

WEST TRAVERSE TOWNSHIP
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 09, 2023

Chairperson Mooradian called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Roll Call: Hollerith, Wallin, Moore, Uutinen, Osetek, Green, Mooradian

Absent:

Visitors: Scott Hinz, Brad R., Ross Maunders, Eric Wynsma, Derek & Tracy Claridge, Chris D., Adam Pogoda, Lisa Johnson, Raymond Epskamp, Roy & Liz Martin, Doug & Sharyn Tayler, Annie Mooradian, May Hinz, David Hinz, Michael & Karen Donnelly, Nikki Orlando, Gary & Lynn Dwight, Joe Gahn, Natalie & Lindy Sobonya

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by all.

Approve Agenda as presented or with additions: **Wallin makes a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Second? All yes.**

Public Comments:

Approval of July 12, 2023, Regular Meeting Minutes: Mooradian has a correction on page 3, it should be Costello who made the comment and not Dyksterhouse. The next sentence should have Cupps making the comment and not Haus. Mooradian moves to page 5, last paragraph “Pond” needs to be added. Mooradian moves to page 7 on a comment Moore made, it should say “maintains” and not attains. **Wallin makes a motion to approve with corrections. Hollerith seconds the motion. All yes.**

Unfinished Business

None

Mooradian states board member Osetek has to sit in the back and abstain from any deliberation, discussion, or votes on the first case because he is within the 300-foot radius of notification. Which according to the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act would exempt him from deliberating the case.

Mooradian opens the public hearing at 7:08 pm.

New Business:

- a. Public Hearing – Case #05-2023: to consider a rezoning request from Single Family & Two Family Residential (R-1) to Transitional Residential (R-2), for two parcels at 7881 South State Road, Harbor Springs, MI 49740, Tax ID# 24-16-15-12-100-080 and Tax ID# 24-16-15-12-100-081, as submitted by Derek Claridge on behalf of Robert Holton (Little Traverse Development, LLC). Mooradian states “the public hearing has been

Proposed: August 9, 2023

Approved:

dually advertised on July 19, 2023, in the Harbor Light newspaper and on July 21, 2023. Notices were sent out to all of the property owners within the 300-foot radius.

Zoning Administrator Lane presents the summary of the case. Lane states he has received written comments in relation to the zoning request from Tim Kepford, Shleishmen, Margo & Ray Martin. Lane states the plan for the zoning request is to focus on the rezoning evaluation criteria of the ordinance and the differences between the R-1 and R-2 district. Lane states “it is informative to know what the applicant plans to do with it, but there is no obligation to do that. If the rezoning is approved, they are authorized to do whatever is allowed in the R-2 district.” Lane states “note that significant difference in the dimensional requirements is the lot area requirements for dwelling density.” Lane states in the R-1 district for single family, you need one acre and for two families you need 2 acres, then the R-2 is a half-acre.” Lane states “if the zoning is approved, the ability to increase residential density will be allowed.

Lane points out section 308.1 in the ordinance relates to the R-2 zoning district, there is language that provides it is not intended to be expanded beyond its present boundaries.

Lane states in terms of the rezoning standards, subsection A, section 1002.6, allows the uses and the district are reasonably consistent with surrounding uses. Lane states with that criteria, he found it to be satisfied because the R-2 uses are consistent with what is allowed in R-1.

Lane answers subsection B if the rezoning was approved would it have an adverse impact on surrounding properties, I found that to be undetermined. If the rezoning was approved, it will allow for an increase density in terms of residential uses.” Lane states “with increased density you will have increased traffic and increased noise potential, more so if it stayed R-1.”

Lane answers subsection C - Any changes in land use or other conditions that would justify the rezoning. Lane states he found that undetermined because he is not aware of any. Lane states in the ordinance it states there is expressed language against expanding the R-1/R-2 district beyond its present boundaries.

