

Mr. Dohm cautioned that storage, even of a commercial nature, was understood to be applied for, but in the event other operational type uses were to be proposed, change of use requests would need to come back to the PC for consideration under a revised PUD.

Chairman Van Berlo asked if the plan had been reviewed by the municipal fire department. Indications were that it had not, but would be prior to final approval.

7:55 PM, there being no more public comment, the public hearing was closed.

Following discussion, a **motion** was made by Mr. Radle, with support from Mrs. Snyder to approve the site plan as presented, and recommend to the Township Board approval of the PUD Overlay District subject to approval of the local fire department, and with the understanding that the storage units are only approved for storage, and that additional approval would be necessary should any of the storage units be used for operational type uses.

The motion was unanimously passed by the following roll call vote.

Radle, yea
Fairbairn, yea
Van Berlo, yea
Snyder, yea
Chattaway, yea

Case #B-02-2018 Mr. Frykberg presented a revised site plan to relocate an existing 30' x 30' garage on property previously approved for an assisted living facility at 3498 M-119, under title Case #B-10 -15 . The garage is replacing the originally proposed 30' x 40' garage, and extends the berm easterly to provide additional protection to adjacent property owners. It was understood when that project was approved that any changes, including the garage, would come back before the planning commission. He presented his memo on the case (*see attached pages 9 &10*)

Mr. Van Berlo questioned the garage opening as depicted on one of the accompanying documents. Mr. Gorman explained that the view of the opening was labeled wrong. The garage door will face east.

Following discussion, a motion was made by Mr. Chattaway, with support by Mr. Radle to approve the revised site plan as presented. The motion was approved by unanimous voice vote:

Township Recreation Plan: Rachel Smolinski discussed updating the Township Recreation plan that expired on December 31, 2017. She explained that there needs to be considerable opportunity for public input, as well as input from PC and Township Board members in the update process. She went over several areas in the current plan that may need attention. The most apparent is the recreation facilities inventory, and the capital improvement schedule. She went over the goals as well.

Following review of those items, Mrs. Smolinski outlined a proposal to implement the review process. She will attend the January 10, 2018 meeting of the Township Board to receive their input, advertise for public input at the February 14, 2018 PC meeting, and offer to hear public input from the resort communities during the July 2018 PC meeting.

Discussion followed, and it was the unanimous consent of the PC to follow the program as outlined above.

Township Master Plan: Mr. Dohm advised that the Township Master Plan was opened for review at the November 8, 2017 PC meeting. A PDF copy has been sent to each Board member. He discussed the content of the current plan, and provided options for moving forward with the review. He indicated that the current master plan is working well, and that his view is that the master plan, as written, is still current, meeting the needs of the community, and nothing further needs to be done at this time.

Following discussion, it was decided by unanimous consent that staff prepare a resolution to that effect for consideration at the February PC meeting, and that if any changes were discovered in the mean time, they could be addressed then.

Other Open Discussion for issues not on the agenda:

a. **Correspondence:** None.

b. **Planning Commission Members:** Chairman Van Berlo asked if there were any comments from Planning Commission Members.
There were none.

c. **Township Board Members:** Mr. Dohm reported that the Twp. Board passed a Michigan Medical Marihuana Licensing Act Opt Out resolution at their December 13, 2017 regular meeting. He advised the Twp. Board will continue to monitor marihuana licensing as it progresses through possible recreation marihuana approval during 2018.

Adjourn: There being no further business to be brought before the commission, Chairman Van Berlo adjourned the meeting at 8:50 P.M.

Date approved 2-6-18
Secretary Tom Fairbairn
Tom Fairbairn

Respectfully Submitted,
William P. Dohm,
Supervisor

LITTLE TRAVERSE TOWNSHIP
EMMET COUNTY, MICH.

Regular Meeting of the Township Planning Commission
Tuesday - January 2, 2018
7:30 P.M.
at
The Township Hall

DRAFT - AGENDA

1. Call to Order.
2. Roll Call: Martin Van Berlo, Joseph Chattaway, Shirley Snyder, Chip Radle
Tom Fairbairn
3. Approve the agenda.
4. Approve the Minutes of November 8, 2017.
5. Public Comment.
6. Case #B-01-2018
PUD (Preliminary & Final) and Site Plan Review for Ben Sackrider at 700 W. Conway Road.
7. Case #B-02-2018
Site Plan Review for modified site plan for FAH assisted living facility at 3498 M-119.
8. Review Twp. Recreation Plan for updates with Harbor Inc., Rachel Smolinski.
9. Discuss Twp. Master Plan that was opened for review November 8, 2017.
10. Open Discussion for issues not on the agenda
 - a. Correspondence:
 - b. Planning Commission Members
 - c. Township Board Members
11. Adjourn.

