD overlay. It is located on the north side of Stutzmanville Road. The aerial of the parcel was shown. The use of the property is currently a golf course with residential and clubhouse uses. The location of the proposed pavilion was pointed out and is roughly in the center of the PUD near the ponds. A photo of the site was on desks tonight. The site plan was shown. The pavilion will only be accessed via golf cart so no parking or snow storage is proposed or needed. This is an accessory use permitted within the zoning district and the PUD. No Health Department review is required as there will be no bathrooms or water to the pavilion. No outdoor lighting is proposed. The elevations were shown. The proposed pavilion meets all setback and height standards of the ordinance. Doernenburg added that the applicant did not attend the township meeting and therefore the Friendship Township Planning Commission and Board have both requested postponement so that they can review the case.

Brian Welsh and Frank Bowers were present for Highlander Golf. Welsh stated that they will attend the next township meeting.

Eby opened the floor to public comment.

Cynthia Donahey, Friendship Township, stated that the applicant did not provide them with any information nor did they attend the meeting. She asked that they provide the required information to the township for review. Welsh stated that they will get in touch with her to submit that information.

This case was postponed to allow the township review and will be heard at the next meeting scheduled for October 3, 2019.

5. **PSUP19-010**  
Ben Beachy, SPECIAL USE PERMIT-Selective Processing & Production Facility, 2615 Gregory Rd, Section 14, Maple River  
Township

**Legal Notice:** A request by Ben Beachy for a Special Use Permit to allow a selective processing and production facility at 2615 Gregory Road, Section 14, Maple River Township. The property is tax parcel 24-09-14-14-000-015 and is zoned FF-1 Farm and Forest. The request is per Articles 8, 21, and 26 and Section 26.33 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**Packet Items:** Request & location map, tax parcel map, application, impact statement, site plan review checklist, 8/12/19 site plan, elevation plan, surrounding parcels plan, 8/16/19 zoning evaluation, letter from Haggard’s P&H, township recommendation.

Salar presented this case. The parcel is located on the east side of Gregory Road and is zoned FF-1 as are surrounding properties. The request is to add a cabinet shop on an approximately 28-acre parcel.
The proposal is for a 3000+sf building to be constructed for this use. The site plan was shown. There are 8 parking spaces required and shown on the plan. The building would be over 300’ from Gregory Road. The parcels to the north and east of this parcel are larger parcels which are also owned by the applicant. The applicant has requested that the engineered storm water requirement be waived due to the property being a flat site with very sandy soil. The building meets all setback and height standards of the ordinance. Photos of the site were shown. There is some screening along Gregory Road. The closest neighbor would be directly across the street. The hours of operation are proposed to be Monday-Friday from 7am-5pm. Approvals from the Health Department and Fire Department have not yet been received. No outdoor lighting is proposed and a sign is proposed at the road.

Ben Beachy, applicant, stated that he is looking to build the cabinet shop as a small business for his family. He has talked to the neighbors and they seem to be ok with it.

MacInnis stated that in the staff report the maximum size of the building is 2000sf. Doernenburg explained that the Planning Commission can authorize a larger building if they desire. She added that this project was discussed at our staff meeting today and the building department wanted to make sure that the applicant realizes that commercial building codes will need to be met which can include requirements for sprinkling for certain building sizes and uses so they will need to check into this.

Drier asked if they were approved for the requested size building and decided to go smaller, could they? Doernenburg stated that the approval would be ‘up to’ the approved size. Drier asked if any of the large trees along the driveway are going to be removed because if they were, this could affect the neighbors. Beachy stated that they have no plans to remove any of those trees. Eby added that at the township meeting they discussed adding more trees.

Hartmann asked if the township felt that additional screening is necessary. Eby stated that there would only be an issue when coming from the north. There were no requirements on size of trees discussed. He added that everything that this community has done so far has fit into the area.

There was no public comment on this case.

Eby asked if we wanted to waive the storm water requirements. He noted that even the industrial parks around the Pellston area have only had a letter submitted. It is all sand and flat.

