EMMET COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
REGULAR MEETING
TUESDAY, DECEMBER 17, 2019 - 6:00 P.M.
EMMET COUNTY BUILDING
COMMISSIONER'S BOARDROOM
200 DIVISION ST
PETOSKEY, MI 49770

AGENDA

I CALL TO ORDER & ATTENDANCE

II MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 19, 2019

III CASES

NEW CASES

1. Case #PZBA19-016 Chris Hampton (Springfield Sign) for Jacob Kendall-KS Michigan Real Estate LLC, SIGN VARIANCE-1264 N US 31 Hwy, Section 34. Bear Creek Township

IV PUBLIC COMMENT

V OTHER BUSINESS

■ Enforcement Report

VI ADJOURNMENT
MEMBERS PRESENT: B. ALEXANDER, T. DRIER, B. BATES, M. BUDAY, J MALOTT

ALTERNATE MEMBER PRESENT: C. LIVELY (Alternate Member)

MEMBER ABSENT: NONE

STAFF: T. DOERNENBURG, N. SALAR, M. LINEHAN

I. Call to Order and Attendance
Chairman Alexander called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM. All members were present.

II. Minutes of September 17, 2019
Drier motioned approval of the September 17, 2019 minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Buday and passed by unanimous voice vote of the members. Alexander wanted to note that on page eight of the minutes there was a comment made by Bates: Bates stated that he feels that if the house were smaller and on a cheaper lake it would be looked at differently. This is a massive property on an expensive lake that owners are dumping money into. He stated that he feels that this isn’t emotionally appealing. He thinks it would be approved somewhere else. He is trying to keep finances out of his decisions both positive and negative. Alexander wanted it on record that the ZBA has not and does not show partiality or prejudices for any reason. They should not and hopefully never will. Bates stated that he is fully aware that cost is not the basis for decisions.

III. Cases
1. Case #PZBA19-014 Wayne Shotwell for Belle Tire, HEIGHT VARIANCE-Flagpole, 2150 Anderson Rd, Section 18, Bear Creek Township

Legal Notice: A request by Wayne Shotwell for Belle Tire for a variance to the height of a flagpole located at 2150 Anderson Rd, Section 18, Bear Creek Township. The property is zoned R-1 One & Two Family Residential with a Consent Judgment regulating the land use. The property is tax parcel 24-01-19-18-100-058 and is owned by National Retail Properties LP. The request is to allow a 60' high flagpole where 30' maximum is permitted. The review will be per Section 22.07 and Articles 19 & 25 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Pocket Items: Request & location map, tax parcel map, application, letter from applicant, email from Debbie & Mike Sears, Record of phone call from Linda Leech, zoning permit, PUD agreement, consent judgment, case history of request for flagpole variance, zoning evaluation, letter from Haggard’s P&H
Doernenburg showed the location of the property on a PowerPoint presentation noting that it is part of a larger PUD which is under consent judgment. The PUD boundaries were pointed out and the location of this specific parcel was shown. The consent judgment allows for staff review of site plans and therefore they do not go to the Planning Commission for review. This site was approved for the building, the parking lot, and the outdoor lighting. The permit that was issued noted that the flagpole was not part of the approval. During the inspection for the Certificate of Occupancy, it was noted that the flagpole had been installed and was over the maximum height allowed. The applicants had the option to either reduce the flagpole height or to apply for a variance to this board. Doernenburg noted that the review should be as though the flagpole is not there. The flagpole is setback over 650’ from Anderson Rd, over 850’ from Lears Rd, over 1,400’ from US 131 Hwy, and 450’ from Cemetery Rd. Included in the packet was case information from another variance request for a taller flagpole that was approved for Dave Kring at 45’ tall. This was approved on that site due to the large site area and deep use setbacks. The Kring location is considerably closer to the highway than this case. Two comments were received from individuals on Cemetery Road in support of this request. The surrounding uses are primarily commercial with residences across Cemetery Road. The ordinance standards for height were included in the packet. There are some exemptions but flagpoles are not one of them. The site plan and photos of the site were shown. Doernenburg noted that if the ZBA voted in favor of the request the flagpole could remain in place, if not, it would have to be removed.

Wayne Shotwell, Belle Tire stated that when they decided to come to Petoskey with their store they were in a unique situation as they normally only have to go to one municipality for review. Here they had to go through Petoskey Township* and the County. The architect missed where the flagpole had to be installed in accordance with County standards and they thought it was approved when the building plans were approved through Petoskey Township. * He explained that the owner of Belle Tire is very, very passionate about three things; 1) their people and providing high end health insurance for them and their families, 2) the Country and Veterans. They spend a lot of money on their flags maintaining them and the poles that are at all of their stores. There is a quarterly program in place to change out flags. They are the same size at all of their stores and get recycled through their stores. 3) Customer service; they take great pride in customer service and providing affordable tires and service for all customers. Shotwell stated that they have these flags at every one of their stores and haven’t been challenged in the 14 years that he has been with them. They have never had an issue with the US flag.

Alexander asked Shotwell if he is saying that no one has had an ordinance in terms of height for flagpoles in any of the areas that they have stores. Shotwell stated no. He noted that one community in Indiana asked if they wanted to put up a larger one. This is the only variance from the norm at any of their 117 stores. Alexander stated that he is as patriotic as anyone and was drafted out of college. The question tonight is on the flagpole height itself. The flag does bring attention to the store. We all stand and enjoy the flag but he does have concerns about potential noise of that large of a flag. He stated that he used to have a hotel up in Mackinaw City and they
didn’t go to a larger flag specifically because of the noise issues. He stated that there are two people on Cemetery Road who are in support but the noise can be an issue when winds are strong. Shotwell stated that normally when there are high winds the stores are instructed to take down the flags. They haven’t had any situations with issues from noise or any accidents with their flagpoles.