(Note - If a Board member is not able to attend this meeting, please call the office, 526-0351.)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Little Traverse Township Planning Commission
FROM: Randy Frykberg, PhD
DATE: 12-12-17
SUBJECT: Case #B-01-2018 Consideration of a PRELIMINARY and Final PUD and Site Plan Review for a proposed mixed use of an office building and Storage Buildings at 700 W. Conway Road transitioning from the current land extraction operation. (ID # 24-08-16-15-400-050)

For 1-2-18 PC meeting.

REQUEST

1. On November 8, 2017, the Planning Commission held a pre-application conference on the Ben and Paula Sackrider proposal for 14 storage buildings, each 40' X 60' plus a 20' X 24' office attached to the first storage building, as part of a new PUD at 700 W. Conway Road. The office is the only building that would have a septic tank and field. A great deal of open space, more than required, is shown on the Preliminary Plan. At that meeting, several items were requested and have been submitted:
 - a) A statement of the objectives of the planned development.
 - b) Explanation of the relationship of the PUD to the Township's Master Plan.
 - c) Preliminary sign information, including location and size.
 - d) Major tree stands and rock outcrops.
 - e) All major environmental features.
 - f) Location and type of proposed lighting on the site.
 - g) Proposed Master Deed, deed restriction, covenants or similar legal instruments to be used within the PUD.
 - h) An Impact Statement.
 - i) Final landscape plans, building plans, and sign plans.
 - j) Legal procedures to assure all designated and required open space remains undeveloped

A PUD is a Conditional Use Overlay District and only what the Planning Commission approves at the PUD review(s) can be built. It is the intent of this district to encourage site design in a manner which seeks to integrate new structures and uses with natural site characteristics to minimize impacts on the site and adjoining properties. This permitted district encourages a more creative approach to development through the planned grouping of uses while maintaining the overall density of the underlying zoning district.

A Public Hearing is required. The 17 Standards for PUD approval, taken from the Zoning Ordinance, are listed below.

GENERAL FACTS

1. The 10.0 acre site is zoned FF-1 Farm Forest.
2. Present use of the property is resource extraction.
3. The PUD Overlay District requires a pre-application conference to review the proposal and assist the applicant in completing a full application. This was completed at the November 7, 2017 PC meeting.
4. A PUD permits R-2 and B-2 uses when determined "by the Planning Commission to be compatible with the surrounding land uses following a Public Hearing." Thus the PUD would allow storage buildings and an office.
5. A 50' setback for the perimeter of a PUD is required. The plans show this setback is met or exceeded.
6. Storm water will be handled on site by a 12,200 cubic foot retention basin on the northeast side of the site. Sandy soils to a depth of at least 5 feet will allow percolation at a rate of 12' per 24 hours. Drainage structures and retention areas shall be cleaned out annually in the spring to remove accumulated sediment and debris.
7. 20 parking spaces are proposed and additional parking can be in front of each storage unit.
8. Over 65% of the site will be open space (6.55 acres out of 10).
9. Well and septic will serve the office.

FINDINGS:

2. This is a combined preliminary and final PUD review.
3. A public hearing is required.
4. Standards for PUD recommendation to the Township Board:
 - a) The planned unit development shall be consistent with the Township Master Plan. **This area is designated Neighborhood Commercial in the Master Plan and should serve as a buffer for adjoining non-commercial interests. Part of this property is also in zone 5 and 3 of the Harbor Springs Airport Approach Plan, and some is not in a mapped zone. People should not be concentrated and residential buildings should be avoided. Seems to meet both the Master Plan and the Airport Plan.**
 - b) The planned unit development shall be designed, constructed, operated and maintained in a manner harmonious with the character of adjacent property and the surrounding area. **Meets**
 - c) Landscaping shall ensure that proposed uses will be adequately buffered from one another and from surrounding public and private property and will be consistent with outdoor pedestrian movement. **Meets**