Lane answers subsection D - would a rezoning create a detriment to the improvement or development of the adjacent properties because the uses of the two districts are similar so he does not believe a change would prohibit developmental property in the surrounding area.

Lane answers subsection E – Spot Zoning or not. Lane does not believe so because there are R-2 zones in the proximity to the property. Lane states the location is adjacent to C-1 property and to the City of Harbor Springs which is consistent with the intent of the R-2 district.

Lane discusses subsection F – Lane does not believe there would be a greater impact to provide public service if it went from R-1 to R-2.

Lane discusses subsection G – Is the rezoning consistent with the goals and objectives of the Township Master Plan. Lane states “future land use map identifies this property as commercial industrial and so I believe it is satisfied, because the R-2 district is somewhat of a transitional zoning between residential and commercial.”

Lane discusses subsection H – Are there any errors in the original zoning. Lane found that to be undetermined. Lane states “Specifically I think this was zoned intentionally the way that it was.”

The applicant Derek Claridge states they would like to bring more to the site than is already there. Claridge states “we think because of the site and location there is an opportunity to put more houses.” Tracy Claridge states in addressing the rezoning standards subsection D, she does not feel there would not be any adverse effect on surrounding properties. T. Claridge states there could be complaints of increased traffic and noise, but they would like to provide screening for the headlight pollution and address noise concerns in the association docs and bylaws. T. Claridge believes the surrounding infrastructure can handle the traffic. T. Claridge asks the board if there is any particular section, they would like her to address.

Hinz has questions for Lane on how the zoning works. Hinz has a property that borders the Claridge’s. Hinz states he asked Claridge what was happening with the property, which Claridge stated they want to build 41 new homes. Hinz states he took an aerial photograph of the property and discussed it with the board.

Natalie Sobonya who resides at 7447 S. State Rd would like to address the noise. Sobonya states their home is parallel with the road off of Franklin Park and says the noise has increased significantly since the trees have been removed. Sobonya is also concerned about all of the traffic, safety, and noise that would come with all of the new homes.

Doug Taylor who resides in the Tamarac. Taylor states he is concerned where the road would come out and the number of homes Claridge is proposing to build. Taylor states it would add a lot of traffic. Taylor suggests a traffic study based on what the board decides.

Lindy Sobonya who resides at 7447 S. State Rd. Sobonya presents photos to the board of the “said” property. Sobonya is concerned with the amount of traffic if changed to R-2 zoning. Sobonya states she is in favor of R-1 zoning, but not R-2.

Nikki Orlando expressed her concerns about the traffic. Orlando states she does not understand how you can enter a residential area through a commercial property.

Mary Hinz asks if the easement through Franklin Park was approved by the Zoning Board. Wallin states “it would not be approved by us.” Mooradian states it is something to do with the title.

Gary Dewight who resides across from the new easement on Franklin Park. Dewight states he has read the flood plain information for that area. Dewight believes there is a requirement to lower the Franklin Road 8" to avoid flooding of the elementary and middle school. Dewight states "anything that is going to increase runoff from that site is going to raise the flood potential, which does directly affect the schools."

Brad R asks if an R-2 would require a well or septic systems. Mooradian states that question would have to do with a site plan review.

Lisa Johnson whose family owns vacant property on Collins Ln. Johnson cannot imagine 41 homes on that property and feels more information is needed. Johnson asks if it is their intention to put affordable houses in there. Johnson disagrees with this plan.

Paul Roberts who resides at 7345 Collins Ln. is concerned about the increased traffic. Roberts states he does not want a major development in his backyard.

Jim Roznowski who is adjacent to the property on State Rd. is concerned about the increased traffic with a new development.

Les Monger who resides at 7707 Evergreen Ridge states the reason for going from R-1 to R-2 would be to increase density. Monger does not believe people want a density increase.

Karen Donnelly has a property in Franklin Park which is next to the proposed development. Donnelly is concerned how it will change the character of the area. Donnelly believes higher density would change that. Donnelly believes more information is needed.

