

CENTERVILLE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Lindy Kellogg Chairperson, Vice-chair VACANT

Joe Mosher, Secretary & Board Representative; Mary Beeker, member; Noel Bielaczyc, member

December 04, 2023; Regular Meeting Approved Minutes

Call to Order: Lindy Kellogg, Chair, called the meeting to order at 6:32PM.

Attendance: Lindy Kellogg, Joe Mosher, Mary Beeker and Noel Bielaczyc

- **Staff Present:** Acting Recording Secretary Karla Gerds, Planner Chris Grobbel and Attorney Lauren Teichner
- **Public attendance** 34 in person

i. Review Agenda

ii. Public Comment Regarding the Agenda None.

iii. Revise/Approve Agenda –

MOTION: Beeker moved to approve the revised agenda, seconded by Mosher, Unanimously approved.

iv. Declaration of Conflict of Interest -None.

v. Revise/Approve November 6, 2023, Monthly Meeting Minutes

Corrections

Mosher: Should be noted that the time of break is approximate at 8:32.

Page 3, Article 3, Section 13.1 Requirements for Site Plan of the Findings of Fact item should be added before that in the Findings of Fact. Regarding the recording of the vote as 3 to 1. It should be added before Section 1a. on page 7.

MOTION: Mosher moved to amend previous meeting minutes under Article 13, Section 13.1 Requirements for Site Plan add that the PC determined in a 3 to 1 vote that the header of that section had been conditionally met, seconded by Beeker. Unanimously approved.

Kellogg move to accept minutes as revised. Seconded by Mosher. Unanimously approved.

vi. Report from Township Board Representative – Mosher reported the Centerville Township Board of Trustees met Bielaczyc at the last meeting and voted to approve his appointment to PC.

vii. **Report from ZBA Representative** - Jamie Damm was the previous ZBA representee on the PC. At this time no replacement has been assigned.

viii. **Zoning Administrator's Report** - No update from Tim Cypher.

ix. **Planning and Zoning Issues**

- **Old Business**

- **Northgate**

- Public Comments:**

- John Popa-This is a new permit and a new campground and should comply with the present ordinance. Citizens are behind the PC. Proposed campground is very intrusive. This is a new permit. Section 13.1 G requires to preserve natural state and I ask the PC to honor that. Just say no to some of this stuff. A new boat launch is not permitted in this area. Section 13.10 G. Comments also submitted in written format. Have to go to the ZBA for the boat launch and for rentals. Very intrusive development at the waterfront. Just say no to that. Drawings continue to show construction in the setbacks. Nothing in the plans about enforcing the loud boats. If you don't think that something is going to fit in just say no.

- Mosher: Two packets of public comments posted on the website and Current as of mid-day Saturday, the second packet will be posted following the meeting.

- Glen LaCross- as read by John Popa, reminder of setting precedent. Requested moratorium until study some of this stuff. Willing to find a professional person to review these plans. Highest tax base in the state and the citizens need to be listened to.

- Audience member- Asked the those giving public comments to please speak up.

- Applicant comments by Attorney Brion Doyle- This process has been going on for 1 ½ years, 9 meetings. Constructive work has been done to narrow and compromise. No comments on the items submitted last week. Plan is compliant and should be approved with conditions for regulatory approvals.

Deliberation by the PC : Updated Finding of Facts version 8. Noel will abstain from voting as he is new.

Kellogg asked for a recap of mediation agreement by Attorney Lauren Teichner.

Teichner: Mediation agreement requires PC to follow the Zoning Ordinance specifically Article 13 (F)(e). The PC can approve, propose revisions or deny. The approvals can be with conditions. From legal standpoint the approval must be conditioned on regulatory approvals. The PC can no longer judge whether or not the regulatory approvals have been met. Paragraph 8 of mediation settlement agreement relates to regulatory approvals. Read section 8 into the record.

“>>>>”

Kellogg: regarding Section 13.1 (H)(a), applicant’s memo dated November 27th, question about how the PC was interpreting the Finding of Facts section 13.1 H(a), page 14 of the current Finding of Facts.