Bates stated that he is in this area almost daily. He has read the ordinance carefully. This is only about the flagpole height and has nothing to do with the flag itself. He noted that his business installed a flag this year and wanted to go bigger but had to follow the ordinance. It is black and white to him that the flagpole should be at 30’.

Malott asked Shotwell if their entire store inventory has this flag. Shotwell stated yes. Malott stated that it may not have started as signage when they began this, but it is pretty ingenious. He asked if it is lit at night. Shotwell stated it is. Doernenburg stated that the ordinance does not allow flags to be lit from the ground; they would have to be lit from the top of the pole or the side of the building. Shotwell stated that it has to be lit per flag protocol. Bates stated that the lights are shown on the ground lighting up on the print. This would be against the ordinance. Doernenburg agreed that it would be a zoning violation.

Buday stated that he also thinks this is a black and white issue. The ordinance states that the height must comply. This flagpole exceeds the height standard and falls into the self-created hardship category.

Drier stated that she wonders about a minor modification. She asked Shotwell if he is going on record that all 117 stores have this size flagpole/flag. Shotwell said yes.

Shotwell stated that they were not aware of the issues with the lights. They should be able to modify the lighting if this is approved. There are a number of lighting options.

Alexander explained that Craig Lively is an alternate member and would not vote tonight as all members are present but Lively can still participate in the discussion.

Lively asked if there are other flagpoles in Emmet County that are higher than 45’. The Odawa flag was mentioned but this is not under County jurisdiction. Doernenburg stated that there may be. Lively stated that he passed four that he thinks are over that height.

Doernenburg stated that the last variance request for the flagpole height utilized sign variance standards such as deep use setback and large site area. Bates noted that the minutes also stated that that flag was lower than the highway. Lively asked if a 30’ flagpole could be installed on a 10’ hill and be fine. Doernenburg replied that grades can be modified. Shotwell stated that their flag sizes are 20x30’ and cannot be flown from a 30’ flagpole. Drier asked if they ever fly any other flags from their poles. Bates reminded her that we cannot regulate the flag itself. Shotwell stated that they do not fly anything other than the US flag. The only exception to the flag size is if there
are trees or buildings in the way when the flag has to be flown at half-staff. They then use a smaller flag to avoid any issues during that time.

Alexander stated that the issue is that the flagpole was installed. The fact that the architect didn’t realize that there were height regulations does not relieve you from the responsibility. You are requesting a lot of relief. He stated that most businesses want a flagpole and many have likely wanted to put in a taller flagpole but have not done so because they reviewed the ordinance standards that put the maximum height at 30’. It comes down to meeting ordinance criteria. There are alternatives, there are no issues with still doing business there with a shorter flagpole/smaller flag. He noted that he drove back out to the site tonight. It does appear to set a little lower but is still well above the buildings and stands out. The intention is that flags should not be used as signage but this definitively brings attention to the store. No one else has one at this height.

Doernenburg noted that when Shotwell was originally speaking he mentioned Petoskey Township. She wanted to note that it is in fact Bear Creek Township*

Alexander opened the floor to public comment.

Jason Sackrider, McBride Construction, asked what the reasons for the approval of the higher flagpole at Dave Kring. Doernenburg read the reasons from the motion.

Shotwell asked if they would be considered a deep-use setback. They are back far and the road goes down a way to them. Is the dealership as far back as we are? Doernenburg replied, no.

Bates made a motion to deny Case #PZBA19-014, a request by Wayne Shotwell for Belle Tire for a variance to the height of a flagpole located at 2150 Anderson Rd, Section 18, Bear Creek Township. The property is zoned R-1 One & Two Family Residential with a Consent Judgment regulating the land use. The property is tax parcel 24-01-19-18-100-058 and is owned by National Retail Properties LP, based on the facts in the case and because the proposed flagpole height is 60’ and Section 22.07.7 requires the height to not exceed 30’. The motion was supported by Buday.

Doernenburg noted that it is important to have clear reasons for the denial in the motion. She suggested reviewing the reasons for approving a sign variance which includes deep use setback and large setback area. Alexander added that it has to be shown that there isn’t a reason to grant the requested variance.

Bates modified his motion to the following: a motion to deny Case #PZBA19-014, a request by Wayne Shotwell for Belle Tire for a variance to the height of a flagpole located at 2150 Anderson Rd, Section 18, Bear Creek Township. The property is zoned R-1 One & Two Family Residential with a Consent Judgment regulating the land use. The property is tax parcel 24-01-19-18-100-058 and is owned by National Retail Properties LP, based on the facts in the case, Section 22.07.7 limits flagpole height to not exceed 30’ and because the applicant has not demonstrated a need for a
variance based on Section 22.07.11 B. The revised motion was supported by Buday.

Lively asked if the lighting needs to be included in the motion. Doernenburg stated that it is a separate issue that doesn’t have anything to do with the flagpole height. He asked if we were reviewing a variance for a lighted sign would it be part of the sign. Doernenburg stated yes, if it was in relation to the case.

The revised motion passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Alexander, Bates, Buday. No: Drier, Malott.

Alexander advised Shotwell that the case was denied but the ordinance does state that three 30’ flagpoles can be on the site; this may be something to look into. Shotwell asked if there was a way to appeal this decision. Doernenburg explained it would be through Circuit Court.

2. Case #PZBA19-015 McBride Remodeling for Matthew & Lissie Canzono, SIDE YARD SETBACK VARIANCE, 4972 Lower Shore Dr, Section 30, Friendship Township

Legal Notice: A request by McBride Remodeling for Matthew and Lissie Canzono for a side yard setback variance of up to five feet to apply to an addition to a residence at 4972 Lower Shore Dr located in section 30 of Friendship Township. The property is tax parcel 24-06-12-30-325-015 and is zoned SR Scenic Resource and RR Recreational Residential. The SR zoning district extends 400 feet from Lower Shore Dr toward Lake Michigan, the remainder of the property toward the west is zoned RR. The request is per Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance and would allow the addition within ten feet from the side property line.