Roy Martin has a property at 405 Franklin St. Martin wonders why this is under review since it is not able to be expanded. Martin states it is not the same land use. Martin states he is against the plan.

Joe Graham resides at 7407 S. State Rd. which is directly north of the "said" property. Graham states he does not believe there would be no adverse effect to the surrounding properties because it would be a density of housing that is uncommon in the township.

Raymond Epskamp states there is a need for affordable housing. Epskamp would also like to know if it is ADA compliant.

?? resides at 2209 Meadow Lands Trl. and is worried of how it will effect Lightfoot Rd.

Mooradian closes the public hearing at 7:47 pm. and the board begins deliberation.

Mooradian recaps the history of the property. Mooradian clarified that bulk and density in the code looking at the schedule is 22,000 sqft per unit in the R-2 zone. Mooradian states if there is a duplex in the R-2 zone there has to be 44,000 sqft.

Mooradian states in our code if it were zoned R-1 it could have 6 units and R-2 could have 12 units. Green asks Lane “is a unit a single-family dwelling or can a unit be multiple family dwelling?” Lane answers that a unit would be single family dwelling. Mooradian states the code allows for a duplex. Lane states it would change the lot. Green states you could not have a quad. Mooradian states “you can cluster them into one building, but you can’t get beyond that number of units.”

Mooradian states “we do have to specifically look at the rezoning, we do have the intent of the R-2, not to expand.” Moore states “you guys keep misspeaking on that point. Lane stated it correct once but then misrepresented it a couple of other times.” Moore states “the specific quote from the text is, it is not intended that this district shall be expanded beyond its present boundaries.” Moore states “it reads a lot different than it can’t be expanded or it shall not be.” Mooradian states “did I say it cannot be expanded because if I did say that it that way, I retract it.” Mooradian states “I agree, it does say it’s not intended to.” Moore states he looked at this every possible way and the density between R-1 and R-2 are different, but the uses are the same. Moore states its going from six to 12 max. Mooradian states “even if it was rezoned R-2 with 12 units, that’s before the site plan, road approvals, Health Department approvals, and other things that may limit it.”

Wallin appreciates how Mooradian interprets the case but does not intend to extend the R-1 to R-2. Wallin states “I believe it is a terrible sight distance problem and I see numerous accidents at the Franklin Park entrance.” Mooradian agrees it does have sight issues.

Hollerith states he has concerns on the adverse physical impact on surrounding properties.

Uutinen states he is on the fence between the R-1 and the R-2. Uutinen states “I think 12 units sounds a lot better than 40 units.”

Mooradian states a decision does not have to be made tonight and there is an opportunity to expand the request. Green states he is agreeing with Wallins statement and he is also concerned about the traffic.

Moore has questions on section B & C that were undetermined by Lane. Moore states “I am not sure that the traffic is a consideration at this time.” Moore does not see how that would create a physical impact on a surrounding property. Moore feels that is something to take under consideration for a site plan. Moore states “I am not so sure we should be giving an industrial area too much weight as far as the impacts of a residential area.”

Moore states on section C, he believes there have been changes in land use. Mooradian states “based on those comments I would make the suggestion that we don’t have to take action on this case tonight. We could look at expanding a larger area and rezoning 10 parcels to R-2.” Hollerith states it sounds like updating the master plan at some point.

Wallin makes a motion, based on the findings of facts discussed by the West Traverse Planning Commission I move to recommend denial to the West Traverse Township Board of Trustees to rezone the properties at 7481 S. State Road, Harbor Springs MI, 49740, Tax ID# 24-16-15-12-100-080 & Tax ID# 24-16-15-12-100-081 from R-1 to R-2 because the applicable standards of the West Traverse Township Zoning Ordinance has not been met. Green seconds the motion. Roll call: Moore – No, Wallin – Yes, Hollerith – Yes, Green – Yes, Uutinen – Yes, Mooradian – Yes

Mooradian states the case will now go to the Board of Trustees, their September 12, 2023 meeting.

