

# NOTICE OF MEETING

A Regular Meeting of the Leelanau County Planning Commission (LCPC) will be held at **5:30 pm Tuesday, OCTOBER 24, 2023** in the Leelanau County Government Center – 1<sup>st</sup> floor.

*(Please silence any unnecessary cellular/electronic devices)*

## **DRAFT AGENDA**

**CALL TO ORDER & PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ROLL CALL**

**CONSIDERATION OF AGENDA**

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST** (*refer to Section 3.7 of the Bylaws*)

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

**STAFF COMMENTS**

**CONSIDERATION OF SEPTEMBER 26, 2023 MEETING MINUTES** *pgs 2-7*

**OLD BUSINESS**

**NEW BUSINESS**

1. PC-13-2023 Long Lake Township Master Plan (document previously emailed to members) Review **pgs. 8-14.**

**REPORTS**

1. Housing Action Committee
2. Parks & Recreation Committee
3. Report from LCPC members of attendance at township/village meetings, or Other Meetings/Trainings

**COMMUNICATIONS/CORRESPONDENCE**

**PUBLIC COMMENTS**

**STAFF COMMENTS**

**COMMISSIONER & CHAIRPERSON COMMENTS**

**ADJOURN**

### **LCPC Members**

Steve Yoder-Chair  
Casey Noonan-Vice-Chair  
Melvin Black-Chair Pro-Tem  
Craig Brown  
Rodney Brush  
Brian Fenlon  
Melinda Lautner  
Tom MacDonald  
Robert Miller  
Tom Nixon  
(1 vacancy)

**A REGULAR MEETING OF THE LEELANAU COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION WAS HELD ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2023, AT THE LEELANAU COUNTY GOVERNMENT CENTER.**

Proceedings of the meeting were recorded and are not the official record of the meeting. The formally approved written copy of the minutes will be the official record of the meeting.

**CALL TO ORDER** Meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m. by Chairman Yoder who led the Pledge of Allegiance. The Meeting was held at the Leelanau County Government Center, 8527 E. Government Center Dr., Suttons Bay, MI.

**ROLL CALL**

**Members Present:** S. Yoder, T. Nixon, C. Brown, T. MacDonald, M. Black  
B. Fenlon, R. Miller, C. Noonan

**Members Absent:** M. Lautner  
**(prior notice)**

**Members Absent:** A. Trumbull (resigned), R. Brush

**Staff Present:** T. Galla, Director, G. Myer, Senior Planner

**Public Present:** D. Manikas, Cleveland Township

**CONSIDERATION OF AGENDA**

*Motion by Noonan, supported by Nixon, to accept the agenda as presented. Motion carried 8-0.*

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST** – None.

**PUBLIC COMMENT** – None.

**STAFF COMMENTS**

Galla informed members that A. Trumbull had resigned. Due to her busy schedule, she felt she couldn't give the commission the attention it deserves. Also, members will be reviewing a Master Plan from Long Lake Township at their next meeting. Galla said she had already emailed the plan to members so that they would have time to review it.

**CONSIDERATION OF JULY 25, 2023 MEETING MINUTES**

*Motion by Fenlon, supported by Noonan, to accept the minutes as presented. Motion carried 8-0.*

**OLD BUSINESS**

Review of Fall Session

Galla stated that she thought they would draw a larger crowd. She did have a few people inquire about Zoom options or the ability to watch at a later date. People still want to stay at home rather than attend

in person. Galla said overall she was pleased with the session. She would have liked the speakers to get into a few more of the problems involved with big developments. She realizes this also would have taken more time, and it took a lot of time to get through what they did.

Fenlon said he enjoyed the training and the speakers were very knowledgeable. He realized he still has a lot to learn. Miller said they did a great job. Some of the pitfalls and concerns on big projects were stressed to the right degree.