MacInnis made a motion to approve Case #PSUP19-010 Ben Beachy for a Special Use Permit for a cabinet shop up to a maximum ground floor area of 3,072 sq. ft. on property located at 2615 Gregory Road, Section 14, Maple River Township, tax parcel 24-09-14-14-400-015, as shown on the site plan dated Received August 12, 2019 because the standards for Article 21 and Section 26.33 have been met, the use will not conflict with the residential character of the neighborhood, only people living on the premises and up to 3 additional people may be employees, any exterior lighting be reviewed by Zoning Administrator, hours of operation will be limited to Monday through Friday 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., landowner designates additional 11.5 acres be set aside as part of the business to meet the 40 acre requirement, approval is contingent upon Health Department and Fire Department approval and compliance with applicable building codes and screening as requested by Maple River Township. The engineered storm water requirement is waived due to topography and soil type and because the township has recommended approval. The motion was supported by Scott and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Scott, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, MacInnis, Hartmann. No: None.
6. **PREZN19-04**

Walter D Kring for Debra L Kring Trust, REZONING FROM R-2/B-1/PUD-1 to B-2, 2001 US 31 N Hwy, Section 26, Bear Creek Township

**Legal Notice:** A request by Walter D Kring for Debra L Kring Trust for a rezoning of property located at 2001 US 31 N, Section 26, Bear Creek Township. The property includes tax parcels 24-01-16-26-100-026 and is currently zoned R-2 General Residential, B-1 Local Tourist Business with a Planned Unit Development-1 (PUD-1) overlay. The request is to rezone the property to B-2 General Business per Section 27.11 of the Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Commission may consider removal of the PUD-1 designation on the subject property and on parcel 24-01-16-26-300-005.

**Packet Items:** Request & location map, tax parcel map, application, zoning maps and aerials, 8/21/19 zoning evaluation, letter from Haggard’s P&H

Doernenburg presented this case. The parcel is located on N US 31 and is adjacent to Dave Kring auto. The zoning map of the area was shown. The request is to rezone parcel 100-026 to B-2 to coincide with the dealership zoning. Removal of the existing PUD overlay has also been advertised for review. Doernenburg pointed out the PUD outline on the area and stated that the small parcel that is not included in the PUD is already zoned B-2. The Future Land Use map shows commercial uses along US-31 and mixed use along Hiawatha Tr. Photos of the area were shown. Surrounding uses include a fence company, a building previously used for dog grooming and boarding, and retail across the street. Doernenburg pointed out that there is water in the ditch along Hiawatha Tr. Kring’s auto dealership has an access along with some of the other businesses to Hiawatha Tr. There are some residences across the road which are all very well screened. The Bear Creek Township Master Plan shows this area as mixed use. Doernenburg stated that the options for consideration tonight would be Rezone to B-2 and keep the PUD-1 overlay, Rezone to B-2 and remove the PUD-1 overlay, retain the existing zoning and PUD-1 overlay, or postpone. The policy is typically to postpone for a second hearing on a rezoning request.

The applicant was present. He stated that he has no plans at this point but wanted to get the rezoning done just in case.

MacInnis stated that he buys his cars from Kring but doesn’t feel that it is a conflict of interest.

There was no public comment on this case.

Doernenburg stated that the PUD was originally in place for allowance of the artisan mall years ago. Eby added that then it was residentially zoned and it was obvious that it was all going to be business uses at some point. Max Putters worked on this PUD as a way to control as businesses moved in. They assumed at the time that this PUD could be withdrawn on some or all of the lots in order to shrink the PUD. This request goes right along with what was intended to be accomplished by the PUD. Doernenburg stated that with the very wide road right-of-way here you get the added advantage of it feeling like there are greater setbacks than there actually are.