- b. Site Plan Review – Case #06-2023: site plan review for a commercial and self-storage facility on South State Road, Tax ID# 24-16-15-12-350-009, Tax ID#24-16-15-350-011, as submitted by Terra Firma Development, LLC, Eric Wynsma, on behalf of Upside Downtown, LLC, Eric Wynsma.

Lane introduces the case. Lane states “it is a two-phase project, totaling just over 71,000 sqft of storage building space.” Lane states “on the site plan provided, the northern portion which is phase one will have 3 units of self-storage totaling just over 21,000 sqft. Building A will be 9,170 sqft approximately 13 units 560 sqft each. Building B, 7,363 sqft, approximately 11 units 600 sqft each. Building C will be 4,507 sqft , about 20 to 21 units 200 sqft each.” Lane states “on the southern portion, will be phase 2. That is a 50,000 sqft building that will be a bilevel with various size units.” Lane states in the application the applicant says they are intending on having bathrooms installed up to code and connect to public water and sewer. Lane states “both properties combined into 1 are the C-1 commercial district, total acres is 4.5 combined. Property is currently vacant, it has hills, and a lot of vegetation.”

Lane continues “to the north and east are commercial zoning under the Township Zoning Ordinance. Similar uses to the north, to the south is the city of Harbor Springs, and to the west is residentially zoned property.” Lane states that in the Master Plan the property is designated as commercial industrial which lines up with the designation. Lane states in terms of the zoning ordinance review the storage buildings/mini storage are uses permitted by right in the C-1 district. Lane states “the C-1 criteria, in section 309.2, I have determined most of those are satisfied because the uses are permitted. They are proposed to be built within the required setbacks.” Lane does not believe they are going to impair air or light to adjacent properties or that they will diminish the market value of any surrounding properties. Lane states they have proposed a sprinkler system, a drainage and retention infrastructure which is included on the site plan. Lane states that traffic will increase consistent with the proposed storage units.

Lane states “section 309.3, there were elevations provided for phase 1 in the buildings that were being depicted as less than the maximum and there was not an elevation for phase 2.” Lane states dimension requirements for the C-1 district are provided in the memo. Lane states “all of the set-back requirements have been met.”

Lane states “Development Standards, 309.4, lighting as depicted on the elevation drawing also represented on the site plan.” Lane suggested that the PC may want to discuss screening because they are on the side of the property closest to the residential neighborhood. Lane states ingress/egress is depicted on the site plan screening. Lane states that based on the scope of the project, he is sure if it is efficient to adequately screen everything from adjacent properties.

Lane states “in terms of section 309.5, parking requirements there are 65 spaces depicted which means that the minimum requirements in the zoning ordinance have been met. Lane states it is for the PC to determine the placement on that.

Lane states “in terms of section 504.1, the graphic criteria for site plan, I believe it has all been satisfied for phase 1 and for phase 2 there were no elevation drawings.”

Lane states “section 504.2, Site Impact Statements were provided in the application.”

Lane states “in terms of site development review standards, section 506; subsection “a”, vehicle, pedestrian interaction on the site. I am suggesting the PC discuss that with the applicant.” Lane states “subsection “b” with the width of the access drives, I think the PC should discuss that. I think some of those widths are 22’ but that includes the parking areas. The question is if emergency vehicles can fit down there to accommodate all of those units.” Lane states “subsection “c”, whether buffering or screening is sufficient. Lane states “subsection “g”, topography, and natural landscape. There are a lot of hills, so it will take significant modification for the topography of the site to do this project.” Lane states the applicant is going to put in retaining walls and the PC may want to discuss if what is proposed is sufficient to address soil erosion. Lane states “subsection “h”, drainage, we are going from a hilly wooded site to a lot of impervious surfaces, so I would suggest the PC discuss whether or not the storm water management proposed is sufficient.” Lane states “subsection “j”, I did not see a snow storage area, so that may be something the PC wants to discuss.” Lane states “lastly subsection “k”, as with all site plans the PC can make their approval contingent on approvals from all the other agencies having jurisdiction with the county.”