Nixon commented that the speakers were well prepared and he enjoyed talking with Mary Reilley, she is always helpful. He appreciates staff for putting it together. MacDonald said the small group thing took up a lot of time that could have been better spent. Brown said it was a very good session and the speakers pointed out some things he never would have thought of. Yoder said he also anticipated a lot more people. The comments he heard were all positive and the content they had was really good.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **PC12-2023-03 Cleveland Township-Text Amendment Short Term Rentals**

Galla reviewed the staff report saying that the township has based this off of some reviews they have done of other ordinances dealing with short term rentals (STR's), so a lot of the text is similar to what is in other township zoning ordinances. Galla said this is a text amendment to add Section 4.28 Short Term Rentals to the zoning ordinance. The township held a public hearing on September 6 and received some public input. Following the public hearing they passed a motion to recommend the Cleveland Township Board adopt the amendment.

Galla pointed out that the current zoning ordinance on the Cleveland Township website does not include a Section 4.27, after 4.26. Instead, the Ordinance adopting 4.27 starts on page 111 of the document. For consistency, the ordinance should be cleaned up to show each of the new sections so that a person could easily find them. Galla continued, saying that this text would permit STR's in the Agricultural District, Residential I, II and III Districts, with requirements for permits, standards and owner responsibilities and penalties. The township has not yet set the maximum number of STR's. The STR industry has seen an increase in growth, with online access and popularity of rentals vs. a stay in a hotel or motel helping to drive up the popularity. This issue with STR's is not limited to Cleveland Township. A lot of communities are struggling with what to do with them.

Galla continued, saying the issue with STR's is not specifically mentioned in the township's plan, but under Appendix A, Public Comment Plan, from a public open house, there were some issues listed and some public comments received. It was noted in the Public Hearing introduction that this amendment was requested by the township board and was modeled on Leelanau, Suttons Bay, and Elmwood Townships STR ordinances. Galla noted that the "purpose statement" doesn't seem to read as a "purpose statement" consistent with other sections in the zoning ordinance. The township could also take the statements A through L and shorten into a similar type Purpose statement as that in Section 4.26.

Galla continued, saying that the township informed staff that these uses of STR's are already allowed in the commercial, commercial resort, business, and recreational districts. Staff questioned if the township will allow unlimited STR's in these districts but set a maximum allowed in the Agricultural and Residential districts? Item L. states the township intends to prioritize primary resident owners when awarding permits. If challenged, will the township be able to defend this statement to prioritize permits to primary resident owners? Galla then moved on to Section 4, Short Term Rental Permit, C. Renewal of Permits and questioned whether the permit has to be applied for every year? Section 4,

Item D. refers to the Cleveland Township Fee Ordinance but the document online is called a Fee 'Schedule'.

Galla then mentioned Section 5: Short Term Rental Standards, D. 4) states the township will provide the phone number of the contact person to all neighbors within a 300-foot radius of the STR boundary. This is also listed in Section 6: Owner Responsibilities A. Why? This could get out of hand with neighbors making calls, instead of contacting the township and having the authorized person at the township handle the issue. This amendment states that Cleveland Township (zoning administrator or other person designated) is authorized to issue all permits and issue civil infraction notices. Galla said it might be cleaner to run it through the township, not the neighbors. Galla pointed out that staff felt the 10-foot fire distance didn't seem adequate. Under M. Quiet Hours it states "...which does not disturb the quiet, comfort or repose of a reasonable person of normal sensitivities". This statement seems like it would be hard to determine or enforce. Is there another way the township can word this requirement?

In conclusion, Galla said she had a few emails back and forth with D. Manikas because staff was a little confused and still are as to whether or not this is a Police Power Ordinance or an amendment to the zoning ordinance. Some townships do have this as a stand-alone ordinance and if that is the case, Cleveland Township needs to make sure they have followed the proper procedures to put it into place.

Manikas stated that he also questioned if this was a stand-alone ordinance and he was told by the township supervisor Tim Stein that it was not. Manikas continued, saying that the township doesn't have anyone to integrate the amendments into their zoning ordinance online and that is why the amendments are just added to the website. STR's are mentioned in Objectives and Action steps of the township's Master Plan. They were not high on the list at the time the Master Plan was done, but things have changed in the last five years so the township board directed them to develop this. Some of the language is more "flowery" than they usually write because it was borrowed from other townships. Their lawyer's advice was to list out the purpose since this gets to the PRE question and makes it defensible. And to the point that they allow STR's in other zoning districts makes it defensible.