- d) Vegetation proposed by the developer or required by the Planning Commission shall be maintained in a healthy living condition and such vegetation if dead shall be replaced. **Will be met**
- e) The planned unit development shall not substantially change the essential character of the surrounding area, unless such change is consistent with the Township Master Plan. **Meets**
- f) The planned unit development shall not be hazardous to adjacent property, or involve uses, activities, materials or equipment which will be detrimental to the health, safety or welfare of persons or property through the excessive production of traffic, noise, smoke, fumes, ground vibration, water runoff odors, light, glare or other nuisance. **Meets**
- g) The planned unit development shall not place demands on public services and facilities in excess of current capacity, unless planned improvements which will increase the capacity sufficient to service the development have already been scheduled for completion. **Meets**
- h) The planned unit development shall be designed to preserve public vistas and existing important natural, historical, and architectural features of significance within the development. **Meets**
- i) The planned unit development shall be designed so that its pedestrian, non-motorized and automobile circulation systems are safely and conveniently integrated with those of abutting property and any linear trail or park systems intersecting or abutting such development. **Meets**
- j) The planned unit development shall provide that vehicular and pedestrian traffic within the site shall be safe and convenient and that parking layout will not adversely interfere with the flow of traffic within the site or to and from the adjacent streets. Safe and adequate access for emergency vehicles to or within the development and adequate space for turning around at street ends shall be provided. **Meets**
- k) The planned unit development shall not result in greater storm water runoff to adjacent property after development than before development for up to a 50-year storm. The open space shall be provided with ground cover suitable to control erosion, and vegetation that no longer provides erosion control shall be replaced. **Meets**
- l) The design of the planned unit development shall exhibit a reasonably harmonious relationship between the locations of buildings on the site relative to buildings on lands in the surrounding area; and there shall be a reasonable architectural and functional compatibility between all structures on the site and structures within the surrounding area. It is not intended that contrasts in architectural design and use of facade materials is to be discouraged, but care shall be taken so that any such contrasts will not be so out of character with existing building designs and facade materials so as to create an adverse effect on the stability and value of the surrounding area. **Meets**
- m) The design of the planned unit development shall ensure that outdoor storage of garbage and refuse is contained, screened from view, and located so as not to be a nuisance to the subject property or neighboring properties. **Meets**

MEMORANDUM

TO: Little Traverse Township Planning Commission
FROM: Randy Frykberg, PhD
DATE: 12-18-17
SUBJECT: Case #B-02-18 Site Plan Review for Assisted Living Facility at 3498 M-119 (Parcel # 24-08-16-22-200-001).
For 1-2-18 PC Meeting

REQUEST

Dean and Hilde Bonesteel have requested permission to relocate the existing 30' X 30' garage (in the front of the property on M-119) approximately 900 feet to the east and convert it to a maintenance/storage garage. The new location would be in front of the parking area and the berm will be extended to the west in front of the garage. The parcel is immediately north of the Sheriff's Office and is zoned R-2 in the front and R-1 in the rear. The garage, now in the R-2 zone, would be moved to the R-1 portion of the property.

On July 11, 2016 the Planning Commission approved the site plan for a 40 unit care facility, including a 30' X 40' storage garage to be built behind the 40 bed facility. The 30' X 30' relocated garage will replace the 30' X 40' approved garage behind the building. Because the garage to be moved is already on site, the buildings footprint would be 1,200 square feet less if this project is approved.

On 12-7-15, the Planning Commission approved a Conditional Use Authorized by Special Permit for the use as an assisted living/memory care facility, with the condition that final approval is subject to a site plan review that satisfies the Conditional Use Approval Standards of Section 1304 of the Zoning Ordinance (standards listed below). A Site Plan Review is required for the concept to move the garage and eliminate the approved 30' X 40' garage.

GENERAL FACTS

1. The 7.5 acre parcel is zoned R-2 in the front and R-1 in the rear.
2. Minimum setback requirements in the R-1 District are 30' front, 10' sides, and 25' rear. In the R-2 District the minimums are 30' front, 20' sides and 35' rear.
3. The plans show the new location of the existing garage to meet all setbacks. .
4. The property will still be served by one on-site well and septic system.
5. A little under 7% of the parcel will be the buildings, leaving 93% of the parcel as open space.
6. A screened dumpster will still be located on the south side of the property, approximately 50' behind the front of the building.
7. Stormwater will still be handled on site by 5 retention and percolation areas.

8. Alternative uses, that are allowed by right on this property and thus wouldn't need Conditional Use Review by the PC, include:
 - a. For the front R-2 zoned portion of the property, the acreage would allow multiple family dwelling for up to 7 families or up to 11 two-bedroom apartments, or any of the uses allowed in R-1 (listed below)
 - b. For the remainder of the property, about 5.5 acres zoned R-1, the acreage would allow farms, churches, public, parochial, and private schools not operated for profit, or up to 5 single family detached homes.

FINDINGS:

1. The proposed relocation of the existing garage requires a Site Plan Review.
2. **Standards for Site Plan Review** (Section 1508 sub 4.):
 - a) *The location and design of driveways and entrance feature with respect to vehicular and pedestrian traffic. **No changes. Prior to the initial approval of the site plan on July 11, 2016, MDOT approved the entrance including the acceleration and deceleration lanes.***
 - b) *The traffic circulation plan and off-street parking lots with respect to public safety, on site uses, and adjacent properties. **No changes***
 - c) *Buffer Techniques, fences, wall, greenbelts, and landscaping may be required by the Planning Commission in pursuance of the objectives of this section and/or as a condition of the establishment of the proposed use. **A berm with evergreens, to help screen the parking lot from the residential area to the north, will be extended to the east so that the garage will also be screened.***

SUMMARY

This proposed garage movement appears to meet all the Township requirements. Unless information to the contrary is presented at the meeting, approval seems appropriate.