Scott inquired if we would want to waive the second hearing requirement on this case as there has been no public comment and/or issues brought up. Doernenburg stated that there was no public comment at the township meeting either. Urman stated that there was some discussion on screening but it is very dense and thick so no problems were anticipated. By consensus, the members were in agreement of waiving the second hearing.
Scott made a motion to recommend approval of Case #PREZN19-04, Walter D Kring for Debra L Kring Trust for Rezoning from R-2 General Residential and B-1 Local Tourist Business to B-2 General Business on property located at 2001 US 31 Hwy, Section 26, Bear Creek Township, tax parcels 24-01-16-26-100-026, as proposed on the zoning action application dated Received Aug 12, 2019 because the standards for rezoning have been met. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the Emmet County Master Plan, the uses are consistent with surrounding uses, there would not be an adverse impact on surrounding properties, it would not create a deterrent to the improvement of adjacent properties, also to recommend approval of removal of the Planned Unit Development-1 (PUD-1) overlay for 2001 US 31 Hwy (tax parcel 24-01-16-26-100-026) and 1911 NUS 31 Hwy (tax parcel 24-01-16-26-300-005) both within Section 26, Bear Creek Township to provide for consistent zoning along the US-31 corridor for the reasons identified above in the rezoning, the township has recommended approval and the customary second hearing has been waived due to lack of opposition and interest. The motion was supported by Urman and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Scott, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, MacInnis, Hartmann. No: None.

7. PSUP19-011 Michael Topley, SPECIAL USE PERMIT-Accessory Building as main use, 2232 Country Club Rd – adjacent vacant lot, Section 33, Bear Creek Township

Legal Notice: A request by Michael Topley for a Special Use Permit for an accessory building as a main use at 2232 Country Club Rd, Section 33, Bear Creek Township. The property is tax parcel 24-01-16-33-400-014 and is zoned R-1 One and Two Family Residential. The request is to allow a 1,200 sq. ft. residential accessory building on the property without a main use per Section 22.01 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Packet Items: Request & location map, tax parcel map, application, impact statement/site plan review checklist, building use affidavit, 8/21/19 zoning evaluation, 8/12/19 site plan, parcel map, letter from Haggard’s P&H, revised R&L map, revised zoning evaluation

Doernenburg explained that the address is actually for the adjacent lot where the house is situated. The vacant lot is where the accessory building is proposed. An updated staff report and request & location map were included in the supplemental packet. The notification was double checked to be sure that all of the same people would have been notified for this parcel and they were. There is a shared driveway in between the vacant parcel and the house at 2232 Country Club Rd. Another house to the south also shares this driveway. The site plan was shown. The site plan includes a location for a future house as required by the zoning ordinance but there is not one proposed. This is a legal conforming parcel. Bear Creek Township recommended approval with some conditions which have been added to the draft motion in the revised staff report. Photos of the site were shown.

Steve Shuman was present for the applicant in case of questions.

There was no public comment on this case.

Urman made a motion to approve Case #PSUP19-011, Michael Topley for a Special Use Permit for a Customary Accessory Building without a main use on property located on Country Club Road, Section 33 of Bear Creek Township on tax parcel 24-01-16-33-400-017, as shown on the site plan dated RECEIVED Aug 12 2019 because the standard of Section 26.16.1 have been met based on the facts presented in this case, the building meets the size standards of the Ordinance and on condition that the building be used for personal use, an affidavit of use be filed with the Register of Deeds prior to issuance of a zoning permit, the siding will not be metal, the roof will be shingled, the side walls will be no greater than 12 feet with a 6:12 pitch, and the trees in the front yard setbacks must be retained to the greatest extent possible to screen from the public roads, and Bear Creek Township Planning Commission and Board both recommended approval. The motion was supported by Scott and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Eby, Drier, Scott, Laughbaum, Urman, Kargol, Alexander, MacInnis, Hartmann. No: None.
IV Public Comments: None

V Other Business: There was discussion regarding the withdrawal of the Plichta case. Scott stated that the township did review the case and they stated that they wanted the applicant to try the business out as approved for a couple of years and get some data before they would consider the major changes that had been requested. There were two people present from the neighborhood at their meeting, one in favor and one opposed. They had also received some letters. Doernenburg stated that she had also received some inquiries. MacInnis asked why they were requesting this if they had just recently received approval for their PUD to do the winery. Scott stated that this request was to be reviewed under the new winery standards and would be longer hours and a longer season. Drier asked that the township minutes be placed in the file in case in the future this is requested again.

Eby asked if anyone was notified for the Beachy case as he owns the larger parcels surrounding the subject piece. Doernenburg stated that 10 notification letters were sent. Eby stated that people received their letters after the township meeting. Doernenburg explained that we notify for the County meetings and the township meeting notification are there as a courtesy. There are times that required cutoff dates and various township meeting dates don’t work out.