Packet Items: Request & location map, tax parcel map, application, letter from applicant, zoning ordinance excerpt- Article 7 & 19, letter from Marty & Cheryl Zafchak, photos of site, zoning evaluation, 10/19/19 site plan & floor plans, letter from Haggard’s P&H

Salar presented this case with a PowerPoint. The location of the property was pointed out. It is located on the lakeside of Lower Shore Drive. The parcel is zoned both SR and RR but the area that is in review is completely within the SR District. The request is for a side yard setback variance of 5’ to add an addition to the south side of the house 10’ from the property line. She explained that the setback required in SR is 15’. There is a discrepancy in the ordinance that shows the side setback at 10’ which is what the plans were drawn based on. The site plan was shown as well as photos of the site. There are two platted lots with four PID numbers which are all used as one zoning lot. The parcel is in two townships but we are only looking at the section located in Friendship Township. One letter of support from a neighbor on the affected side has been received. The township has recommended approval.

Matthew Canzono, owner, stated that when they put in an offer on this property the land was in disarray and the hill and forest had been decimated by the previous owner who had planned to build two houses. They had intended originally to build near the lake but during the research process and planning, they fell in love with the existing house where it sits. It is a charming A-frame atop the hill. This property is a place for them to come and retire and they needed a bit more room if they were to keep this house. He stated that he played with a lot of drawings and
came up with a design based off of what they knew and his wife’s research into setback requirements. They made plans and spent a lot of money refurbishing the house. They have remodeled 90% of the interior, installed new windows, painted, and were hoping to add the addition. They found out afterwards that there are two spots that list the side setback standards for the SR district. They had plans drawn up based on the 10’ that they saw in the ordinance. They are not blocking any scenic views and meet the spirit of the ordinance.

Alexander stated that understanding there is a misprint in the ordinance, he does see a comment in their application stating that they are unable to change their plans for the addition. Are the eaves figured into this? Paul Drayer, McBride Remodeling, stated that the site plan shows the walls only and the eaves would be in addition to this. The vertical circulation is on that side of the house. If it were moved around, they would basically be locked out of that side of the house. The intent for the addition is to add a master suite. Alexander asked if the addition was planned when they were doing the remodeling. Canzono stated that they always knew that they’d be putting in a master suite and knew this was the side of the house that they planned to use. He stated that Tom Gallagher did a great job on the landscaping and putting it back together. The whole house would have to be reconfigured if it were changed around. Alexander stated that the application packet noted that there were variances given to neighbors in the past. Canzono stated that the neighbor to the north received a side yard setback variance. The other neighbor has sent in a letter of support. Lissie Canzono stated that the neighboring houses are at the lakeside not near where their house is on the hill. M. Canzono stated that he thinks the neighbors were all happy when they didn’t decide to build near the lake. Alexander asked Doernenburg if this case would need to be re-advertised due to the eave overhang? Doernenburg stated that eaves can extend into the setback on certain sized lots. Drayer stated that the eaves on the addition fall within the requested 10’ setback.

Buday asked if only one house could be built on this lot. Are you planning to build another house down below in the future? Doernenburg stated that because of the location of the existing house, unless they completely destroyed the house they couldn’t build another. Buday asked if they had any plans to build additions in the future. M. Canzono stated no.

Drier stated that she was unable to go to this site but the great photos helped. M. Canzono stated that he forgot to advise them there is a camera on the site for animals so he saw many of them come out.

Lively asked which part of the property is zoned SR and which is zoned RR. Doernenburg explained that SR district extends 400’ from the road right-of-way. She noted that the side yard setback in the RR district is 10’ and if they had called to ask if they could build by the water it would have been a 10’ setback requirement. She stated that there is an issue in the ordinance. There is a section that states that if there is a conflict, the stricter regulation would apply. This issue has since been corrected. Lively asked if the public had knowledge of this. Doernenburg stated that the applicant didn’t at the time of application and they relied on what they saw in the ordinance. Lively stated that he doesn’t see an issue with the request and understands the complications with the mechanicals being on that side of the house. If the house was 10’ lower they wouldn’t have this problem. He asked if this is a critical dune site. Doernenburg replied, no.
Lively stated that the addition isn’t close to the water and won’t have to worry about erosion. Drayer added that the owners have spent a lot of money to restore the house and re-build the property and the hill.

Malott stated that he is supportive of this request.

Bates stated that he has no questions or concerns.

Alexander stated that after being at the property, he wouldn’t want to be down by the water given the great view they have. He stated that sometimes we require easements from the neighbors in cases like this to make sure houses still keep minimum setbacks between them. In this case the road is there and no one is going to build up by their house. He thinks this is in the right spot.

There was no public comment on this case.

Malott made a motion to approve PZBA19-015, a request by McBride Remodeling for Matthew and Lissie Canzono for a side yard setback variance of up to five feet to apply to an addition to a residence at 4972 Lower Shore Dr located in section 30 of Friendship Township as shown on the site plan dated Received Oct 18 2019. The property is tax parcel 24-06-12-30-325-015 and is zoned SR Scenic Resource and RR Recreational Residential. Approval is based on the facts presented in this case, the practical difficulty is a result of an error in the Zoning Ordinance, the variance request is consistent with the RR zoning district setback standards and is the minimum necessary to do substantial justice to the applicant and other property owners in the district, and it will not cause an adverse impact on surrounding property values, or the use and enjoyment of property in the neighborhood or zoning district and because the township has recommended approval. The motion was supported by Bates and passed on the following roll-call vote: Yes: Drier, Malott, Alexander, Bates, Buday. No: None.