Manikas said that the township master plan does reference short term rentals. And their attorney suggested listing items out for the Purpose statement as that references PRE and other items and it was felt listing them was the best. He also stated that other townships have a requirement that the neighbors get the contact person information, so that way, the neighbors can address an issue before it turns into a complaint that the township has to handle. Perhaps they can work it out between the parties.

Manikas emphasized a crucial point, this is not a taking because in their ordinance currently, any STR in Residential or Agricultural is in violation. He referenced a previous training and the fact it was mentioned that just because you haven't enforced it, doesn't mean you can't. It has gotten to a point where the township needs help to enforce it and this is a strategy - to charge fees in order to hire a third party to monitor because it is overwhelming. Manikas clarified that he misspoke at the meeting regarding permits and reapplying. The text clearly states that you have priority to renew, you do need to reapply. The township wanted people to be able to plan year to year, that once they have a permit, they will have top priority for any available permits the following year. Manikas concluded by saying that they are looking at numbers right now to limit the number of STRs and will make a recommendation at the next township meeting. The number of STR's have become a problem and they are disrupting the neighborhoods and affecting the homes available for those who want to live here.

Fenlon stated that he is concerned about the fire distance because the international fire code recommends 25 feet. 10 feet is appropriate for a charcoal or gas grill, 25 feet for a fire pit, and 50 feet for an open fire. Most insurance companies will not be happy with that distance. Also, the phone number given to neighbors could get out of hand. How would that even work? Instead, direct those calls to the township and the relevant enforcement in the township. Manikas said they talked a lot about that. Most of the other ordinances they reviewed had that in there. They didn't want to put it all on the zoning administrator. If the neighbors can handle it by going to the point of contact, then there is no formal complaint. However, if it gets out of hand the township will find out.

Miller made reference to the 300-foot radius and having an authorized agent to contact because you can't get ahold of anyone at the township after hours or on the weekends and get any response. How is the 300-foot radius defined? Property lines or the residences? The text states that a bedroom is for two people, but a lot of these properties have bunk rooms. Noonan stated that it is capped at twelve person's total. Manikas said it is based off the septic which is their primary concern. Two persons per bedroom and children over 3 since they are using a toilet at that age. Miller questioned places that are marketed for more people than what they are licensed for. Manikas said there are companies that monitor that type of thing, and that would be a violation. Miller wanted to know if a sign by the road would be permitted. Manikas said signage is addressed in the text. Manikas said STR's are in their neighborhoods, this isn't just in commercial areas. They allow that stuff in the Business, Commercial Resort, and Recreation Districts. The courts were pretty clear that they do not have a right to commercial use of a residence in a Residential District. Miller concluded by asking why they would reference fireworks when there are other township ordinances that apply to that? Manikas stated that redundancy doesn't hurt.

Noonan said he applauded the township for wrestling with the bear. It's a difficult thing in every township and there is no cookie cutter ordinance. It is nice to see the township working through this.

Nixon pointed out to Section 1, Purpose, D. and said to remove the word "be." He likes the septic language and the language used to define the maximum allowable number of occupants. He does see a conflict between Section 5, D and Section 6, A. Nixon wanted to know who would be responsible for issuing the correct number. Manikas said at the moment, the zoning administrator or whoever grants the permits, but the board may contract that out to a company. Nixon mentioned that Suttons Bay township has had significant challenges for parking and what that means. They are now talking about the distance a vehicle is parked from the hardened surface of the roadway. The intent was always to allow people to walk or ride bikes down the edge of the road without getting run over by a vehicle that is on the roadway. This may be something to think about because the Sheriff won't do anything if the car is parked on the shoulder of the road, only if it is in the roadway. Nixon said he also raised the question as to why this wasn't a police ordinance? A zoning ordinance regulates the use of the land and a police power ordinance regulates the activities on the land. In Suttons Bay they viewed STR as an activity and used a police power ordinance. And to use it as a zoning ordinance, there needs to be some reference to it in the Township Master Plan. There has to some relationship between the zoning ordinance and the Master Plan. Suttons Bay discovered they didn't have that kind of strength in their Master Plan. Nixon concluded by saying that Suttons Bay Township uses a company to monitor their STR's and it is very helpful. The company's number is given to neighbors and they keep a log of the calls they receive and let the township know. They do not take any action, they just let the township know what the people around the rental are experiencing. They have learned that a lot of people rent by word of mouth.