Lane states “the last thing I want to mention because this is being proposed in 2 phases the PC can request a performance guarantee under section 916 of the ordinance. That performance guarantee is designed to ensure that whatever is approved actually gets constructed, because in the application the applicant is saying that the intent is for phase 2 to be completed 2 years after phase 1 is completed.”

Hollerith asks Lane “Phase 2 information is incomplete at this point?” Lane states “in that they don’t have elevation drawings, so yes, it is incomplete.” Uutinen wonders when looking at the site plan how the topography and the natural landscape is going to look. Wynsma states “we are not looking to do a minimum standards program; we are going to do this the right way. There is going to be some landscaping.” Wynsma states “as far as the hill, it is a really hard site. Any commercial use there is going to be a struggle.”

Wynsma states “the reason we laid it out the way we did is we are trying to make the site

fit the project instead of the project fitting the site.” Wynsma states they have done the best they can with a 5.25-acre site and the topography. Wynsma states “we think this a pretty efficient use of a challenging site.” Chris Delusky, the Construction Design Manager for Pogoda Management states this is an economical conversation as well as an environmental conversation, so they plan to do it minimally. Wynsma states using the topography they will still be able to maintain a lot of the hill. Wynsma states they will not be disrupting a lot of the soil or land. Wynsma states they will use the natural topography to help with the screening process. Uutinen asks Wynsma what the Evergreen Ridge residents will be looking at. Wynsma states they will more than likely see a rooftop. Mooradian if Building A 18 or 19 feet high and the floor grade is proposed at 717, and directly west of the building is a 12-13’ embankment. Mooradian states the building will be higher than Evergreen Ridge Association.

Ross Maunders states this project affects him because of where his property is and feels Wynsma should sit down with the residential owners who border it and make a plan to work for everyone involved. Mooradian states one of the requirements it needs to be properly screened from the residential to the commercial zone and that needs to be discussed. Annie Mooradian asks if they could retain the trees on the southern line. Wynsma states “the goal is anything on that edge we would have to install retaining walls to maintain that site versus taking it out. It does not make sense to demolish the whole site.” Wynsma states they are having a more detailed site survey which is being completed now. Mooradian states “the engineer has not really disturbed the 50’ setback on the southside, but it is all out on the westside.” Mooradian states “the entrance is at 709 and Building C is at 716 which is 7’. So, from their proposed entrance to the first building on the right which is already elevated 7’.” Mooradian asks Wynsma “that building according to your elevations is only 11’ high.” Wynsma states that is correct. Mooradian states “so we are looking at a 17-18’ high elevation.” Mooradian believes screening along Building C would be important.

Wallin would like to know about the parking situation. Mooradian states “Building B is a drive thru, with an overhead door on each end of the building so they do not have to have parking there.” Mooradian states “I would almost like to see some parking spaces removed and have a few near each building.” Mooradian is not sure why there are 64 parking spaces. Wallin agrees.

Hollerith states he would like to see a screening masterplan for the site because he is concerned about the water retention which gets into snow removal. Hollerith also states he is concerned on the width of the road in the back. Hollerith would like to see the detailed site survey when its available.

Mooradian states “I have read somewhere there is fencing but I do not see anything on here other than a gate.” Lane states it’s on the north line. Wynsma states it will be at the parking line, not on the property line. Mooradian states the applicant may want to move the gate 10’ so vehicles with trailers are not hanging out on State Rd. Wynsma states they are considering the gate at E.

Mooradian states going to the applicants engineer discussing a 25-year storm or at the applicant's expense contact a third party to do a storm water review which can be a basis for discussion.

Mooradian asks Wallin about lining up the intersection. Wallin states there are 3 entrances if you want to count Backus Dr. Mooradian states "it seems they are offset and maybe there should be an alignment. Wallin does not feel it is a concern.