IV. Public Comments:

V. Other Business:

- 2020 Meeting dates were reviewed with no objections.
- Doernenburg introduced Becky Pettenger who was in the audience. She explained that Becky does a lot of the prep work for these meetings including the PowerPoint presentation.
- There was some discussion regarding needing to have specific reasons in motions for approval or denial. Doernenburg stated that it is not enough to just state that they don’t meet ordinance standards. Bates stated that he realized about half-way through that Doernenburg was asking him to include more justified reasons. Doernenburg stated that this has been customary to allow in past motions but we do need to be more diligent with this in the future since ZBA decisions can be challenged in court. Past cases have even been challenged by a neighbor. Bates asked if it is proper to take notes on what items they’d like to see in a motion prior to the meeting. Doernenburg stated that it is and is encouraged. He asked if it would be appropriate to preface a motion with personal feelings about a case as some of these cases exist beyond this room. Doernenburg stated this is not appropriate. Bates stated that he wants to respect the process and make sure everything is above board.
- There was some discussion on the Open Meetings Act and correspondence between the
group. Alexander asked Doernenburg if there is a way to put more specific reasons into denial draft motions so that they can be more specific. Doernenburg stated that we can try to do that. Buday asked if it is appropriate to add on to another person’s motion. It is as long as the person making the motion agrees to add onto their motion.

Mark Drier stated that he believes that Bates' comments in regards to his personal situation not being able to have a higher flagpole sent a bad message. Alexander stated that it was a logical argument because most people do not make ZBA requests because they look at the ordinance or ask questions and see that what they want is not allowed and make other plans. Bates stated that he does appreciate the feedback and made that statement as a statement of fact only.

- The 2018 Annual Report was passed out with little discussion.
- Enforcement Report: Distributed with some discussion.

VI. Adjournment:
Alexander called the meeting adjourned at 7:15 PM.

Minutes Certification:

Mark Buday, Secretary                        Date
A request by Chris Hampton (Springfield Sign) for Jacob Kendall for a sign variance at 1264 US 31 North, Section 34, Bear Creek Township. The property is zoned B-2 General Business and is tax parcel 01-16-34-100-021. The request is to allow a second wall-mounted sign on the existing building. The review will be per Section 22.07 of the Zoning Ordinance.
APPLICATION TO EMMET COUNTY ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS
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

NOV 25 2019
DATE RECEIVED
$ 500
FEE

PLEASE MAKE CHECKS PAYABLE TO: EMMET COUNTY

APPLICANT:

Applicant's Name: Chris Hampton (Springfield Sign) Phone: 417-862-2454
Applicant's Address: 4525 E. Kearney, Springfield, Mo. 65803
Applicant's Email Address: chrish @ springfieldsign.com

OWNER:

Owner's Name: Jacob Kendall Phone: 319-821-5199
Owner's Address: 1264 US 31 North, Petoskey, MI 49770
Owner's Email Address: jake @ jacobkendall.com

JOB SITE LOCATION:

Township: Bear Creek Tax Parcel #: 24-01-16-34-100-021
Address: 1264 US 31 North, Petoskey, MI 49770

ZONING REQUEST:

Zoning Board of Appeals:
- Dimensional Variance
- Expand Nonconforming Use
- Interpretation
- Sign Variance
- Administrative Appeal
- Temporary Use Permit
- Other

Describe Request:
- Respectfully request the addition of one
- (1) wall sign on the West side of the building
- above the main entrance
- (See attached Narrative)

REQUIRED INFORMATION:

Front Yard Setback requested: 25 Ft.
Side Yard Setback requested: 10 Ft.
Rear Yard Setback requested: 10 Ft.
Waterfront Setback requested: 20 Ft.

Site/Plot Plan required:
- 9 copies of each document submitted are required.
- PLOT PLAN MUST BE DRAWN TO SCALE.

- Date Submitted or N/A
- Elevation Drawing
- Complete Site Plan

REQUIRED:

A complete plot plan drawn to scale is required to show: property dimensions; front, rear, and side yard setbacks; streets, roads, and all existing and proposed structures on the lot and other site inventory such as, but not limited to well & septic location, driveway location, etc. A property survey may be required if deemed necessary for proper review.

Review Article 25 of the Zoning Ordinance for review standard.

OTHER:

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

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

Chris Hampton
Signature of Applicant

Chris Hampton (Springfield Sign)
Printed Name of Applicant

Date

*Required Signature of Property Owner

JACOB R KENDALL
Printed Name of Property Owner

11/21/19

Date

Scanned by CamScanner
Culver’s of Petoskey, Michigan
1264 N. US Highway 31
Petoskey, MI. 49770

Zoning board of Appeals Variance Request

Variance Request: Requesting a Second Wall Sign

We are respectfully requesting a variance that we be allowed one (1) additional wall sign on the west side of the building over the main entrance.

We understand that the codes allow one (1) wall sign and two (2) wall signs if we are on a corner lot per Emmett County Code 22.07.2. But due to the physical nature of the property being very slender and the existing building having a physical setback of approximately 140’ feet to the front of the building off of U.S. Highway #31, and the average setback distance of the surrounding Eleven (11) businesses, with the exception of the Builders First Source Lumber yard being an average of 72’ feet, that makes our building sitting almost twice as far off the road as the surrounding businesses. The sight distance to the building heading west along U.S. Highway #31 to see the building is 269’ +/-, due to the lumber yard fence and buildings on the east side of the property completely blocking the west bound view. The sight distance heading east on US #31 is 420’ +/-, due to the miniature golf course and line of trees to the west blocking the east bound view, we are virtually blocked out of view until you are right on top of the property.