Black commented that he liked the public comments by people who have been renting their places for many years. This shows you how successful they are and they haven't rocked the boat. Manikas stated that they have been getting complaints recently. Also, when they heard those public comments, it

reinforced the principal residence exemption (PRE) priority. Black said the well and septic language might be a little stringent, a lot of it depends on the septic system itself. It's not uncommon to go five to ten years between pumping. Black concluded by saying that he likes the amendment and is glad to see them working on this because we are a vacation destination.

MacDonald questioned if the township could defend the prioritization of how the permits will be distributed? Also, Section 1, L, reads "for the reason stated above..." which is pointing to all of the declarations previous to that. There is sort of a disconnect to all of the previous statements, then saying they are limiting these to primary residences. He suggests removing "for the reasons stated above." And related to that, he also recommends in Section 4, L, removing "Therefore". MacDonald said they don't need justification for why they are doing it. Manikas stated that their lawyer said it is best to have it in there. MacDonald said his last question was on signage, is that addressed? Manikas said yes.

Brown mentioned the requirements now for a driveway permit which were not in place years ago. Many driveways are not safe because they were put in a long time ago. They receive phone calls at the road commission from people who want to reduce the speed limit in front of their STR. He recommends a requirement for a valid driveway permit from the road commission within the last five years. Yoder said some of the stuff may be hard to enforce, but in general the township did a great job. This issue is a runaway train right now in the county and any way they can slow it down a little is good.

Nixon commends the septic language included in the amendment, it's a community interest. In Suttons Bay Township they had a home that was renovated and put on the market as a STR. During the sales process it was discovered that the remodeling altered the number of bedrooms, so the Benzie Leelanau County Health Department investigated and put a stop order on the purchase until corrections were made. Manikas mentioned a septic study they did and said one of the early findings is that heavy use is what leads to enteric bacteria in the house. Miller questioned with the permit renewal process; would the township be requiring documented cleaning of the septic? Fenlon pointed out that it does.

***Motion by Noonan, supported by Black, to recommend approval of the Cleveland Township STR Text Amendment, to forward the staff report, minutes and all comments to the Cleveland Township Planning Commission. Motion carried 8-0.***

## **REPORTS**

### Housing Action Committee

Galla updated members on the meeting held the prior day saying that Yarrow Brown updated them on the Housing Summit coming up in October, in Traverse City. Brown also reported on the number of housing units needed in the county and there was a lot of discussion on what the next steps might be. Galla continued, saying that Habitat for Humanity is moving on to units 5 and 6 at Maple City Crossings and they will be starting on the New Waves project in Elmwood Township. Homestretch is almost done with the Marek Rd. project and they put in an offer on some property that the LBA owns. Galla concluded by saying there was discussion on whether the HAC should continue in its present structure or a citizen group be developed like other counties are doing.

### Parks & Recreation

Noonan reported that a gentleman wanted to put a skating rink at Myles Kimmerly Park and volunteered to do all of the work. He thought there was water there year-round, but there isn't. The well is winterized because of all of the irrigation lines. They are not sure now if this will happen.

**REPORTS from LCPC members**

Brown said County Rd. 675 road closure is happening now, to replace culverts. This will be ongoing until mid-November. Another project is coming up on County Rd. 651 to reconstruct the road. It will be shut down for about three weeks to put in left turn lanes.

Yoder said Solon Township is still working on their Master Plan and will be working on a STR ordinance and an accessory dwelling amendment. They recently finished a three-month visioning session for the parks to apply for DNR grants to help with improvements. They are looking at replacing all of the wooden bleachers with aluminum. Yoder concluded by saying he will be doing the Citizen Planner course in East Bay Township.

**COMMUNICAITONS**

Citizen Planner Course  
Northwest Michigan Housing Summit 2023

**PUBLIC COMMENT** – None.

**STAFF COMMENTS**

Myer reported that the Hazardous Waste & Electronics Collection held the prior day was a success with 405 vehicles dropping off materials.

**COMMISSIONER & CHAIRPERSON COMMENTS** – None.

**ADJOURN**

Meeting adjourned by consensus at 6:28 p.m.