1. Housing-Density-Minimum Floor Area: Doernenburg stated that there are some items to consider which include density changes, minimum floor area changes, short term rentals, accessory dwelling units, existing duplex standards in FF zoning restrictions (haven’t seen many applications come through for this)

   Density-Proposed is a change to the minimum lot width by reducing it to 60’ wide and a minimum of 12,000sf for lot area on parcels in the FF zoning district that are serviced by public sewer and/or water. Kargol stated that there aren’t very many of those parcels in the County. Doernenburg agreed stating that it was narrowly tailored. This density is already allowed in the R-1 and R-2 districts. We are essentially talking about some locations in Bear Creek Township on N US-31, Hiawatha Tr., Anderson Rd, the township hall corridor on Division, and down E. Mitchell Rd to about Orchard Creek subdivision. In Littlefield Township there is sanitary sewer and water as well but likely not much that are zoned FF. Eby asked if we are making regulations to allow something in these areas that the market won’t cooperate with. Doernenburg replied that this is a possibility. Scott stated that all areas that would be affected are closer to larger commercial areas. Eby stated that we just rezoned R-2 to B-2 in these areas that this would apply to. He would hate to stick more into the ordinance that will never be used. MacInnis stated that it has been discussed in the past of doing these types of things on a case-by-case basis and making changes incrementally as opposed to looking at the broader issues. He had supported that thinking in the past but given the way humans are, perhaps this is something that we should do incrementally instead of trying to solve a problem that may or may not exist. We could wait until someone comes in with a request and asks us to fix it. Scott stated that this may be the right answer and it may not be but if someone is looking for an area that they can do this and can’t find it readily available they will just look somewhere else as opposed to asking for a zoning change. Eby asked if staff is getting requests for this. Doernenburg stated that when she attends housing partnership meetings she constantly hears that zoning of one unit per acre is stifling affordable housing potential. If the property is rezoned, then the price goes up which also won’t allow for affordable housing. This seemed like it could be a small step in a few areas that could help. There is a developer that is interested in this type of development however we have not had a request yet. Urman stated the development was discussed at the Bear Creek Township meeting. Eby stated that he would
like someone with an idea that is a practical request come in. Doernenburg stated that he
could ask the developer to come to this board with their discussion and invite the Bear Creek
Township Planning Commission to join. Perhaps they could explain what they want and discuss
what the current ordinance would allow them to do. Another option would be to create a
residential PUD with greater setbacks, higher density, amenities, open spaces, etc. and give
density bonuses for adding these items to a development. This was discussed as a committee
when Max Putters was still here. Laughbaum stated that he would rather see the zoning of a
parcel change than adulterate the FF zoning district. It is pretty straightforward as it is now,
you have one acre, you get one use. The problem to him is the size of the house not the size of
the land. Land is pretty affordable in Emmet County. Scott stated that it depends on where in
Emmet County it is. Laughbaum stated that there are areas that shouldn’t be used for
affordable housing. Eby stated that he thinks this should not be shot down but perhaps not
moved forward until there is a market for it.