We are just requesting that we be given this variance as a means to have additional wayfinding and advertisement to our consumers, and our signage be given it’s due diligence as the surrounding businesses are sitting closer to the road and are more visually accessible to the consumer. The physical design of the existing purchased building is laid out in such a way that the patron entrance faces west out into the parking lot, therefore creating a visual hardship and a need for a second wall sign for wayfinding to the consumer and the subsequent request for a variance.
Culver's is a nationally recognized restaurant, and with that comes Brand Standard consistencies. The Brand Standard format for Culver's wall signs is to have a sign on 3 to 4 elevations and especially over the main entry feature. This sign is consistent with branding, public identity, public way finding, public safety, marketing and visual imaging throughout the entire chain. By Code we are allowed 15% of the surface area of the mounting wall which would be 121.5 Square feet on the North Elevation, our sign is only 29.12 square feet, due to the physical nature of the purchased building being smaller in size compared to a new construction building. The normal size of our Front Elevation sign is 46.67 square feet. The additional wall sign we are requesting would also be 29.12 square feet, in which the allowable square footage of the west wall would be 265.3 square feet. The total of our two signs is 58.12 square feet, compared to the total allowable square footage of just the North wall of 121.5 square feet. So we are well under the square footage allowed by code. Our signs are very modest in size and color and provide a complimentary appearance when placed together. The design of the brand standard has the signage and architecture in mind to compliment each other, and without the sign we will just have a blank wall and defeat the overall architectural visual design in which it was intended.

In regards to the surrounding businesses, there are Major chain restaurants in the same zoning area which have more than one (1) sign per building face, as well as locally owned businesses. We are requesting that we are given the same opportunity to display our “Brand Standard” signage and given the chance to provide our services to a growing and thriving community.

The granting of this request would not be detrimental to the public's health, safety or welfare. Our signs are modest in sizing and coloring nor do they “overwhelm” the building design or compromise the building architecture. Granting of this request will provide visual knowledge to the public to provide them with proper way finding which will decrease potential traffic congestion and improve public safety. We also feel our request is in harmony with the spirit and intent of the current codes in which they were set forth.
We are respectfully asking for you to review our request, see our need, and approve our request.

Sincerely,

Chris Hampton
Springfield Sign
4825 E. Kearney St., Springfield, Mo. 65803,
chrish@springfieldsign.com
417-862-2454
SL-SERIES

Channel letter construction
One piece (saddle capped sections)
LED internal illumination
Typical application for new construction
Embedded power supplies
UL marked product
No install pattern needed, level line scribed in back of sign

PROPOSED VARIANCE REQUEST

SL-30 ILLUMINATED WHITE SCRIPT CHANNEL LETTERS

SIGN SQUARE FOOTAGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEVATION</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>SQUARE FOOTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORTH ELEVATION</td>
<td>SL-30 (44.37&quot; x 94.50&quot;)</td>
<td>29.12 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST ELEVATION</td>
<td>LL-X (17.67&quot; x 27.88&quot;)</td>
<td>3.42 SF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES

LL-X LED accent strip lighting typical placements:
WEST: (2) places - NORTH: (3) places - SOUTH: (2) places
EAST: (2) places
8P-1 typical Drive Thru placement: EAST
MFG: T&D, STYLE: T&D, COLOR: T&D
MFG: T&D, STYLE: T&D, COLOR: T&D
MFG: T&D, STYLE: T&D, COLOR: T&D

DATE CREATED / REVISION HISTORY

9/4/19
9/5/19 - REV1 ELEVATIONS UPDATE
9/25/19 - REV2 ELEVATIONS UPDATE
10/19/17 - REV3 - PERMITTING - REV2-ELEVATION UPDATE

SALES PERSON: MARK WEGSELL
DESIGNED BY: B. PLAVVEC
AO: 22455
FILE PATH: T:\Cyrious\Doc\Order\22455

©2019 Springfield Sign & Graphics Inc., Springfield Sign

This drawing is copyrighted material. It remains the property of Springfield Sign unless otherwise agreed upon in writing. It is unlawful to use this drawing for bidding purposes, nor can it be reproduced, copied or used in the production of a sign without written permission from Springfield Sign & Graphics.

This is an artistic rendition and final colors / sizes may vary from that depicted herein.
SIGN PACKAGE PROPOSAL
NEW BUILD

PRESENTED TO:
Culver's - Petoskey, MI

DATE PREPARED:
9/4/19 - Preliminary
9/5/19 - Rev1
9/24/19 - Rev2
9/25/19 - Rev3
9/25/19 - Permitting
10/16/19 - Rev4 - Permitting - Rev1
AD-1 ADDRESS NUMBERS

Routed Address Numbers

AD-1

Address letters as required for building occupancy
Size & quantity may vary
Stud/adhesive mounting
1/2" thick, black XPVC

NOTE: Address to be verified with G.C. prior to mfg.

*VARIES

NOTE:
- Address to be verified with G.C. prior to mfg.

SCALE: 1" = 6"

*SEE NOTE

NOTES

SALES PERSON: MARK WESSEL
DESIGNED BY: B. BLAUVELT
AD: 22455

DATE CREATED / REVISION HISTORY:
9/4/19
9/4/19 - D-PERMITTING

FILE PATH: T:Cyrious\Doc\Order\22455

© 2019 Springfield Sign & Graphics Inc., Springfield Sign
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**BB-1 BUTTERBURGER PANEL**

ButterBurger Outdoor Panel Wall Sign

**BB-1**

- All aluminum 0.080" thick panel - backside is blank (white)
- Baked on aluminum white enamel finish
- Digital print overlay with overlaminate
- Rounded corners are to be 1.25" radius
- Sign is to be mounted at 50 degree angle (set by flange)

---

**COMING RIGHT UP!**

RIGHT NOW, WE'RE MAKING YOUR MEAL FRESH. DELICIOUS IS JUST UP AHEAD.