# Leelanau County Planning & Community Development Staff Report PC13-2023 (Long Lake Township) Master Plan Review

Reviewing Entity: Leelanau County Planning Commission  
Date of Review: October 24, 2023

## SECTION 1: GENERAL INFORMATION

**Date Request Received:** September 22, 2023  
**Expiration of Review Period:** November 3, 2023 (42-day review period, per PA 33 of 2008, as amended)

**Note:** The Public Notice states a 63-day notice period for a Master Plan amendment. While the statute provides for a 42 day review period for an amendment, having a longer public review period provides more time for citizens to provide input on the proposed changes.

**Requested Action:** Review and comment on the Long Lake Township Master Plan 2023 Update.  
The draft plan is online at: <https://longlaketwpmi.documents-on-demand.com/document/e59f6512-2ccf-ed11-a3b4-000c29a59557/Master%20Plan%20%20Amendment.PDF>

**Applicant:** Long Lake Township Planning Commission

**The township plan with changes was previously emailed to the County Planning Commission and the documents are on file in our office, and can be found on the Long Lake township webpage.**

## SECTION 2: TOWNSHIP ACTION

The Notice of Intent to Plan was distributed by the Long Lake Township Planning Commission on March 16, 2023 to neighboring Local Units of Government and Leelanau County Planning. The Long Lake Township Board passed a motion at their September 12, 2023 to approve the distribution of a draft update of the Township Master Plan.

The township planning commission will be holding a Public Hearing on the proposed Master Plan on November 28, 2023. Written comments may be submitted at the public hearing or may be submitted through an on-line questionnaire found on their website or emailed to [planner@longlaketownhsip.com](mailto:planner@longlaketownhsip.com). Comments will be received until 5:00 p.m. on Tuesday November 28, 2023.

## SECTION 3: BASIS FOR PLAN REVIEW

**Section 41 of the Michigan Planning Enabling Act (MPEA) (PA 33 of 2008, as amended)**, requires a copy of a Plan or extension, addition, revision of other amendment of a Plan to be submitted to the county planning commission for review and comment. The review period for an extension, addition, revision, or other amendment is 42 days.

### Section 41.

3. If the county planning commission or the county board of commissioners that receives a copy of a proposed master plan under subsection (2)(e) submits comments, the comments shall include, but need not be limited to, both of the following, as applicable:



(a) A statement whether the county planning commission or county board of commissioners considers the proposed master plan to be inconsistent with the master plan of any municipality or region described in subsection (2)(a) or (d).

(b) If the county has a county master plan, a statement whether the county planning commission considers the proposed master plan to be inconsistent with the county master plan.

(4) The statements provided for in subsection (3)(a) and (b) are advisory only.

## SECTION 4: ANALYSIS

*The Principal Goal of the Leelanau General Plan is to establish a strategy for meaningful growth that protects, and where possible, enhances the unique character and quality of life on the peninsula by focusing on the balance of environmental protection, resource management and economic development so as to provide a foundation for a sustainable economy that permits long term prosperity for all present and future Leelanau County residents. The proposed amendment to the Master Plan has been reviewed for consistency with these policies.*

### Policy Guidelines of the Leelanau General Plan

#### **A. Intergovernmental and Regional Context**

*A partnership founded on mutual respect and mutual support in achievement of the common goals of the General Plan should guide the development and implementation of new relationships between the County and local units of government in the County and between the County and adjoining counties in the region.*

**Does the proposed plan strive for greater cooperation between neighboring units of government?**

Yes.

#### **B. Preservation of Peninsula Character**

*The interdependence of the natural and people-made features on the peninsula that make up its rural character, with the activities that comprise its economic base require that future land use change on the peninsula not undermine and where possible enhance the character of the area around it, and in so doing contribute to the unique rural character of the area around it, and to protection of the unique rural character of the entire Leelanau Peninsula.*

**Does the proposed plan include strategies for the preservation of rural and small-town character?**

Yes

#### **C. Working with Nature**

*Extensive and diverse sensitive natural features found throughout the peninsula provide the foundation for the present and future quality of life on the peninsula and should be protected where pristine, restored where damaged and have access and use managed for long term sustainability everywhere else.*