Teichner: The Zoning ordinance -the criteria must meet 4 items presented in Findings of Fact in order to add the regulatory approval concession. MZEA has broad language about criteria for conditions being allowed. Allowed as set forth by Zoning and Planning Administrator.

Mosher: Conditional approval should be holding true to the 4 criteria of ZO section criteria. They should all hold true.

Teichner: The plain language of this section states that these are criteria that conditions must meet to be placed on any approval.

Beeker: Pg. 15 of v. 8 of Findings of Fact- only comes in with conditional approval?

Mosher: Pgs. 14-15 items 1 through 4. Subitem 3 – conditional approval must meet the ZO criteria. Does this conditional approval meet these 4 criteria?

Grobbe: All relevant standards of the ordinance have been met if there is a conditional approval. When and if we get to the point of scrubbing this ordinance in the future this will need to be addressed as it is a confusing part of the ordinance.

Mosher: to Attorney Lauren Teichner addressing Mr. Popa’s comments on the boat launch. Which part of the ordinance applies to the boat launch? Guidance on accessory use and whether or not this needs to go to ZBA.

Teichner: Public prospective that 13.10 (C) discusses the shoreline alterations for boat launches and development of boat launches is prohibited. Then need to look to uses permitted by right 6.1 (A) and 6.1 (B) for recreational use facilities. Article 5 is for accessory uses. Need to consider if this is an accessory use. 6.1(B) recreational uses- is defined by applicant in case law referenced in memo. PC should consider if these are recreational facilities and whether or not this meets the definition. Any boat launches must consider whether or not these boat launches are prior nonconforming uses. Consider that NG is consolidating 2 boat launches into 1. Consider whether this is an expansion or a reduction of a nonconforming use.

Grobbe: There are 2 current boat launches- whether or not they are conforming. The plan is to Combine this into 1 boat launch with 2 lanes. This needs to be reviewed. Continue as non-conforming use with a smaller footprint. No outside use, no commercial use, internal only to the facility. This overlaps with EGLE.

Beeker: Question for Teichner and/or Grobbel. What does non-conforming use mean?

Grobbel: Non-conforming use is commonly known as grandfathering. It gets to continue until it stops or there is a request to change it. If there is a proposal for something new, then it has to comply with the rules in place at the time. It is unclear here whether it is new here or is it a consolidation of an existing. Grey area on this site plan.

Kellogg: Currently multiple things that don't comply.

Motion by Kellogg to deny application. Beeker seconded the motion.

Grobbel: Suggested that the Findings of Fact should be deliberated before the motion.

Motion withdrawn by Kellogg and Beeker.

Deliberation of new Findings of Fact dated December 2, 2023.

Mosher: Go through previous Findings of Fact to confirm the votes previously entered.

Grobbel: From Applicants Nov 27 memo, version 8. Para 4.4d updated vote but did not update conclusions. In new version of the FOF that has been updated to include the vote and the information.

- Pg 9, number 13, that finding was originally listed as #14 and added language as requested by the PC regarding wastewater and septic treatment in order to cover lot coverage. Mosher correction: Vote 3 to 1 that condition had not met, 1 not in agreement.

Grobbel: Review updated Finding of Fact based on latest submissions. Changes:

- Page 7, under 13.1 requirements for site plan #9 – questions about cabins and glamping units. Need to deliberate and make a decision as to whether this condition has been met, has not been met or has been conditionally met. As we go through the 5 or 6 items the PC needs to deliberate and determine that.

Kellogg: In Zoning Ordinance the definition of building is temporary or permanent. Information provided was not what was asked for. Still looking for information on how far apart these units will be? Section 6.4 in Commercial Resort District states that they must be built not closer than 20 feet apart. Do they conform with the required spacing? Not just about lot coverage but that is definitely a component of it. Several components of this section that are not met, this is not just about lot coverage.

Beeker: Can you help me remember about the 100-year plan and inclusion of that in the lot size?