---

**TYPICAL INSTALLATION - TOP VIEW**

- **WALL**
  - LEFT HAND FLANGE
  - 50 DEGREE ANGLE

**HOLE PATTERN**

- HOLES ARE .250" DIAMETER
  - .757" IN FROM SIDE & 1.468" IN FROM TOP & BOTTOM TAD IS TO BE BENT 50 DEGREES UP AT LINE

**NOTES**

- [Notes and dimensions]

---

**SALES PERSON:** MARX WEBBELL  
**DESIGNED BY:** DRAYVAEY  
**AD:** 22455

**DATE CREATED / REVISION HISTORY**

- 9/4/19
- 9/4/19 PERMITTING

**FILE PATH:** T:\Cyrious\Doc\Order\22455
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DIR DIRECTIONAL SIGNS

Illuminated Directional Signs

DIR

All aluminum construction
LED internal illumination
Totally self contained lighting
Polycarbonate thermoformed faces
Face removal for service
Site plans show placement & field orientation
UL marked product

DIRECTIONAL SIGN 1
DIR-D10-D12

THANK YOU
SIDE: A

PLEASE DO NOT ENTER
SIDE: B

DIRECTIONAL SIGN 2 - REFACE EXISTING
DIR-D10-D12

THANK YOU
SIDE: A

PLEASE DO NOT ENTER
SIDE: B

DIRECTIONAL SIGN 3 - REFACE EXISTING
DIR-D7-D10

DRIVE THRU
SIDE: A

THANK YOU
SIDE: B

NOTE:
SIGN FACE SHOWN IS FOR DIMENSIONAL DRAWING ONLY (CULVER'S LOGO). ACTUAL LOCATION SIGN FACES ARE SHOWN ON LEFT.

SQUARE FOOTAGE CALCULATIONS:
MATHEMATICAL: 2.25 SF
RECTANGULAR: 3.24 SF
Sign lighting other than street and security lights shall be turned off between the hours of 10:00 PM and 6:00 AM, except for premises open for business after 10:00 PM, then the lighting shall be turned off at the close of business.

SALES PERSON: MARK WEDELL
DESIGNED BY: B.BLAUVELT
AD: 22455

DATE CREATED / REVISION HISTORY
9/4/19
9/24/19-REV 1-DIR-UPDATE
9/24/19-PERMITTING
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SPRINGFIELD
www.springfieldsign.com
DTC-2 DRIVE-THRU CANOPY

Drive-Thru Canopy For Order Confirmation System (OCS)

DTC-2
All aluminum construction
Rated for 160 mph winds (3 second burst) & heavy northern states snow loads
Order Confirmation System (OCS) by others
Rear panel (door) access - lockable
Provides protection from rain for DT customer
Houses OCS, speaker & microphone

Culver's

SCALE: 3/8" = 1'

DATE CREATED / REVISION HISTORY
9/4/19!
9/4/19 - PERMITTING

SALES PERSON: MARK WESSEL
DESIGNED BY: D BLAUELT
AO: 22455
FILE PATH: T: \Cyrious\Order\22455

NOTES

*SCALE AND COLORS NOT REPRESENTATIVE FROM EMAIL ATTACHMENTS
*ALL MEASUREMENTS ARE APPROXIMATE
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ELEVATION WALL SIGNS

SL-30 Illuminated White Script Channel Letters

SL-SERIES

Channel letter construction
One piece (saddle capped sections)
LED internal illumination
Typical application for new construction
Embedded power supplies
UL marked product
No install pattern needed, level line scribed in back of sign

NORTH ELEVATION
SL-30, LL-X

SOUTH ELEVATION

EAST ELEVATION
LL-X, BB-1

SIGN SQUARE FOOTAGE

NORTH ELEVATION: QTY-1 SL-30 (44.37" x 94.50") = 28.12 SF
EAST ELEVATION: QTY-1 BB-1 (17.67" x 27.88") = 3.42 SF

Proposed Variance Request
WEST ELEVATION: QTY-1 SL-30 (44.37" x 94.50") = 28.12 SF

NOTES

LLX LED accent strip lighting typical placements:
WEST: (2) places - NORTH: (3) places - SOUTH: (2) places
EAST: (2) places
BB-1 typical Drive-Thru placement: EAST

DATE CREATED / REVISION HISTORY
9/4/19
9/5/19 - KEY1 ELEVATIONS UPDATE
9/25/19 - KEY2 ELEVATIONS UPDATE
9/25/19 - PERMITTING

SALES PERSON: MARK WESSELL
DESIGNED BY: D PIAVELT
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SPRINGFIELDSIGN

www.springfieldsign.com
FCO-3 INTERIOR SIGN

FCO Interior Sign with City & State

FCO-3
0.25" painted aluminum plate
Routed to shape
Pins mounted for rough surface application
VHB tape for smooth wall application
Mounting pattern with fastener instructions

Culver's
Petoskey, MI

0.25" PAINTED ALUMINUM PLATE
0.25" PAINTED ALUMINUM PLATE

SCALE: 1" = 1'

*SCALE AND COLORS NOT REPRESENTATIVE FROM EMAIL ATTACHMENTS
*ALL MEASUREMENTS ARE APPROXIMATE

DATE CREATED / REVISION HISTORY
9/4/19
9/4/19 - PERMITTING
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30' FLAG POLE & FLAG

Proposed Flag Pole & Flag

FLAG POLE

5'-0" x 8'-0" Flag
Brass Ball Topper
Base Collar

NOTES

Flag pole heights shall not exceed thirty (30) feet.
The total number of flagpoles shall be limited to three (3) per site.
Flag poles may be located in the road right-of-way unless permitted by the road agency having jurisdiction.

Lighting of flag shall be of sufficient wattage to illuminate flag surfaces only and shall not be excessive thus contributing to light pollution of the right sky. It is recommended that the flag be illuminated from the top down and directed so as not to interfere with passing pedestrians or vehicles. Ground mounted lighting is prohibited.
**MAX-1 MAXIMUM OCCUPANCY SIGN**

Interior Maximum Occupancy Sign

**MAX-1**

3/16" White acrylic substrate
Direct to surface printing
3M VHB peel & stick adhesive on back

"MAXIMUM OCCUPANCY" must be verified prior to manufacturing

---

*SCALE AND COLORS NOT REPRESENTATIVE FROM EMAIL ATTACHMENTS
*ALL MEASUREMENTS ARE APPROXIMATE

---

**NOTES**

**REVISION HISTORY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9/4/19</td>
<td>PERMITTING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SALES PERSON:** MARK WESSELL