**Does the proposed plan include strategies for environmental protection, restoration, and management?**

Yes

#### **D. Managed Growth**

*Local land use or comprehensive plans and local development regulations should be updated and thereafter maintained to include goals, objectives, policies and strategies for managed future growth consistent with the Leelanau General Plan. Local plans should include more specific land use and density proposals at the parcel specific level. Local regulations should focus on design and other issues of local significance. Public facilities should all be constructed according to local capital improvement programs that are coordinated at all governmental levels on the Peninsula.*

**Does the proposed plan include parcel-specific future land use recommendations (map)?**

The Plan includes a Consolidated Future Land Use Plans Map on page 52.

**SECTION 5: STAFF COMMENTS**

A Master Plan is the vision of how a community will develop over time, providing guidance regarding how areas should be zoned, and standards that should be incorporated into the Zoning Ordinance.

The Master Plan on the township’s website is dated 2005. At least every 5 years after adoption of a master plan, a planning commission shall review the master plan and determine whether to commence the procedure to amend the master plan or adopt a new master plan. The review and its findings shall be recorded in the minutes of the relevant meeting or meetings of the planning commission. This doesn’t require a local municipality to do an update every five (5) years, but it does require a review and then recording that decision in the minutes.

Section 43 of the MPEA states:

(3) Approval of the proposed master plan by the planning commission under subsection (2) is the final step for adoption of the master plan, unless the **legislative body by resolution has asserted the right to approve or reject the master plan.** In that case, after approval of the proposed master plan by the planning commission, the legislative body shall approve or reject the proposed master plan. **A statement recording the legislative body's approval of the master plan, signed by the clerk of the legislative body, shall be included on the inside of the front or back cover of the master plan and, if the future land use map is a separate document from the text of the master plan, on the future land use map.**

**Comments / suggestions:**

Staff has reviewed the Proposed Master Plan Update and offers the following suggestions and comments:

The township has included a Master Plan Summary which is a nice addition to summarize the changes to the plan. Under Section 2. Community Profile, the sixth paragraph, add a “comma” after the word “endangered”.

On Page 3, the first paragraph under History of Long Lake Township, add a comma after “Manistee Moraine” and in the second paragraph under this same heading, the word “much” should probably be “mulch” or “muck” that is found in wetland areas.

On Page 6, 1883, staff questions the wording in the first sentence of this paragraph as it is not a complete sentence and refers to “..received \$.18 for in Traverse City”. Was this the cost of the sheet? Something else?

Page 12, the last sentence of the fourth paragraph under Soils, on Page 12 is not clear. Also on Page 12, under Lakes, Streams, and Other Waterbodies, second to last sentence, remove the “apostrophe” from “Green Lake Townships.”

Page 13, second paragraph, first sentence should read “Long Lake Township contains few streams.”

On page 15, under Long Lake Water Quality, middle of the first paragraph reads “After which the interns and volunteers develop a comprehensive.” It seems this sentence is incomplete. Also, add “the” in the very next sentence so it reads “In addition, the Lake Association also participates in the Cooperate Lake Management Program”. Should Cooperate be “Cooperative”?

Page 16, second to last sentence in the last paragraph, remove the “s” from the word “shoreline.”

On page 21 under Ground Water, the last sentence should read “It must be noted that the data that this data is based on is an algorithm and is generalized.”

Page 23, the last sentence of the first paragraph under Chapter 3, Demographics, add a comma after the word “citizens,”.

Staff notes that several of the Figures listed throughout the document need to have the source cited.

Page 34, last sentence in the second paragraph under Housing Costs, remove the “s” on the word “show”.

On page 46, the last sentence of the second paragraph, replace the word “extend” with “extent”.

Page 47, the last sentence of the last paragraph, replace the word “loss” with “lost”.

All of the Maps should include the north directional arrow, the source and a scale.

Staff questions GOAL 7A on Page 66, under Activity Centers. Is there a reason this is Goal 7A instead of Goal 8? Should the Goals be renumbered?

Page 69, GOAL 11, Objectives, c. reads “Township to appoint in-house Fire Code enforcement personnel. Staff suggests rephrasing this objective to be consistent with the other Objectives, such as: “The Township shall appoint in-house Fire Code enforcement personnel”.