Grobbel: Do you mean 100-year event of lot coverage and stormwater plan? Perilously close to limit of lot coverage. No clarity from applicant. Can determine if water quality will be maintained for 100 year event. Default to county agency. PC can change to the 100-year event for those standards if based on valid concerns about water quality. Determine amongst yourselves if this has been met. Determine if you have enough information.

Mosher: Clear that total number of structures or units has been met. Additional blue prints show they are in the confines of the pad that they will be built on, so no different than the RVs. Conditional approval based on getting complete information on the number and the placement of the temporary movable glamping units.

Kellogg: No specification as where they will be located on the property and they are moveable. Less movable than an RV, but still moveable. Unit, structure, building that can be moved. If they feel that it shouldn't be counted or does that then fall into a trailer home category. We don't know if they conform to spacing. That information has not been provided. Seems more like a permanent structure. They are units on the property that are not be accounted for in lot coverage or the structures on the schematics. Requested that information and it has not been provided. Clearly has not been met.

Grobbel: Proposed finding 9 existing cabins and 5 glamping units. Applicant claims that they do not qualify as structures as they are not permanent. On November 27 applicant provided floor plans with square footage. Based on the information in front of you has the condition been met, not been met, or conditionally met? State the reasons for that decision.

Beeker: Not met, information that the PC has requested and we have not received it and there are disagreements from the applicant to PC's request for information.

Kellogg: Not met.

Mosher: Conditionally met, with the condition that the specific inventory is provided.

Grobbel: With 3 members voting tonight we will consider that one dealt with.

Grobbel: Page 9, #13 –Location of Water Supply Lines, Wells, including hydrants, wastewater and septic systems. On November 6 the PC found by deliberation and a 3 to 1 vote that information provided regarding update system was not provided as needed to calculate lot coverage and the standard was not met.

Mosher: Lot coverage, we can't anticipate what is going to come back for expanding the lagoon or for a different facility all together. Needs to be accounted for in specifications.

Grobber: Part 41 permit from the State of Michigan, foot print is important. Poor soils. High groundwater. Affluent is meant to be filtered by the soil before it reaches the lake. Ordinance has strong standards for water quality. Information has not been provided. Conceptual design has not been provided.

Kellogg: Has not been met. No conceptual plan has been provided. Feasibility of new type of treatment facility has not been provided or studied.

Becker: Not met.

Mosher: Conditionally met. In favor of allowing regulatory agencies to make the determination.

Grobber: Page 8, #14- Written statements on existing infrastructure including traffic, etc. Applicant provided Oct 16, 2023 impact statement. On Nov 6 PC stated not met as to traffic, wastewater, infrastructure etc. On November 27 applicant provided further information about trees along shoreline, planting more trees then removing. November 27 submission did not address traffic, water quality, wastewater treatment, lighting, wetland impacts and etc. PC should find whether condition has been met, has not been met or conditionally met.

Becker: Not met. Tree removal is a proxy for additional care of the lakeshore, only one facet of protecting water quality. I don't find that they have addressed the impact on the lakeshore, Rice Creek or water quality.

Kellogg: While applicant did provide information on tree removal, they did not address noise, operation information requested regarding events, amplified music, etc. No information was provided on those categories. The hardening of the shoreline with riprap has not been addressed nor have alternatives been explored that are less harmful. Wetland, traffic, etc. Not met.

Mosher: Specificity of impact statement. Wish that there was more facts and numerical information. Not met.

Grobber: page 11, #5 – Site plan shall provide reasonable and visible sound barriers and privacy of occupants. 10/15/2023- applicant states that the zoning ordinance does not require a perimeter buffer. Site plan review response dated 10/16, page 10. On Nov 6- PC determined not met in a 3 to 1 vote. Applicant provided information on 11/27 stating that the lakeshore is not included in the sound privacy requirement. Question is whether or not the lakeshore in terms of noise is an adjacent parcel? Has the condition been met, not been met or conditionally met. State your reasons.

Becker: Lakeshore means that many neighboring parcels are adjacent, due to how sound travels. Not met. Need more assurances for sound baffling. Doing a quick website search of applicant's other campgrounds and the activities they have at other sites, it is concerning that we have not received information on any of those activities.