**DESIGNED BY:** D. BLAUVELT

**DATE:** 9/4/19

---
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MB-DT-46 EXTERIOR MENU BOARD

MB-DT-46

Standard Menu Board for Drive-Thru Lane

LED Internal Illumination

POP Graphic panels must be purchased separately

POPP-Out magnet access panels included for easy in & out of POP panels

"-CS" option for 150mph coastal wind standards available

Locking rear access doors (4)

© 2019 Springfield Sign & Graphics Inc., Springfield Sign
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MB-ID-48

Easy lift up & out graphic panel
American Beech Wood surround
Surround is painted black
LED internal illumination
Ultra low power consumption

Culver's

MB-ID-48 INTERIOR MENU BOARD
Blue Low Ceiling Menu Board

MENU BOARD TO INSTALL CENTERED TO THE FRONT CASH REGISTER COUNTER

SCALE: 3/8" = 1"
ME-40-C CUSTOM MONUMENT WITH EMC

ME-40-C

Culver's sign cabinet of aluminum construction and internally illuminated with LED's

Thermoformed polycarbonate faces, embossed Culver's, 3M HP vinyl decoration

Watchfire's Amber Electronic Message Center (EMC) with RF wireless communication

Broadband communication option available

UL marked product

SIGN CODES

- Height: 10' - Sign Area: 56 sq. ft.
- Signs located in the road right of way shall not exceed 32 sq. ft. and 6' in height.
- Changeable message signs may not exceed 40% of the allowable sign area.
- Such changeable message signs shall have no moving parts.
- The background shall be utilit, and the letters shall be monochromatic.
- Electronic changeable message signs must meet all other standards of Section 2.2.07.
- Electronic changeable message signs may not be illuminated between the hours of 10:00 PM and 6:00 A.M., except for premises that are open for business after 10:00 PM, then the lighting shall be turned off at close of business.

NOTES

- SQUARE FOOTAGE CALCULATIONS:
  - OVAL: 8'3" x 5' = 32.40 SF (MATHEMATICAL)
  - EMC: 2'3" x 6'3" = 19.94 SF (2.46 sq. ft. UNDER ALLOWABLE MAX)
  - TOTAL: 52.34 SF
- 56 sq. ft. x 40% = 22.4 ALLOWABLE SQ. FT. FOR EMC

SALES PERSON: MARK WESSELL
DESIGNED BY: D. BLAUYELT
AD: 22455

DATE CREATED / REVISION HISTORY

9/4/19 - PERMITTING

FILE PATH: T: Cygirus\Doc\Order\22455
**REG-HC-1 PARKING SIGN**

**Handicapped Parking Post & Panel Sign**

---

**REG-HC-1**

- All aluminum 0.080" thick panel
- U-Channel steel post (green)
- Bolted connection
- Local codes may require actual copy/graphics to vary
- Rounded corners for safety
- First surface vinyl (printed) copy

**NOTE 1:** Overall height can vary per local codes

**NOTE 2:** 6' x 12" sign panel may also be required

---

**STANDARD FACE OPTIONS:**

- YOU'RE ON THE ROAD
- PLEASE USE PARKING
- PLEASE WAIT HERE
- PARKING RESERVED FOR HANDICAPPING 
- THANK YOU
- OPPS! WRONG WAY
- ELECTRIC VEHICLE PARKING
- VETERAN PARKING
- COMBAT WOUNDED PARKING

**ADDITIONAL FACE OPTIONS:**

- Handicapped Parking
- Post & Panel Sign

---

**FILE PATH:** T:\Cyrlous\Doc\Order\22455

**SALES PERSON:** MARK WESSELL
**DESIGNED BY:** D DAVID
**AD:** 22455

**DATE CREATED / REVISION HISTORY**

- 9/4/19
- 9/4/19 - PERMITTING

**SCALE:** 1/2" = 1'

**ALL MEASUREMENTS ARE APPROXIMATE**
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A sparkling clean restroom is what we strive for. Please inform a Culver’s team member if our restroom needs attention.

THANK YOU!
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V-1-1
V-5-1
V-6

3M HP white vinyl substrate
UV digitally printed image (blue)
Satin gloss over laminate
Contour cut
First surface application

NOTE 1: Business hours shown are typical. However, each location may be different than shown.

1 - 3M is a registered trademark of Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing.
VHD-1 VEHICLE HEIGHT DETECTOR

Vehicle Height Detector for Drive-Thru Lane

VHD-1

All steel (painted) construction
Re-settable if engaged
Used to help protect canopies from advancing vehicles that are too tall

NOTE: Clearance height must be verified prior to mfg.
From: Tammy Doernenburg <tdoernenburg@emmetcounty.org>
Sent: Thursday, November 21, 2019 3:41 PM
To: Lora Martinson <LoraM@springfieldsign.com>
Subject: FW: Sign Permit Approval - and revised zoning permit

Hi Lora,

Based on the approvals below and the revised site plan received today, I’ve attached the zoning permit for Culvers’ location in Bear Creek Township.

The approvals follow based on the site plan received 11/21/2019 (dated 11/8/2019):

SL-30 Elevation Wall Sign is approved as proposed.

BB-1 Panel Wall Sign, based on its location on the building, facing south, is acceptable (not regulated).

DIR Directional Signs three permitted as proposed.

VHD-1, based on its location, facing south, is acceptable (not regulated).

DTC-2 Drive Thru Canopy sign is acceptable (not regulated).

MB-DT-46 Exterior Menu Board is acceptable (not regulated).

ME-40-C Custom Monument With EMC is acceptable provided the following standards are met:
C. Changeable Message Signs

One changeable message sign per business premise subject to the following:
changeable message signs, including, but not limited to, electronic changeable message
signs, shall be permanently affixed to, and be parallel with the wall of the main building
or designed into the freestanding sign as an integral part of the freestanding sign
structure.