On page 70, under Neighborhoods and Sense of Community, Objectives, f., - is there a reason to better define and regulate single family dwellings as it pertains to second kitchens and guest suites? This may be an opportunity to open up additional housing units which are greatly needed in this area. Also, on page 70, the Objectives listed under GOAL 15 might be better accomplished by a non-profit organization than a government agency.

Page 72, the first paragraph under Future Land Use Descriptions, Rural Preserve, is missing the number of acres and percentage of lands designated as Rural Preserve. Page 74 first paragraph under Low Density Residential is missing the same information for Low Density Residential.

Page 73, third paragraph, the two sentences that start with “With regard to form...” and “With regard to development intensity...” are confusing.

Page 79, fourth bullet point after the first paragraph insert the word “of” after attributes.

Page 80, fourth paragraph under Transportation Enhancements, third sentence, add and “s” to the word “pedestrian.”

Page 85, Agricultural, add the word “to” to this sentence so it reads “Properties within this plan district may retain existing zoning or be rezoned to a compatible zoning designation.”

Page 87, item iv. Update ordinance to allow for guest homes.... Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) can provide housing units for much needed housing in the township such as for seniors who wish to downsize and/or live with family, adult children who need housing, workers, etc. Allowing ADUs anywhere that single family housing is permitted, instead of just the residentially zoned districts, provides opportunities to increase housing units. Including long term rental requirements (at least 30 days) in the zoning ordinance would address concerns that these would turn to short term rentals.

Page 88, e. Miscellaneous, remove the “bold” type from “ii. And iii.” Also on Page 88, Task Objectives 2. Amendments to Other General Township Ordinances, a., can the township actually limit the number of units to be served by a private road? Also on Page 88, Task Objective 3. Refine Administrative Processes, b., states “Maintain a list of non-residential uses in the Township, current tenants in commercial/industrial buildings and their contact

information, and regularly monitor for zoning compliance. Is the township dealing with a problem with current tenants in commercial/industrial buildings? There may be other zoning compliance issues in the township – staff suggests a more generic statement in the Master Plan such as: “Regularly monitor uses throughout the township for zoning compliance”.

Under f, Develop a separate Transportation Plan, page 89, staff suggest consideration for addressing safety and traffic concerns at the M-72 location of Jacobs Farm/Gallagher’s Market.

Page 90, h. Develop a Cemetery Plan. What would be the purpose for the Cemetery Plan? Is it documentation or another purpose?

Appendix 1: Opinion Survey Results, staff suggests including the date of the survey and how it was administered, mailed or online. Who prepared the survey?

The plan includes good background information along with charts and data throughout. While there are suggested changes staff has provided for the proposed plan, the document appears to meet the requirements of Section 33 of the Michigan Planning Enabling Act (MPEA). Per the MPEA, Sec. 41 (3) staff did not find the Plan to be inconsistent with the Leelanau County General Plan or with plans from adjacent municipalities in the county. Following the October 24 County Planning Commission meeting, minutes from the county planning commission, along with this report, will be sent to the township for consideration. The township is commended for their work updating the Plan.

## **Appendix - Correspondence from Long Lake Township**



8870 North Long Lake Rd., Traverse City, MI 49685  
PH (231) 946-2249 • FAX (231) 946-4573

## PUBLIC NOTICE

### LONG LAKE TOWNSHIP, GRAND TRAVERSE COUNTY NOTICE OF INTENT TO CONDUCT MASTER PLANNING

March 16, 2023

Dear Planning Commission members, staff, and other interested parties:

Pursuant to the Michigan Planning Enabling Act, Public Act 33 of 2008, as amended, this notice is to inform you that the Charter Township of Long Lake's Planning Commission will be considering a requested amendment to its Master Plan's Future Land Use Map to extend the North Village Center Boundary.

The Planning Commission will send you a copy of the proposed amendment. We welcome your cooperation and comments on the proposed plan.

If you have any questions or comments on our process, or would prefer a digital copy of the proposed plan amendment, please feel free to contact me at 231-946-2249 or [planner@longlaketownship.com](mailto:planner@longlaketownship.com).

Thank you for your interest and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Leslie Sickterman, AICP  
Township Planner