Mooradian asks the applicant to discuss their plan for sewer and water. Mooradian states "you talk about heated units and bathrooms, is that typical for self-storage?" Wynsma states "it's an amenity, so certain sites are heated and cooled, other sites just heated." Wynsma states they would like to provide bathrooms for their tenants when they are onsite. Wynsma states all of the bathrooms are keycode access. Mooradian asks if they are common bathrooms and not for each unit. Wynsma states that is correct. Mooradian states "I do not believe there is sewer on that road, so you will have to have septic and apply for Health Department approval." Wynsma states "the restroom will be in the 2-story building and not in each of them." Wynsma states most of the parking will be at the larger main building, and the others will be drive up.

Mooradian asks if there will be any lighting in the drive areas or parking lots and if so, it needs to be identified on the plan. Wynsma states they plan on doing a post mount wall pack.

Mooradian asks if Moore has any concerns. Moore states that storm retention is a concern. Moore feels that getting a third party to engineer the storm retention would be a good idea. Moore states he would also like to see some nice screening but is concerned that it would not be possible with the storm water requirements. Moore wants to see more on snow removal. Moore states he is happy with the bathrooms because that would have been his number 1 complaint, because he has seen Bosker's units become living units with the number of bathrooms they have. Mooradian states "the landscaping is important because it is such a large-scale project." Wynsma states "we are working with some time sensitive stuff, so is there a way for it to be approved or contingent on approval of that." Wynsma does not want to lose another month. Mooradian states "you can pay for a special meeting and some conditional things we have done in the past." Mooradian asks the board for their thoughts. Wynsma asks if there is a standard they didn't meet as far as the submittal in terms of what landscape or screening was a requirement by the ordinance. Mooradian states "clearly the west boundary line." Uutinen states "in phase 2 the vertical topography numbers." Mooradian states as well as the southbound. Mooradian states the storm water, snow storage and the landscaping plan are too difficult to make conditioned. Wynsma stated, "Moore mentioned a third party, do you want us to engage them or are you going to recommend." Mooradian feels that it would be best if the applicant had them design something more capable. Wynsma states "I think we can request some design change directly with the engineering firm." Wynsma states they have another engineer engaged through the site soil boring, geotec and they can peer review.

Lane reviews the concerned items list. Lane states “more information on retainage on the westside of the property will occur, how screening will be accomplished on the site essentially on all 3 sides but especially on the west and southside and the State Rd. side, better calculations on storm water retention (25 years opposed to 10), maneuvering questions in relation to getting in and out of Building B without impacting people at Building A & Building C, detailed landscaping plan showing the existing inventory and what’s being proposed, snow removal, potentially moving the gate to area E opposed to where it is now, your plan with water and sewer, and lighting in the parking area if that is a plan.” Mooradian states “the existing inventory, they have presented it already.” Hollerith states “we need to look at best use of properties and is this project even needed.” Hollerith states “this is the only commercial property available left in the township and we are going to fill it up with a 50,000 sqft building.” Hollerith does not know if it is needed. Moore states “I could not agree more with you, this is the last thing I want to see going in here. As I said in the last case, I am a huge housing advocate. We are going to now fill up our remaining commercial with storage spaces.” Moore states “that will force our hand to expand commercial and the only place it’s expanding is where no one wants it.” Green states there is a demand for storage and that the board needs to make sure the project has the initiative necessary to make sure all the issues discussed are covered.

Hollerith makes a motion to postpone Case #06-2023 to give the developer more time and bring it back to the September 13th meeting. Moore seconds the motion. All yes.

Other

- a. Zoning Administrator Report – Hollerith asks Lane “in regard to Otis, no change, it is still non-conforming? I have heard they applied for a liquor license and didn’t know if it would change anything.” Lane states “I have sat down with the new owner, and they did not mention any kind of restaurant or bar.” Lane is unaware of them applying for a liquor license.