1. Changeable message signs may not exceed 40% of the allowable sign area.

2. Such changeable message signs shall have no moving parts.

3. The background shall be unlit, and the letters shall be monochrome.

4. Electronic changeable message signs must meet all other standards of Section
   22.07.

Electronic changeable message signs may not be illuminated between the hours of
10:00 P.M. and 6:00 A.M., except for premises that are open for business after
10:00 P.M., then the lighting shall be turned off at the close of business.

30' flag pole meets the Emmet County Zoning Ordinance standards. Lighting may not be mounted on the ground
(either building-mounted or top-down lighting acceptable).

All outdoor lighting standards must be met.

Thank you for your diligence.

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

DATE: 12/02/2019                    CASE #: PZBA19-016

APPLICANT: Springfield Sign & Graphics Inc

PROPERTY: 1264 N US 31 HWY

TOWNSHIP: BEAR CREEK

REQUEST: Wall-Mounted Sign Variance

Facts:
- Parcel is the location of the former Burger King restaurant.
- Parcel is zoned B-2 General Business.
- Signs regulated by Section 22.07.
- Proposal is to allow a second wall mounted sign.
- Complete list of approved signs include:
  - ME-40-C Custom Monument with changeable message sign (freestanding sign).
  - SL-30 Elevation Wall Sign approved as proposed.
  - BB-1 Panel Wall Sign.
  - DIR Directions signs – three approved as proposed.
  - VHD-1 (height safety sign) – not regulated.
  - DTC-2 Drive Thru Canopy Sign – not regulated.
  - 30’ flagpole.
- The signs replaced existing signage for the previous use.
- Applicant provided justification for request (attached to application).
- Adjacent uses – east = lumber company with a non-conforming freestanding sign.
  - West = mini-golf facility; across US-31 – corner lot – vacant former restaurant; south – approved hotel/motel – currently vacant – no signs have been reviewed for the approved use to the south.

General Comments:
Review Standards:

SECTION 22.07 SIGNS AND BILLBOARDS

22.07.11 Sign Variances

In order to allow greater flexibility in property and use signing, the Emmet County Zoning Board of Appeals may permit signs that:
A. Exceed the maximum number of signs permitted when there is more than one bordering County Primary or State Trunkline Highway, and the sign is placed directly in front of the building wall, which faces each road, or farther from the intersection line than the wall,

B. Exceed the maximum sign area for the following reasons: Deep use setback, cooperative sign use (joint use or community type advertising), large site area, and/or natural feature limitations to attaining reasonable signing of the use, or if the property shares a common front or side lot line with a B or I Zoning District.

In granting sign variances, the Zoning Board of Appeals shall consider the impact of each sign on adjoining residential districts, scenic views, out of character skyline intrusions, and obstructions to signs or uses on adjoining properties. The purpose of the sign and its applicability to uses that serve tourists or passerby motorists shall be considered in granting or denying a sign exception.

**Draft motions:**

A motion to **approve** Case #PZBA19-016, Chris Hampton for Jacob Kendall for a sign variance to allow a second wall mounted sign at 1264 US 31 North, Section 34, Bear Creek Township, tax parcel number 24-01-16-349-100-021 as shown on the site plan and ZBA application packet received Nov 5 2019, based on the facts presented in this case and because the two wall-mounted signs collectively meet the allowable area for wall-mounted signage based on Section 22.07.02.A.  
*(additional reasons or conditions may be added here).*

A motion to **deny** Case #PZBA19-016, Chris Hampton for Jacob Kendall for a sign variance to allow a second wall mounted sign at 1264 US 31 North, Section 34, Bear Creek Township, tax parcel number 24-01-16-349-100-021 as shown on the site plan and ZBA application packet received Nov 5 2019, based on the facts in the case because there is only one bordering County Primary or State Trunkline Highway adjacent to the property, the site has been approved for five signs,  
*(additional reasons or conditions may be added here).*
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 December 2019 meeting

Subject: Status of Enforcement Issues

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

2. 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. 5/2/2018 - 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 2 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 Bossingham. 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. 7/9/2019 appeal to Circuit Court filed. Civil Counsel reviewing. 7/24/2019 response filed by Emmet County – awaiting court review and direction. Court received the record. Civil Counsel responding to Appellant’s Brief – due 10/29/2019. Response from Plaintiff received. Oral Arguments scheduled for January 2, 2020.

3. 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 lights. 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. 8/21/2019 visited site. No change. Owner to be contacted. 9/11/2019 letter sent. Site visit conducted – no change.

4. Friendship Township – 3485 S Lake Shore Dr - complaint of tree-cutting and RV use. Follow-up needed.

5. Littlefield Township – Petoskey St - Ponsheawaing - rental nuisance complaint. Follow-up needed.

6. County-wide – PC – Discussion needed regarding RV use on lot without a main use. Complaints received for: 7515 N Lake Shore Dr, CV Twp, 5733 Rustic Rd – BC Twp, 3146 W Levering Rd - CV Twp, 4471 Straits View Dr – Wawatam Twp, 5611 & 5615 Petoskey St – Littlefield Twp, 3485 N Lake Shore Dr - Readmond Twp, 10209 Banwell Rd – Littlefield Twp, 10209 Banwell Rd – Littlefield Twp, 4477 NE River Rd, 11150 West End Rd, 11150 Ambers Rd, 11451 North Shore Rd.


8. 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 -
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.


13. Bear Creek Twp- 2000 Fochtman Industrial Park Dr – based on complaint made during PC meetings for 2020 Fochtman Industrial Park Dr – spoke with ECRC. Plan to meet on-site and review drainage for adjacent property.


15. Bear Creek Township – 796 Bellmer Rd – rental nuisance complaint. Follow-up needed.

16. Bear Creek Township – 528 N Fletcher Rd – 9/17/2019 – complaint of building being constructed without a permit. Sent letter to owner 10/3/2019. 10/16/2019 Received phone call from owner indicating he would apply and that the building was a farm use building. No application received to date (10/23/2019).