Mosher: I separate the programming question from the buffering question. Separate programming should be managed through nuisance. Buffering is separate. Others around the lakeshore have cleared their waterfront to preserve their view. Wish there was a requirement regarding shoreline that better protected us. This has been met.

Kellogg: Commercial resort district buffering needs more than a residential property. Limits are placed on the number of events. Information about their events has not been provided. The condition has not been met.

Grobbel: There is not noise or nuisance ordinance in the township.

Mosher: Police power could come into play.

Grobbel: Police power ordinances are retroactive. Vote is 2 to 1 on that standard.

Grobbel: page 11, #2 – landscape in natural condition. On Nov 6 PC voted that the standard had not been met. 2-2 tie, therefore the standard had not been met.

Grobbel: page 12, #6- all buildings or groups of buildings shall be so arranged so that emergency services can access them from all sides. 12 cabanas with permanent roofs along the pools will be placed with 2 to 3 feet between structures. Section 3.5 of the Ordinance- Fire Hazard section states no building or structure may be placed closer than 10 feet. On Nov 6 PC voted 3 to 1 that the standard had not been met. On Nov 27 – the applicant provided information that the cabanas will be combined into 1 structure. Deliberate on that and determine if the standard has been met, has not been met or has conditionally been met.

Kellogg: Why in FOF does it say no closer than 10 feet but FOF says 20 feet? Plus 11 additional cabanas at splash pad- drawing dated 9/12/2023.

Applicant: Doesn't know if there are additional cabanas. Would be fine with condition to combine them into one structure similar to the other for emergency access purposes.

Kellogg: 5 minute break at 8:03.

Break ended at 8:16.

Grobbel: We need to revisit the 2-2 vote. It is not an automatic denial. Will return to that at the end.

Pg. 12, #6- all buildings or groups of buildings shall be so arranged so that emergency services can access them from all sides. Deliberation.

Mosher: Workable solution to have the other 11 cabanas combine into 1. Do the combined structures change anything for the fire department. Conditionally met with all cabanas combined and the new plans reviewed by Fire Dept and EMS to make sure that they have the access that they need with the combined structures.

Becker: Agreed.

Kellogg: Still missing information to say that it has not been met. Conditionally met, also as to the unknown buildings.

Grobbel: 3- conditional approvals.

Grobbel: Page 13, #12- Driveway traffic safety standards of MDOT and county road commission. Applicants state that the Road commission has found the plan acceptable as studied. On Nov 6- PC asked for additional traffic study of impacts. Applicant stated on Nov. 27 that would be a new condition.

Grobbel: MEPA, page 14 based on counsel and the public input. #16 modified for #7 – all site plans should conform to all applicable statutes. Explanation of MEPA, any decision made by state or local governments must consider impact on the environment as protection of the public trust. Must protect from pollution, impairment and destruction. Feasible and prudent alternatives must be considered. Must look at the whole environment. You must consider whether this condition has been met, has not been met or has conditionally been met. MEPA must be read as a supplement to all decisions that a local government makes.

Teichner: Important that the PC talk about facts in evidence to rely on this decision, expert reports, etc. Feasible and prudent alternatives to the project. Look to specifics in the record, if the only evidence in the record is related to regulatory approvals that would need to be left to the regulatory agencies due to the mediation agreement.

Mosher: Is the mediation agreement still germane to this discussion? Both of the lawsuits have been restarted and no decision was made in November.

Teichner: it is not clear whether or not the mediation agreement is still in effect or not. Still operating under the settlement agreement at this time.

Becker: What evidence to look at for MEPA? Evidence as it stands now?

Teichner: Consider what you have in front of you, what you do know or don't know.

Grobbel: "is likely to" is also part of MEPA.

Kellogg: Anything that a regulatory agency is going to look at, we can't consider?

Teichner: If the only evidence that you are looking at is related to a regulatory proceeding that is outside the bounds of the mediation agreement.

Kellogg: Retention ponds and specifically the one that is really close to RICE Creek, is that in our purview?

Grobbel: Yes, that is in your purview for MEPA and other places in the ordinance.

Kellogg: What about riprap at shoreline?

Grobbel: There are alternatives to riprap including biotechnical alternatives.

Beeker: If there are alternatives how does that relate to pollution or impairment or destruction that doesn't have an alternative?

Teichner: If PC finds that there is the likelihood of pollution, impairment or destruction it would be on the Applicant to show that there is no feasible alternative to their project and that their project is consistent with the reasonable requirements of the public health, safety and welfare in order for it to proceed despite that potential impairment, destruction or pollution.

Grobbel: It is a high standard.

Teichner: The protection of public resources is the motivation behind this section.

Beeker: The plan rises to level of likely destruction of the lakeshore, the natural lakeshore providing the benefits that a normal lakeshore typically does, helping with flooding, erosion, ingress and egress of natural species. Can not approve due to MEPA.

Kellogg: Concerns about the retaining pond at the Rice Creek boundary of the property. Installation or location will impair the natural activity of that creek. The hardening of the seawall and the increase to that to over 800 feet will have a negative impact as well on the natural resources. Not familiar with the soils, if they are considered wetlands or how that relates to this. Not met.

Grobbel: Wetlands delineation will be considered by EGLE.

Mosher: Requires a lot of speculation, estimating this is dangerous. Probability of severity is difficult. Hung up on has or likely to. Alternatives to the proposed layout that could move development further from Rice Creek and the lakeshore. Subjective call. Don't feel equipped to make a decision on this.

Grobbel: Use the evidence in front of you. Expert reports. This is statute has a very low standard of certainty.

Teichner: Need vote, can't abstain when only 3 voting.

Mosher: Has been met.

Grobbel: 2-2 vote on Nov 6. Page 11, #2. Need to revisit to break the tie.

Mosher: Has been met.

Beeker: Does septage system factor in here with topographic modifications?

Grobbel: Wastewater treatment system has to be part of the plan. This is over seen by the state and the county. The real issue is the over plan and how much of the soil is being removed. Is it in harmony with the surrounding area?

Kellogg: Conflict with harmony of the area. Not met.

Beeker: Landscape, do we mean vegetation or is it more narrow?

Grobbel: Living things and hardscapes. Ordinance says natural. Meaning the land more than ornamental shrubs.

Beeker: Not met. Not close to natural state.

Grobbel: Back to beginning. Motion to approve, deny or conditionally approve.

Kellogg: Motion to deny application, multiple outstanding items not in compliance with the ZO. Beeker seconds the motion, and agree with the rationale.

Deliberation on the motion.

Beeker: We have spent a lot of time and deliberation on this and I don't necessarily want to spend more time on this. I am not sure that we will be able to resolve the issues in the future.

Kellogg: Agree, can only deliberate and get information in our meetings. Applicant still has not provided all of the requested information. Does it fit the community, the environment, the master plan? Plenty of clarity in the ZO to move forward with the denial. The applicant can reapply with an application that fits better in the future. It is more about the scope and the harmony and the negative impact on the environment. Approval as is would set precedent and change the scope of our Township. Clearly shows that it does not meet the current ordinance.

Mosher: Our role is not to deny development or to promote development but rather to guide development. This process has shown weaknesses with the ZO. The ZO does not allow for enabling the Master Plan. The ZO needs more clarity to allow PC to do their job and to support the community and the applicant. Concerns with plan, scope of the project. Wish that it was pushed off the water further. Can only speculate on impact. Conditional approval.

Roll call for motion to deny:

Kellogg: In favor

Beeker: Yay

Mosher: Nay

Grobber: 2 to 1 vote to deny the application. No further deliberation and no conditions at this point. Applicant can bring forward a new application. This can be removed from old business.

- **PC review of goals/action items for future**
 - Vice chair position open, if interested in opening contact Lindy Kellogg. 3 applications already. Recommendation/ nomination will be made to the Township board, applications turned in by Dec.22 to be presented at the January 10th Twp Board meeting.
 - Mosher is heading up committee on STR. 14-15 interested citizens. Part of the group is doing an inventory of current STR. Second group is studying other STR ordinances from other townships, etc. Findings presented in the spring.
 - Inventory special uses and sensitive land areas. Identify areas in the township with special uses or features, both ecologically and businesses.
 - Continue housekeeping updates on ZO.
- **New Business:**
 - Discussion of potential moratorium on site plan applications

Kellogg: discussions with legal team regarding updating the ZO. With new applications always coming in updating the ZO gets pushed to the side. Considering a moratorium on new site plan applications.

Bielaczyk: Is this moratorium immediately in effect? What about current application?

Kellogg: Immediate. Updated ZO to be completed in 6 months. New Amoritas application would be part of moratorium.

Mosher: Can this be done with more than 1 meeting a month?

Grobbel: 6 month maximum, schedule meetings as often as possible, following OMA, probably 2 meetings/month (1 regular, 1 special meeting with updating the ZO as the only the agenda item). Must meet objective to restructure ZO. Six month maximum but it can be less.

Beeker: Is it possible to reach out to other townships to seek coherence with others?

Grobbel: That is the intention.

Kellogg: Some updates were begun prior to Northgate application.

Mosher: ZO process?

Grobbel: Public meetings and public comment, a final draft gets county review and comments, then make recommendations to Twp Board, TB then will vote to adopt it. It takes months.

Beeker: Best method of communication to share research with the public? How to get information from public more quickly?

Grobbel: Deliberation must be in front of the public. The public can give input at any time. Deliberation and recognition of it should be in the minutes.

MOTION: Kellogg made the motion to ask the Twp Board to adopt a resolution placing a temporary six month moratorium on the review, consideration and approval of site planning applications so that we can work on updating our Zoning Ordinance during that time. I also move that we direct Legal to draft the resolution and to include any litigation required exceptions to the moratorium that they recognize would be in the best interest of the township. Mosher seconded the motion. Unanimous.

- Amoritas/Under Canvas- Site Plan Presentation, Pre-Application Process

Introductions- Petra Kuenhis, Landscape Architect with Mansfield Land Use Consultants-
Agtourism Zoning

Property Owners-Emily Goodell and brother Matt Goodell. Kaitlin and Richard from Undercanvas.

Goodell family purchased the property on Amor Road in 2011. Vineyard and a farm. Property was wild. 148 acres, approximately 50 acres being used for production, including barns, etc. No homestead. Expressed the need for this project to help make farming more sustainable in the current economic climate.

Kuenhis stated that they were under the impression that they were at the PC meeting for a public hearing. Keunhis reviews the regulatory approvals and the site plan. Already permitted driveway. Zoned agricultural. Fits with the agricultural tourism and eco-tourism in the Master Plan.

Undercanvas sites- 75 tents, Kaitlin Collin- real estate and Richard- construction. Tents will be in place from March to October season, tents come down in the winter. Occasional events- large events require buyout of the entire site, weddings, quiet hours is at 10pm, tents are spaced 75 feet apart, Liquor license – will need to get retail license. On-site well and septic – completed by county.

Public comment:

Steve Hamilton- Twp resident, importance of decision. First proposal, won't be the last. Violates the master plan. Sets precedent. So many places in the Twp that these could be proposed for. Appreciate moratorium. Update Master Plan too.

James Hollaman- next door to Amoritas. Opposed to proposal. Concerned about impact and land values. Speaking out against development but not the family. Has easement through Goodell property. Concerned with fire danger.

Michelle Uhaze- rural space, open space, rural character. Exception to this.

Jim Carpenter- letter on behalf of Darlene Doorlag, Centerville Twp. Opposed. Tent City. How is this agritourism? Drunks on rural road. Frontage on Amor Road, road in terrible condition, told no money to fix Amor Road. Gravel road. Drain on utilities and infrastructure. How can staff when every place is understaffed?

Emma Rosi- on Amor Road, concerned about precedent. Believes application is incomplete. Where will they house 90 employees? Employee Housing not in plan. Laundry facilities not in plan. Failed to describe the storage that will be needed to store tents seasonally. 200 car trips per day- gravel road with few car trips per day. 200 car trips per day does not include employees. Is the kind of development that we want to see on agricultural lands?

Bill Uhaze- husband of Michelle. Borders Amoritas. Drive, bike or walk the road. Noise, smoke from wood burning fires, affecting way of life. Loss of evergreens. Who will monitor this resort? Trespassers? Dangerous precedent.

Barkley Welch- should not be considered, false information. Noise, air and light pollution. Direct violation of Master Plan. Negative impacts.

Johanna Sheldon- walks Amor Road. Degree in agriculture. Grim reality that farming in Leelanau Co is not sustainable. Agritourism is a future for farmers. This is an option to keep one parcel of agriculture land. Need to do something so that we don't lose all of our agricultural land.

Mike Foremasano- worked with farmers, cherry farmers. Lots of farms going out of business, replaced with housing developments.

Carrie Onon- to farmers in audience. How are other farmers throughout the country dealing with this? Maintain rural nature. How do we keep farming as a community? Can we come together as a community to help farmers to farm?

Nicole – on Amor Road. Saying you have met requirements does not make it so. Doesn't fit agritourism. Draw attention to Section c- limits of provisions. Alcohol providers not considered under agritourism. Does agritourism ordinance apply to a vineyard? Concerned about resolution?

PC Questions:

Mosher: Proposed amenity area? Size, area? Communal firepit managed by staff?

Kellogg: Events-capacity? How often? Where on property? All guests to event staying on property? Is there a cap on number of guests?

Grobbel: What brought you to Centerville Twp?

Mosher: Did you approach Under Canvas or vice versa? What do you see as the agricultural part of the tourism?

Emily Goodell: When we started and tried to get a vineyard and bottling facility we used Mansfield and maintained a relationship. Mansfield introduced them to Under Canvas. As to agritourism- depends on liquor control commission. Depends on separation between bottling facility and retail. Vineyard tours, currently do vineyard tours but it is difficult. Harvest days- have more people involved in harvest in October.

Grobbel: Whose alcohol will you sell?

Kaitlin: Full liquor license, couldn't sell Amoritas. Lease approvable by MLCC and then separate liquor license.

Kellogg: Goodell family not involved in operations, just leasing?

Mr. Goodell: We would be involved in the agritourism part of it.

Kaitlin: Could have a farm table dinner that could be hosted by Amoritas. Try to use all local products.

Grobber: what is relationship between Amoritas and Under Canvas? Lease and liability.

Emily Goodell: new drift management plans and increased communication.

Grobber: can you provide lease?

Kaitlin: No.

Kellogg: where is Under Canvas doing the farming to be considered agritourism? Separation between Amoritas and Under Canvas so how agritourism?

Mosher: Does the lease allow – is there a right of assignment? If Under Canvas is sold is there a way to keep restrictions?

Kellogg: With development, tent areas, tree loss? How much? Where is the firewood coming from?

Kaitlin: Selective, minimal trees cut down for tent placement.

Kellogg: shortage of firewood in county.

Emily Goodell: forest management plan in place, not as firewood.

Grobber: should have publicly noticed site plan visit.

Public Comment

Mike Foremasano-keep in mind that Emily and Matt are people and consider them too.

Michelle Uhaze- need to know details of lease.

Mr. Uhaze- Light colored area is?

Grobbel: Tree removal and grading to put in driveway

Petra: Yes, tree removal, grading and storm water containment all needed and approved.

Mosher: If no moratorium, next meeting could be public hearing in February or special meeting.

Kellogg: Next meeting is February 5, 2024.

Mosher: Thank you to Tim Johnson for his 28 years of service and 25 years as the Chair. Get involved. Owe a great deal of gratitude.

Minutes amended on February 5, 2024, to reflect review and incorporation of the amended Final Version 9 of the Findings of Fact dated December 5, 2024.

x. **Adjournment**

MOTION: Kellogg moves to Adjourn at 10:48 pm. Seconded by Beeker. Unanimously approved.

Respectfully Submitted,

Karla Gerds
Acting Recording Secretary