**Minimum floor area:** Doernenburg stated that there is a reduction in the minimum floor area
proposed at 500sf from 720sf for permanent residences. After last month’s meeting
Laughbaum asked her to check with the building department to see what the minimum size
would be allowed under the building code. She did and there isn’t a minimum size per se but
there are minimum clearances required in a bathroom. The Plumbing Inspector thought that
an 80sf bathroom would be the minimum size for the bathroom. Documentation had been
distributed regarding social issues with smaller homes. Scott stated that he is good with 500sf.
Eby stated that he is not. When he discusses this with people and they discuss whether homes
of this size should be allowed in a subdivision, the answer is no. Doernenburg stated that the
office gets calls and inquiries for tiny houses or smaller houses all of the time but the majority
of the houses in Emmet County are at least 1000sf and larger. Eby stated that the demand may
be there for people to reduce their footprint and live in a small house in the middle of
nowhere. He stated that he thinks this should be a special use permit so that basic
requirements are reviewed. If a parcel has a certain amount of acreage they could put multiple
small houses on it. Laughbaum stated that the trouble is that a lot of land is already owned or
passed down and the people want to be able to use it. Eby stated that if the acreage minimum
was met it could have only one house. Laughbaum stated that he thinks that setting up a
bunch of smaller houses is like setting up a trailer court. How would this work? Eby stated that
they could have a SUP on a 20-acre parcel. This size is not a single family home. You can only
fit 1-2 people in it. Scott stated that he doesn’t agree and that four people could easily fit into
a 500sf house. It is all about what you can afford and what you want to live in. Drier asked if
we should do a straw poll to give Doernenburg some direction of where we want to go with
this. MacInnis stated that he would like to see someplace that exists today with a community
of tiny houses. Scott stated that 500sf is not a tiny house. 240sf and under is a tiny house.
Doernenburg stated that 400sf and under cabins in the campground codes are regulated
differently. MacInnis would like to see a place that has solved the affordable housing issue and
see what they do. Drier stated that no one is coming up with a solution. It’s being pushed back
on zoning but zoning is only a small part of the issue. Doernenburg stated that zoning is part of
the solution. It is also financing as banks are much more restrictive than before and issues in
getting a builder as well. Zoning is the only part we have some control over. Eby stated that
there are many different types of communities in Emmet County. Alexander stated that certain
areas would likely find smaller homes acceptable; how do we determine this. Eby stated that
he wishes that the Maple River Golf Course project had moved forward so that we could judge
the market. Kargol stated that we should imagine what 500sf is so that we are aware of what
size we are actually talking about. Doernenburg noted that a typical two car garage is 24x24’
which would be 576sf. Kargol stated that people should have the option to build what they can
afford. He wouldn’t mind a community either. With an overall change these could pop up anywhere and be out of place. Scott asked him to define out of place. Many times when thinking “small” people think “shack”. This is not the case and many times the smaller buildings can be nicer than a larger building. Eby stated that he is not sure they belong everywhere. Urman stated that he thinks 500sf is too small for a family to live in. Doernenburg stated that seasonal dwellings could be smaller. Urman asked if 600sf would be better. Doernenburg stated that this was the minimum before it was changed to 720sf. Hartmann stated that according to MacInnis the demographics of the County are changing and people aren’t having multiple children. MacInnis stated that there is a lunch and learn at the college where the state demographer is going to come up and discuss the changing demographics. Most that are coming here are retired, 60+, and are not the workforce. This does provide money but if the purpose is to have affordable housing for the workforce, what does changing this solve. Drier asked if a smaller home could be used as a summer rental. It could. Doernenburg stated that she thinks that most people inquiring are younger. Linehan stated that she feels that is true but it is also a mix because there have been a number of people inquire because they want to be here and don’t want to deal with a large home. Laughbaum stated that people stay in places like extended stay motels which are much smaller than we are suggesting. Doernenburg stated that she has asked at housing meetings what the density would have to be to be able to have the affordable housing everyone is looking for and she hasn’t received an answer. The Little Traverse Bay Housing Partnership had presented at a Bear Creek Township meeting, which five Emmet County Planning Commissioners attended. The PowerPoint used for that presentation was distributed which offered data. “Affordable” is, of course, based on your income. If your housing and transportation costs are 30% or less of your income, it is considered to be affordable. MacInnis stated that there are many businesses that have provided housing for their employees in the past and some that still do. Kargol agreed stating that the larger employers should be stepping up to the plate to provide housing for their employees. No specific direction was provided. Members seemed to favor input from a potential housing developer.

2. Proposed corrections to Zoning Ordinance text: Doernenburg stated that some errors had been found when our ordinance was being reviewed to be placed on the website. These are areas that had duplicate references throughout the text but had only been advertised to change in one particular section. There is also a discrepancy between the text and illustration for side yard setback requirements in the SR district. Scott made a motion supported by Alexander to publish the zoning ordinance text amendments. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

3. Enforcement Report- Distributed, no discussion.

4. Emmet County Resilient Master Plan 2020: Doernenburg reported that the survey has been completed but the information is not back yet. The consultant has done the first review for the open houses and focus groups.

5. Training opportunities: Various upcoming training opportunities were discussed.

VI Adjournment

There being no other business Eby called the meeting adjourned at 9:06 p.m.