Hollerith asks about Harbor Points PUD. Lane states that it will come to the PC.

Moore states “I don’t know if it is worth looking into Boskers. I have seen 2 units where they were installing a granite kitchen unit, I have seen living room setups, full mechanic setups, decoration, full on living spaces.” Mooradian states “they are supposed to be storage units for personal storage and no business operations.”

Mooradian asks Lane “he noticed they were building a deck at the Otis, I looked at the aerial photo and there was no existing deck on that building. You say they are changing the grade and building a deck, but it seems to me it is encompassing a lot larger space than the cement was.” Lane agrees and is meeting with them tomorrow. Lane states “what they are doing is not what they told me.”

- b. Township Board Representative Report – Green gave his report.

c. Correspondence – None

Planning Commissioner Comments (open discussion) – Moore states he has a different take on Pond Hill Farm than Green does. Moore states “our zoning administrator presented us with a laundry list of things that should be discussed with the Pond Hill case. It was our duty to discuss those things and I don’t think we addressed a single one.” Moore stated “what I think happened was the duty of the PC was taken to the board and the same exact laundry list to consider was put onto the board and that was our duty. I think we and the Township should be embarrassed at that fact.” Moore states “I do not feel we did our job at all. There seemed to be a rush.” Moore states “you said you felt like you needed to move it to the board. I understand I was asking questions and really wanted input and did not get any from the other board members.” Moore found that frustrating. Moore states “Mr. Green made both motions and it’s shocking how different they are. There was a giant list of conditions on your motion for the board and there was virtually no conditions on the motion you made. They were all things in relation to the list the Zoning Administrator tasked us with discussing.” Moore states “the way that motion was rushed took that duty and responsibility away from us and put it on a board which is not something that board is supposed to be doing.” Moore states “I also have comments on the way you spoke to me, it reflected in the minutes, I don’t think your threatening way of addressing me is appropriate at all. You also said that I will make a motion, I would appreciate you not speaking to me that way and I would appreciate you not demanding how I act or what I am going to do.”

Public Comments: (Name was not stated) “you mentioned that there are 10 different parcels and changing those to R-2 for future expansion, will that increase the taxes if changed from R-1 to R-2?” Mooradian states it will not.

(Name not stated) “the photos I gave to you on the entrance to the 6.3 acres off of State Rd., it goes almost straight down. If it is zoned R-1 it means only 6 homes can go on it, correct?” Mooradian isn’t sure if 6 homes can go in. Mooradian states “their next step with no zoning change they have the potential for up to 6 units. When you start looking at the site plan requirements and other agency requirements, we know it’s a bad site spot.” Mooradian states “the Emmet County Road Commission would have to come out, if you want to do more than 4 units you would have to have a commercial entrance. If they want to have 5 units back there, they will have to have a commercial driveway that will have requirements for sight vision. To get any driveway they would have to have Road Commission approval and depending on its sight vision, they may not allow 4 units. I do know there is a trigger at 5.”

Annie Mooradian states “I know that rezoning piece is tough, and its butting commercial property. At some point we need to increase the density because 1 acre is quite large, and we need to allow for additional housing.” Mooradian states “we have to address we have a housing problem.” Mooradian states “to Moore’s point that you didn’t mention is that a woman did stand up representing Birchwood and they said how incredibly rude they found Green at that meeting. I felt that was really a reflection, because I heard from many that it was predetermined, and Green came in with a bullying attitude and you did.” Mooradian states “I did not see anybody deliberating and giving the time we had in the past on other things.

Gahn voiced his concerns of going to R-2.

Proposed: August 9, 2023

Approved:

Next Meeting: Planning Commission Regular Meeting, September 13, 2023, 7:00 PM

Adjournment: **Wallin makes a motion to adjourn.**

Respectfully Submitted by:

Dawson Moore, Secretary

Transcribed by:
Paige Fisher

Proposed: August 9, 2023
Approved: