

**KASSON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
**Monday, February 19, 2024 7:00 p.m.**  
**Kasson Township Hall, 10988 S. Newman Road, Maple City, MI 49664**

**Minutes**

1. Call Meeting to Order/Pledge of Allegiance  
Chairman Lanham called the meeting to order at 7:00pm with the Pledge of Allegiance.
2. Roll Call of Commissioners and Staff/Recognition of Visitors
  - A. Present: Chairman – Mike Lanham; Zoning Board of Appeals- Dave Noonan; Vice Chairman- Jerry Roush; Secretary T Eftaxiadis; Township Board Rep- Tad Carter  
Absent: None
  - B. Staff: Tim Cypher, Zoning Administrator; Marsha Wolf, Recording Secretary
  - C. Visitors present: approximately 8 visitors
3. Consideration of Agenda: Additions or Corrections  
**Chairman Lanham asked for a motion to approve the agenda as presented. Roush moved to approve the agenda as presented; T Eftaxiadis seconded. All present in favor, motion carried.**
4. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest- None
5. Approval of Minutes – January 15, 2024  
Lanham requested clarification on January minutes page 5 regarding Sleeping Bear Investments sign and if it is currently within ordinance. Cypher advised it does not currently meet standards. Lanham requested January minutes to be updated to match corresponding agenda numbers. January minutes were updated appropriately.  
**Chairman Lanham asked for a motion to accept the minutes as amended for January 15, 2024 meeting. Noonan moved to approve the minutes as amended for January 15, 2024; Roush seconded. Carter abstained from approving due to being absent for January 15, 2024 meeting. All remaining present in favor, motion carried.**
6. Correspondence Received -  
Cypher advised he will address correspondences during the public hearing.

7. General Public Comment – None

8. Area Reports

- A. Chairperson – Commissioner Lanham – No Report
- B. Secretary – Secretary Eftaxiadis – Advised the continuation of public hearing was posted as required.
- C. Township Board – Commissioner Carter – No Report
- D. Zoning Board of Appeals – Commissioner Noonan - No Report
- E. Zoning Administrator’s Report – ZA Cypher – January 2024 was sent out on February 10, 2024. With January 15, 2024 minutes being approved, Cypher will reach out to Elmers with renewal permits that were approved last month. Cypher completed 4 construction site inspections. The pending yard clean-up is on-going and good progress is being made. Cypher received 16 phone calls and 9 emails.

9. Old Business

- A. Sleeping Bear Storage -Public Hearing- Continuation from January 15, 2024 meeting
  
- B. Close regular meeting and open Public Hearing  
**Chairman Lanham asked for a motion to open the Public Hearing for Sleeping Bear Storage continuation. Carter moved to open the continuation of the Public Hearing for Sleeping Bear Storage, Eftaxiadis seconded. All present in favor, motion carried.**
  
- C. Continuation of Sleeping Bear Storage Public Hearing  
Lanham advised the January 15, 2024 meeting addressed first 4 sections of the public hearing process, and PC Discussion with staff will begin. Cypher requested public comment to be allowed prior to the discussion with staff. Board approved to have public comment prior to discussion with staff.

1. Public Comment:

Mark Patterson, 3800 W. Empire Hwy. Red Barn. Referred to site plan and asked how big the building on the west side is. Exhibit F says 165 ft, but site plan shows 220 ft. Addressed no trees are showing on site plan on the west side and asked if that was still the plan. Patterson addressed the slope on west side and asked if it was a 50% slope on final site plan since it will affect the type of shrubbery to be planted.

Butch Wilbert, 3993 W. Gilbert Hwy. Concerns on changing the facility from the original site plan and the decision on expanding from the original plan. The wind blows dirt onto the southern windows of the resident's home. Concerns on the size of the screening used on the back of the property and asked if the berm will still be there. Concerns on the trees that will be planted and the time it will take for growth.

Libby Western, Sleeping Bear Bed & Breakfast. Concerns on township on times of construction. Last time construction was conducted, they worked all night long. There are pictures showing work being conducted at 2:30 am with bright lights hitting resident's homes. Construction will impact guests experience with lights and noise, so she would like to know if hours of construction will be limited and flood lights concerns will be addressed with contractors. In regards to previous comment that storage area will increase to property value, would like to know how that was determined. Western researched storage units and how far customers travel, advised that is typically a 3-5-mile range with less than 20% traveling further than that. Advised there is sufficient storage in the area already. Western would like less comment from the applicant on how beautiful the facility will be because the only beautiful storage unit is one you cannot see. Mentioned Empire is the gateway to the dunes, and hopes the value of the area is not affected.

Dean Western, 11977 S. Gilbert. Concerns on trees and Krause was going to put in Evergreens. Stated other Kasson Township commercial buildings have a screen of trees. Concerns with lights and loud noise and dawn to dusk access with the facility abutting a residential neighborhood. If there is no access, there does not need to be any lights but motion sensors lighting. Height needs to be limited keep horizon. Questions retention pond for runoff vs. tension pond that would drain. Addressed noise and climate control. HVAC runs at 70-90 decibels, similar to the noise level of a motorcycle. An industrial generator can go up to 115 decibels, similar to the noise level of a siren. Concerns of fire hazard and self-storage facilities requiring a sprinkler system required by Michigan building code.

John Younkens, 3987 W Gilbert Farm Lane. Concerns of conversation not reflected in previous minutes regarding access after dusk and that gates would automatically lock at dusk. Advised what is heard verbally makes it into amended approved document.

## 2. Applicant Response to Public Comment:

Jen Aragon received 5-6 letters and will respond to the items addressed. Advised retention pond needs to be there per Steve Christianson permit. Commented area is sandy and great for filtration, there should be no standing water. Concerns with erosion and sediment control and that MDOT approved the project per the new proposal. The fire department signed off with no concerns. District health has also signed off as proposed. Drain commissioner current SESC is sufficient. In regards to access, they do not plan to have 24hr access. Applicant proposed to have gate for proposed hours of 6am-10pm. Motion sensors as previously discussed will only be activated when someone visits and advised the statistic is people visit the storage typically every 4-6 months. The downlight proposed is on the south end M72 to light front of road. Trees will be 2-inch caliber pines, 4-5 ft high with 2 rows staggered. Applicants hired landscaping company. Elected to do a fence along the whole perimeter, proposing cedar fence on 3 sides to make more aesthetically pleasing and block view of storage facility. Lighting has been addressed with contractor and after-hours work, and should have been an isolated incident when they were pouring concrete. Plan is based of 6.44 acre, they have 6.99 acres, hence the changes.

## 3. PC Discussion with Staff:

Cypher: Received 2 letters late in day that were not presented for review to Commissioners due to time of submission. Advised Jim Lively who owns the campground, sent an email (Attachment A) to Cypher to support the project. Lively noted concerns of night sky and landscaping is adequate to represent the township in a good way. Cypher commented that neighbors are in the commercial district and private arrangements or verbal agreements previously stated by Krause, unless deed restricted in which Cypher could find no record, it makes it difficult for the township to enforce previous agreements. Cypher advised Dean Western concerns (Attachment B) addressed in public comment were received in email and will be forwarded to commissioners to review.

Libby Western sent letter (Attachment C) to Cypher with questions on how many trees, distance between, size, trees location, lighting, hours of construction. Neighborly courtesy addressed in Libby Western later, Cypher advised excavators tend to work later when weather allows. In addressing Libby Westerns concern of glamping area on southeast side the B&B being impacted. Cypher advised there are general standards the state affords due to the limited building season.

Cypher received a letter from Hughthir White (Attachment D) 12745 S. Trememos Rd. Empire. White hopes there will be site blockage, trees planted, dawn to dusk construction access. Addressed concerns of proposed height of building going from 12ft to 22ft. Cypher commented ordinance allows building height up to 35 ft.

Cypher received a letter (Attachment E) from Gabriel Griffith of 3550 W Empire Hwy. Concerns of property values going down with commercial structures. Suggested set hours of operation, natural barrier on all signs, appropriate lighting, height of proposed building staying at 12 ft. and rethink retention pond. Cypher advised the retention pond is a requirement.

Cypher received letter from Doug Turrill and Calla Werle (Attachment F) in regards of concerns for night light, buildings max height of 12 ft. being retained, no 24-hour access, confirmation that lighting is down lighting and concerns for the retention pond.

Cypher received a letter (Attachment G) from Rebecca Lessard, 13035 S Green Trail. Concerns on the expansion include lighting, limited access, concern of someone living in storage units, building color, building height and required landscaping. Cypher advised someone living in a storage unit would never happen as part of the lease requirement and zoning requirements.

Cypher received a letter (Attachment H) from Mark Patterson that was summarized in public comment.

Tad Carter questioned if the facility and the neighboring properties are in a commercially zoned district, Cypher advised the Red Barn and the Bed and Breakfast are commercially zoned. Carter asked if there was anything in this commercially zoned district that this proposal would be in violation of. Cypher advised that from his perspective there is no violation, unless proved otherwise when findings of fact are reviewed. Carter asked in commercial zoning is there a requirement for trees, landscaping, etc. Cypher advised individual property owners can put screening up. Being good neighbor and ordinance in zoning is the only thing that can be enforced by the township. Lanham advised there is a minimum that will be advised in the findings of fact. Cypher advised the commission can make suggestions but conditions that are placed on the approval that are over and above the zoning ordinance should come directly from the applicants.

T Eftaxiadis confirmed Building H is 220x40. T asked what the slope of the elevation of west slope is. Cypher advised approximately 5-10 ft. T asked if there were sprinkler requirements. Cypher said there is a county building code that if required the code office will make determination. Cypher advised the

code office is hesitant to do a code review without the township approval first, but the fire chief did not mention a need for sprinklers.

#### 4. Findings of Fact:

Cypher advised the findings of fact (Attachment I) have not been updated yet from the new submittals and the applicant has requested a modification.

Cypher reviewed findings of fact and asked commissioners to respond with questions/concerns/discussion as follows:

Section 7.5B: Cypher advised the site plan will need to be updated with date, security gate and fence.

Section 7.7B: Cypher stated he reached out to the assessor and was advised that market values were increasing, even when located next to a commercial property. In regards to the screening and buffering, Lanham asked if the applicants proposal met the or exceeded the current ordinance. Cypher advised they are consistent with what the standards are. Lanham suggested protecting the west side of the property with more than a fence to include adding Conifer trees for visual effect and dust collection. Discussion among commissioners included determination on size and location of trees. Eftaxiadis commented that the south side of the property shows 7 maple trees that will take a long time to grow and will not provide screening in winter. Roush asked if the commission can impose a higher standard or requirement to the ordinance, Cypher advised yes, but the commission should be careful requesting above and beyond the standard, although this situation is unique as a special land use. Commissioners agreed that the Conifer trees around the property should be minimum of 6 ft. with the option of with a single row 12-15 feet apart, or 2 staggered rows with 20 foot spacing. The Commissioners agreed that the applicant may put up a fence but it will not be required due to the requirement of trees. Commissioners discussed timing of planting trees and determined the trees should be planted by June 1st. Eftaxiadis suggested adding prohibitions to the lease for disposing of liquids from storage vehicles/boats out of concern of contaminants in the retention ponds. The applicant advised they would provide a lease to the board for review. Additional Discussion: Commissioners agreed that hours of operation and accessibility should be dawn to dusk year-round.

**Lanham asked for a motion to approve with/without conditions or deny the Sleeping Bear Storage Amended Special Land Use Permit. Eftaxiadis motioned to approve the application for Sleeping Bear Storage Amended Land Use Permit with conditions discussed in finding of fact. Carter seconded. Roll call vote: Noonan (yes), Eftaxiadis (yes), Roush (yes), Lanham (yes) Carter (yes). All present in favor, motion carried.**

D: Close Public Hearing and resume regular meeting

**Lanham asked for a motion to close the public hearing for the Sleeping Bear Storage Amended Special Use Permit. Carter moved to close the public hearing; Eftaxiadis seconded. All present in favor, motion carried.**

e. Zoning Ordinance Amendments for PC Review  
No review at this time

10. New Business

A. Zoning Ordinance

Commissioner Lanham suggested a review of the ordinance.

Commissioners agreed to address the review at the next meeting.

11. General Public Comment - None

12. Comments from the Commissioners – None

13. Next Meeting: Monday, March 18, 2024; Kasson Township Hall

14. Adjournment

**Chairman Lanham asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Eftaxiadis moved to adjourn the meeting; Noonan seconded. All present in favor, motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 8:51 pm.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Marsha Wolf  
Kasson Township Recording Secretary

## Attachment A

---

**From:** Jim Lively <[jim@thelivelyfarm.com](mailto:jim@thelivelyfarm.com)>  
**Date:** Monday, February 19, 2024 at 12:58 PM  
**To:** Tim Cypher <[tim@allpermits.com](mailto:tim@allpermits.com)>  
**Subject:** Kasson storage units

Hi Tim-

This is a quick note to comment on changes to SUP for storage units across from our place on M-72 in Kasson Twp.

I have no concerns about another building, footprint, etc. I hope the landscaping plan doesn't change, as the last plan looked good to me.

My only issue is to continue to ensure we maintain a dark night sky. If storage unit customers are allowed in after dark, I hope lights would be on motion sensors and go out without movement; also, lights should be shielded down when they are on.

New owners seem to be very understanding and cooperative. Good luck tonight.

- Jim Lively

3805 W. Empire Highway

---

DRAFT



## Attachment B

Dear Kasson Township,

I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed modification to the self-storage units on 72.

1. **Notification:** I have heard from multiple local residents that they were not notified by mail of the meeting and proposed changes. Which does not give people adequate time to research their questions and concerns (and therefore favors the non-resident developer over the local residents). I suggest that the meeting be postponed until all the area residents have proper time to research their questions and provide concerns.
2. **Quality/skillset of the Developers:**
  - a. In their handout, bullet point 3 states: *"To be financially feasible, and to make this a Class A facility, we needed to add..."*
    - i. If the property was not financially feasible based on 6.44 acres and 7 buildings, then why did they purchase it. This calls into question not only their financial acumen at that time, but also their ability to financially manage the property in the future if they are unable to analyze basic projections of revenues and expenses.
    - ii. A "Class A" self-storage is generally defined in the industry as:  
*"Class A self-storage properties represent the highest quality facilities in their market and MSA. These are generally newer properties built within the last 15 years with relatively low vacancy rates. Class A self-storage facilities have prime locations within their market and typically command the highest rent with little or no deferred maintenance issues.*  
It is thus noted that a Class A facility is not dependent on "additional" buildings, nor does it need to include boat/rv storage, nor climate-controlled units. Therefore, for the developers to say that their request will make the property a "Class A" facility, is inaccurate at best and disingenuous at worst.
3. **Future deforestation plans:** Exhibit A states "We will plant trees, both beautifying the area and providing important natural resources."
  - a. It was my understanding that the planting of trees was an original requirement. So, do they intend to plant more than was required? If so, what are these "additional" trees they intend to plant that will "beautify the area"?
  - b. The definition of natural resource is "materials or substances occurring in nature which can be exploited for economic gain". Therefore, this raises the question, do they intend to cut down and sell the trees they plant in the future for economic gain?Both these points make me question what they plan to do. Or question if they are just insincerely trying to portray themselves in a favorable light.

4. **Aesthetics:** Note that the other nearby storage facilities took into account their surrounding environment when choosing their design materials.

a. Manitou self-storage:

Note the tan & green color scheme which blends with the surrounding environment:



b. Glen Lake Storage:

Note the tan & green color scheme with brown roofs. Which all are in keeping with the surrounding area. Also, worthy of note, the distance from Benzonia Hwy. Plus the mature trees creating a visual buffer.



c. Glen Lake Storage Recreational Condominiums:

Note the choices the developer used with red and green color schemes in keeping with the surrounding area. Also of note, Note the mature trees buffering the property.



d. Glen Craft Marine Boat Storage:

A predominant green color scheme. Which blends with the surrounding area. Also of note, is the multiple layers of pine trees which help the aesthetics of the area. So that instead of a visitor thinking they are in an “industrial/warehouse” township they are in a beautiful rural area.



By contrast the “Sleepy Bear Investments” has made no similar consideration to their surroundings as they have chosen a bright blue color which is not reflective of the area. And appear to have instead (what can only be assumed) either a) chosen the lowest cost colors showing which implies that they choose personal profits over being good neighbors, or b) did not care at all what color was utilized which also lends credence to the consideration that they are not good neighbors as they gave no thought to the area. And if they are not “good neighbors” now then it is safe to assume that they will not be “good neighbors” in the future.

One last point on aesthetics. I recall being at the original approval meeting when Mr. Krause stated that his other storage properties “have won awards for how attractive they are”. I distinctly recollect this because I have worked in commercial real estate for over two decades and have never heard of there being “awards” for attractive self-storage. I also well recall someone on the planning board being impressed and that this was “good to know”. Given what has been built to date I would now like to ask the board (no disrespect intended, though sarcasm is acknowledged) what “awards” do they think this facility will be winning.

5. **Safety/Topography:** if they expand their property to the west and remove more of the slope this has the potential to jeopardize the safety of the residents to the west. As their driveway borders that side. Has an engineering study been done to show that the property to the west will be unaffected?

If an engineering study is not performed and the neighboring property is affected due to changes that destabilize the slope) will the developer, or township, or planning board be subject to civil liability. And God forbid someone were hurt because the neighboring property or driveway is destabilized would the developer, township, or planning board be subject to criminal liability?

---

6. **Sewer & Retention Pond:** This was never in the original proposal. A Sewer and retention pond presents a number of questions and concerns including:

- a. The proposal makes no mention of how said "sewer & retention pond" will be maintained.
  - i. Will it be lined to prevent seepage? Proposal does not address this.
  - ii. Will it be filled with sewage? It is labeled as a "sewer & retention pond". Again, the proposal does not address this.
- b. A permanent pond of water (the definition of a retention pond) creates a breeding ground for mosquitoes. And a location for nuisance animals to take residence. There is nothing in the proposal for how it will be designed to prevent this from transpiring. Nor what type of regular maintenance will be proposed to prevent said problems from developing. Will there be a fence around this sewer & retention pond? Will they use chemicals to prevent unwanted plants and mosquitoes? Without knowledge of the pesticides, insecticides, or herbicides to be used how will the surrounding residents be assured that the groundwater not become contaminated by unknown chemicals. Who would be liable in such a circumstance if the groundwater was poisoned\*. I understand if this sounds alarmist. But to make no verbal mention of a "sewer & retention pond" other than to just draw it on the site map, within a few hundred feet of surrounding residences, and have no accompanying information is worthy of alarm.

*\*Regarding a Sewer pond - Per the University of Missouri: "Drinking water contaminated with sewage can cause health problems such as diarrhea, nausea, cramps, dysentery and hepatitis." Of note the latter two are life-threatening illnesses.*

7. **Signage:** An internally lit sign: wow, I am astounded this is even being proposed. I mean talk about something not in keeping with the surrounding area. It would be stand out like a sore thumb. And would set a horrible precedent for what is otherwise a more naturally designed signage landscape. To even propose such a request reflects someone who has not visited the area and considered what would be in keeping with the immediate area.

Please consider nearby signage: Almost all are wood, notably small, and simply designed.





8. **Lighting:** One final point. I would encourage the planning commission to propose that any property lighting not only be downward/nightsky but also to only be motion activated. As the property was approved for only dusk to dawn access. There would be no need for lighting to be on all night long. And this would help maintain a “rural” tranquil environment.

Thank you,

Deane & Elizabeth Western – Kasson Township Residents

---

Attachment C

Questions for Kasson Township Feb 19th 2024 meeting

Why is a retention pond needed, could you instead have a detention pond?

How many trees? Distance between? What size?

Where will these trees be planted?

I do not feel we have a clear understanding.

What kind of lighting will be used? It is stated that  
"Flood lights have been addressed with contractors."

This I believe has not been well defined.

What are the hours of construction 8 am - 6 pm? 7 am - 7 pm?

As we have witnessed, they have worked past 2 am.

Where we have been subjected to bright lights and loud beeping  
from trucks backing up.

I ask because we have a Glamping area on the south east side of our property.

The months that they will be working on this project will impact us.

If this property was not financially feasible as it was, why did you purchase it?

Why was a new survey needed? After the project started.

---

## Attachment D

Monday, February 19, 2024 at 13:14:36 Eastern Standard Time

---

**Subject:** Storage units on M72 at Gilbert Rd  
**Date:** Sunday, February 18, 2024 at 9:19:22 PM Eastern Standard Time  
**From:** Hughthir White <hughthir000@centurytel.net>  
**To:** tim@allpermits.com <tim@allpermits.com>

Hi Tim,

Writing to you to let you know i share concerns regarding several issues related to these storage units.

I would not like to see this place lighted up every night. I love the dark sky. I have neighbors who reside real close to these units and know it will be an awful nuisance to have these lights on each and every night.

I as well certainly hope that some sort of sight blockage can be made, such as trees planted.... to ease the eyesore that these storage units create.

If i understand right, originally it was supposed to be "from dawn to dusk" hours of operation. How can this now be overlooked?

Also the height of the buildings? Original proposal for 12', yet now proposing 22'?

I am further back down Gilbert Road and into the woods. By i will be driving by this environment every day, and night, and i want my good neighbors to remain in an environment that is not unnecessarily harming to their peace of mind.

I certainly hope you take my concerns to heart!

Thank-you!

Hughthir White  
12745 S. Temenos Rd  
Empire MI 49630

231 357 7446

---

## Attachment E

Monday, February 19, 2024 at 13:14:59 Eastern Standard Time

---

**Subject:** Storage Units on M72  
**Date:** Monday, February 19, 2024 at 9:03:04 AM Eastern Standard Time  
**From:** Gabe Griffith <griff.gabe@gmail.com>  
**To:** tim@allpermits.com <tim@allpermits.com>

To whom it may concern,

We are the occupants of 3550 W Empire Hwy. My wife and I moved into our home two years ago from a large city in search of peace and solitude. The amount of development we've seen in our area during this time has been staggering.

It's disheartening to see beautiful fields being transformed into self storage hell scapes. I can't help but wonder how this is affecting our property value.

Alas, the damage has already begun; however I would like to do my part to minimize the impact this development has on myself as well as my community.

A few things that could help make the unattractive cubes somewhat tolerable would be:

- Set hours of operation (NOT 24hr access)
- Adequate natural visual barrier from all sides (multilayered and staggered evergreen screening)
- Lighting (NOT dust to dawn, consider the light pollution it'd be creating!)
- Height was proposed at 12' buildings, let's stick to the original proposal
- Please re-think the retention pond - they're unattractive, a breeding ground for mosquitoes, unpleasant odors, and without proper maintenance water quality will plummet.

--  
Gabriel Griffith  
614-717-5136

---



## Attachment F

Monday, February 19, 2024 at 13:15:21 Eastern Standard Time

---

**Subject:** Storage units, M-72 and Gilbert Rd. - Concerns  
**Date:** Monday, February 19, 2024 at 9:44:09 AM Eastern Standard Time  
**From:** Doug Turrill <turrilld@gmail.com>  
**To:** tim@allpermits.com <tim@allpermits.com>  
**CC:** deanewestern@gmail.com <deanewestern@gmail.com>

Morning Mr. Cypher,

I am writing to express our concern about the new proposals regarding the storage units. A year ago at the Kasson Township meeting the previous owner of the property and project head had stated the following. There would be no night lighting of the property nor would there be 24 hour access by renters of the storage units. In addition, the buildings would have a maximum height of 12 feet. The current new owners proposal would now include night lighting, 24 hour access by renters, and buildings with 22 foot heights.

Any type of lighting, "down lighting" or otherwise, contributes to night sky pollution for those inhabitants of the area. Lighting is also unnecessary with dawn to dusk access only which again, was part of the original proposal. We are also concerned that trees of substantial height, 6 feet or taller, be planted in a staggered way along the north, south and west sides of the property to obscure sight of the rental units. Units should also not exceed the original 12 feet so that planted trees can, within a few years, block sight of the buildings.

We are also not sure why a retention pond is needed. Ponds such as that breed mosquitos. We live directly 250 yards directly north of the rental units, on the north side of Gilbert Farm road. All of the new proposals would negatively affect us as well as our neighbors.

We ask your attention and consideration to our concerns.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely,  
Doug Turrill and Calla Werle

---

## Attachment G

Monday, February 19, 2024 at 13:15:43 Eastern Standard Time

---

**Subject:** proposed storage units expansion  
**Date:** Monday, February 19, 2024 at 11:54:44 AM Eastern Standard Time  
**From:** rebecca lessard <rlessard2020@gmail.com>  
**To:** tim@allpermits.com <tim@allpermits.com>  
**CC:** deanewestern@gmail.com <deanewestern@gmail.com>, ewester17@gmail.com <ewester17@gmail.com>

Tim and the Kasson Township planning commissioners,

I wish to express my strong concerns about the proposed expansion of the new storage units off of hwy 72 and ask that the commission please consider the following:

1. The requirement of no outside lighting installed. These storage units should not be accessible after dusk, thus no exterior lighting is necessary which will prevent any additional light pollution of our night sky. This limited access would also hopefully discourage folks from moving into their storage units as temporary housing.
2. The blue color is so obtrusive! The existing storage units to the east, colored redwood and green, at least blend and fit into the existing surroundings. Please have the developer consider a different color than that hideous blue.
3. Mandatory landscaping that would include new tree plantings with trees no less than 12 feet in height, shrubbery and berms
4. No new storage units built that would exceed the 12 foot height, as originally proposed.

Thank you for taking the time to consider these concerns,

respectfully,

Rebecca Lessard  
13035 south greenway trail  
empire, mich. 49630

---

## Attachment H

---

**From:** mjd Patterson <[mjdpatterson@gmail.com](mailto:mjdpatterson@gmail.com)>  
**Date:** Monday, February 19, 2024 at 1:32 PM  
**To:** [tim@allpermits.com](mailto:tim@allpermits.com) <[tim@allpermits.com](mailto:tim@allpermits.com)>  
**Subject:** Re: 12.12.2023\_Draft\_Modification of Development Site Plan\_Kasson\_3722\_Sleeping Bear Storage[31].pdf

Dear Tim and Kasson Township Planning Commission,

I appreciate your time and consideration of our concerns in regards to concerns with the Sleeping Bear storage units latest plans:

1. In review of the newly submitted plans it does not show any trees aligning the property to the West as promised by Mr. Aragon in the meeting in January. We are a Mixed use facility with residential and commercial together. In the last meeting Mr. Aragon said he would put trees as a buffer along our property line and none are shown on this new plan. We would also like to make sure that there is a berm along with the trees to address any possible erosion issues that his cutting into the hill has created. If he is trying to be a good neighbor this plan does not reflect those sentiments. The trees along the property line will not only buffer our property from the unsightly large buildings but will provide a visual buffer for the bed and breakfast to our West. Their guests sit out back and used to have a beautiful view of pasture and will now be looking at the back of a metal structure. The tree buffer would greatly help as promised by Mr. Aragon.

Also speaking to the tree buffer on our side. It was previously agreed to by Tom Kraus and should have been conveyed as a stipulated item to the Aragon's. It was in our purchase agreement when we purchased our property that trees would be put along our property line if and when a storage unit facility was put in..

The plans are VERY VAGUE with the trees that they are showing. Two rows of pines.. What size - width/height? Will they have irrigation so that they don't die? What are the plans if the trees or vegetation start to die? Is there a replacement guarantee or will they just leave them and not replace them? The plans leave so much to interpretation and do not give enough specifics.

We are also very concerned with the erosion along with the visual issues. The trees and berm will help mitigate both of these issues and we would appreciate this being part of the plan requirements. I am proposing a higher berm and trees as outlined on the north side of the property as a way to solve the possible erosion issues. The roots of the trees will help to maintain the erosion of the hill and avoid any issues with the deterioration of the setback.

---

This is a great concern for us.

2. The lighting was always proposed as motion sensor lighting (dusk to dawn), and the change from that to an always lit in the evening facility is really going to effect the peaceful use of the properties next to it. The bright lights are not appropriate in a rural setting and will affect the quiet enjoyment of the stars and nature. This is an issue that needs to be addressed.

3. Along with the lighting is the hours of operation. This was never to be a 24/7 access facility and now they are trying to make it as such. This is a dusk til dawn facility and should remain as planned. The lighting from vehicles coming and going at all hours of the night will be a huge disruption to all of the neighboring residential properties that surround this facility.

4 One other real concern is the retention pond. This should be a dry retention pond and not one that holds water. The standing water will create a breeding ground for mosquitoes and if you read the letter attached from the drain commissioner they should have plenty of area for runoff making a retention pond unnecessary Would you want a breeding ground for mosquitoes near your home? I don't think so. This is a huge health concern for all neighboring properties and should be addressed.

6. I guess my last concern other than the lack of concern about the neighbors, is have there been any feasibility studies done on the need for this amount of storage in such a rural area? I am concerned that they will not fill the units and this will become an eyesore if not properly maintained. If they are not making the money they project because of lack of need what will happen to the upkeep on the property. Where are the studies that show this size and amount of storage is even needed?

It appears that Mr. Aragon had already planned for this proposed expansion based on the extra electrical boxes that are already in existence. Can someone please explain why they would be there if they hadn't already planned on making this expansion? It seems like this is something that has been in the works and not communicated to the public/neighbors. Something just doesn't seem right about this. It feels like this was the plan all along. Mr. Aragon knew about the extra footage on his property even before building anything on it.

The plans for this site are very vague and ambiguous. There are no renderings showing the neighbors how big and high the buildings will look. I think renderings of the site and more specific details on landscaping, hours of operation, and lighting, etc. should be made available before any decisions are made. The public does not have enough information to make an informed decision in our opinion.

---

Thank you again for your time and consideration,

Jennifer and Mark Patterson

The Red Barn

---

**Attachment I**

**KASSON TOWNSHIP  
SPECIAL USE PERMIT FINDINGS OF FACT  
January 15, 2024**

Applicant Name(s). Jennifer Aragon

Owner Name(s) **Sleeping Bear Investments, LLC**

Tax Parcel Number **45-007-019-008-12**

Date of Meeting: **Monday, January 15, 2024**

<b>GENERAL FINDINGS OF FACT</b>
The property covered by this Special Use Permit Application is described as: PT SW 1/4 SEC 19 COM SW COR SD SEC TH S 87 DEG 30'05" E 467.41 FT TO POB TH N 00 DEG 57'05" E 660 FT TH S 87 DEG 30'05" E 460 FT TH S 00 DEG 57'05" W 660 FT TH N 87 DEG 30'05" W 460 FT TO POB (A/K/A PARCEL B) SEC 19 T28N R13W 6.98 A M/L 2023 SPLIT FROM 007-019-008-00 Also known as 3722 W. Empire Hwy., Empire, MI 49630
The Commission finds that the site is located in Kasson Township, Leelanau County.
The Commission finds that the site is 6.98 +/- acres in size.
The Commission finds that the site is located in the Commercial Zoning District (Section 4.)
The Commission finds that the proposed type of use of the property will be Commercial in nature, specifically for the operation of a commercial self-service storage facility.
The Commission finds that the use is permitted with a Special Use Permit in this District (Commercial), that the applicant has requested a Special Use Permit amendment because of the commercial nature of the business.
The Commission finds that Section 7.3 of the Zoning Ordinance delegates the Commission the authority to review and approve, approve with conditions, or deny the request for a Special Use Permit.
The Commission finds that Section 7.5.B of the Zoning Ordinance requires a Special Use Permit Application contain a Development Site Plan prepared in accordance with Chapter 8 of the Zoning Ordinance.
The Commission finds that Section 8.4 of the Zoning Ordinance delegates the Commission the authority to review and approve, approve with conditions, or deny a Development Site Plan.
The Commission finds that a Notice of Public hearing was published on December 28, 2023 in the <i>Leelanau Enterprise</i> as required by Sections 7.6.A.1 and 7.6.A.2 of the Zoning Ordinance and with Public Act 110 of 2006, as amended (MCL 125.3103).
The Commission finds that notice was mailed to all required parties on December 28, 2023 as required by Sections 7.6.A.1 and 7.6.A.3 of the Zoning Ordinance and with Public Act 110 of 2006, as amended (MCL 125.3103).

The Planning Commission makes the following findings of fact as required by Chapter Seven of the Zoning Ordinance for each of the standards and requirements listed in Chapter Seven: Special Uses

ITEM	STD MET?	FINDING(S):
<b>SECTION 7.5.A REQUIRED APPLICATION DATA</b>		
<i>1. The name, address, telephone number and signature of the property owner and applicant;</i>	Yes	An Application containing this information was submitted. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.
<i>2. A full legal description of the property on which the proposed special use is to exist of be conducted, including the property tax parcel numbers(s), together with proof of property ownership and applicable options on the property, if any;</i>	Yes	The commission finds that the full legal description of the property was submitted. Ownership information was verified thru Leelanau County Tax Records. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.
<i>3. A detailed description of the proposed special use for which the permit is requested</i>	Yes.	The commission finds that information on the applicant's submittal packet, dated December 12, 2023, specifically in the document "KT Addendum Special Use Application" was determined complete by the ZA on December 23, 2023. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.
<i>4. Project schedule and development plans</i>	Yes	The applicant has proposed an amendment with a single phase which is adding 1 additional storage building & office to an existing approved Special Land Use. ( Two Peas -February 2022 – 7 buildings ) The plan is reconfigured from the original approval Therefore the commission finds that the proposed project schedule and development plan is applicable.
<i>5. Vicinity map with north point indicated</i>	Yes	The commission finds that the item is found on the Site Plan. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.
<i>6. Land uses and existing structures on the subject parcel and adjoining parcels within 300 feet</i>	Yes	The commission finds that the item is found on the Site Plan. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.

7. <i>Written statements relative to project impacts on existing infrastructure, including but not limited to, traffic, capacity of roads, schools and existing utilities, and upon the natural environment</i>	Yes	The commission finds that the project has no effect on school attendance. Existing utilities have been serving the area and the applicant is proposing to install all electrical underground. Correspondences from Cedar Area Fire & Rescue, MDOT, Health Dept. and Leelanau County Drain Commission, are pending the outcome of the township approval however, no adverse impact to their services are anticipated or expected. Therefore, have ZA confirm prior to Land Use approval.
ITEM	STD MET?	FINDING(S):
<b>SECTION 7.5.B SITE PLAN DATA</b>		
<i>A site plan in accordance with Chapter 8 - Development Site Plan Review.</i>	Yes	Attached. A Site Plan, Dated September 21, 2023 was submitted, containing all the information required by Section 8.7. The checklist for this information is found later in this finding of fact. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.
ITEM	STD MET?	FINDING(S):
<b>SECTION 7.7 BASIS FOR DETERMINATION</b>		
<i>Before approval of a Special Use Permit, the Commission shall establish that the standards specified in this Section, as well as applicable standards outlined elsewhere in this Ordinance, shall be satisfied. Each of the proposed special land uses on the proposed location shall:</i>		
<i>A. Be designed, constructed, operated and maintained so as to be harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity, as indicated in the Township Master Plan or other policies of the Township.</i>	Yes	The commission finds that the proposed project has been designed, and will be constructed, operated and maintained to be harmonious and appropriate to the existing character of the general vicinity, as there are existing storage units on two properties directly east and the use has been in place for years. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.
<i>B. Not be hazardous or disturbing to existing uses in the same general vicinity, and will not have adverse effects on the market value of surrounding property and to the community as a whole.</i>	Yes	The commission finds that the proposed project will not be disturbing to existing uses in the general vicinity as there will be <b>screening / buffers</b> along the property line to the adjoining residential uses to the north. <b>PC to discuss screening / buffers.... Are they satisfactory ?</b> Proposed 2" Pine trees/staggered in 2 rows 18 Per row

<p><i>C. Be served adequately by essential facilities and services, such as, but not limited to, highways, streets, police, fire protection, drainage structures, refuse disposal, water and sewage facilities, and schools.</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The commission finds that the proposed future use will have no impact on schools. Refuse disposal is proposed, but will have no impact on existing services. Private water and sewage facilities are proposed. Obtain a letter from Cedar Area Fire and Rescue that there will be no additional facilities and services required. Have ZA confirm this prior to issuance of a Land Use Approval.</p>
<p><i>D. Not create excessive additional requirements at public costs for public facilities and services.</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The commission finds that no need for excessive additional requirements for public costs, facilities and services. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.</p>
<p><i>E. Not involve uses, activities, processes, materials, and equipment or conditions of operation that will be detrimental to any persons, property or the general welfare by fumes, glare, noise or odors.</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>There is no proposed exterior storage other than temporarily when stored items are being moved in or out. Should the PC agree that the Storage facility developer/operator shall be permitted to stage storage items outdoors to facilitate efficient loading and unloading of storage building as deemed practical by the storage developer/operator. Items may also be staged outdoors for pick up by item owners. Any storage items staged outdoors, shall be kept clear of all fire lanes and property line set standards within the CD. <b>Items shall NOT be staged outdoors for more than 1 day.</b></p>
<p><i>F. Will be in general compliance with the land use policies outlined in the Township Master Plan, the principles of sound planning, and will not jeopardize the economic welfare of the Township.</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The commission finds that the proposed use will be in general compliance with the land use policies contained in the Township Master plan, to the principles of sound planning, and will not jeopardize the economic welfare of the Township. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.</p>
<p><i>G. Will not directly or indirectly have a substantial adverse effect upon the natural resources of the Township. Including, but not limited to, prime or unique agricultural lands, water recharge areas, lakes, rivers, streams, forest, wetlands, wildlife areas and major sand, gravel or mineral deposits.</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The commission finds that these plans are judged sufficient to protect the natural resources of the Township subject to Soil Erosion approval already obtained. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.</p>



<p><i>H. Structures, landscaping, or other land uses, will not disrupt water drainage systems necessary for agricultural uses and will be in compliance with Leelanau County Drainage Commission requirements.</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The site plan shows sufficient detail to reasonably expect that the soil and ground contour provides for adequate flow of water away from the buildings. Further it is not expected that the proposed use will disrupt any drainage systems necessary for commercial uses. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.</p>
<p><i>I. Phases of development are in a logical sequence, so that any one phase will not depend upon a subsequent phase for adequate access, public utility services, drainage or erosion control.</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The applicant states that the project will be built in a single phase. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.</p>
<p><i>J. Phases of development must also be in compliance with the requirements of the district in which it is proposed and all other standards in this Ordinance, as well as with the requirements of the County Road Commission, County Building Inspector, County Drain Commissioner, District Health Department, Soil Erosion Officer, Agricultural Soil Conservation Service, area fire departments, the DNR and other applicable township, county, state and federal statutes.</i></p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>The applicant states that the project will be built in a single phase. No communications have been received from other agencies regarding phasing of the project.</p>

The Planning Commission makes the following findings of fact as required by Chapter Eight, Section Seven that the following required items are included on the detailed site plan review for major projects

ITEM	STD MET?	FINDING(S):
<b>SECTION 8.7</b>		
<p><i>1 The site plans should be accurately drawn at the scale of at least 1" = 100' <u>showing the site and all land and structures within five hundred feet (500') of the site.</u> The Planning Commission may require details to be provided in a scale as great as 1" = 20'. If multiple sheets are used each must be labeled, dated and the preparer identified.</i></p>	Yes.	The commission finds the site plan dated 9/21/2023 meets this requirement.
<p><i>2 The location of proposed or existing property lines, dimensions legal descriptions, tax parcel numbers, setback lines, utility easements and monument locations:</i></p>	Yes	The commission finds the required items on the site plan.
<p><i>3 A vicinity map drawn at a scale of a minimum of 1" equal 2000' with north-point indicated.</i></p>	Yes	The commission finds an adequately detailed vicinity map is provided.
<p><i>4 Existing topographic elevations at two-foot intervals, proposed grades and direction of drainage flows.</i></p>	Yes	The commission finds elevations are shown as required.
<p><i>5 The location and type of existing soils on the site and any certification of borings. (Site Investigation Report).</i></p>	Yes	The commission finds that this requirement is present on the Site Plan.

<p><i>6 Boundaries and elevations of existing and proposed water courses and water bodies, including county drains and man-made surface drainage ways, flood plains and wetlands within one thousand five hundred (1500') feet of the project site and proposed erosion control measures.</i></p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>The commission finds that no water features, as detailed in the requirement, exist within 1500 feet of the site. Therefore the commission finds that this requirement is not applicable to this application.</p>
<p><i>7 Location of existing and proposed buildings and intended uses thereof.</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The commission finds that the proposed locations and uses of the buildings are specifically indicated on the site plan. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.</p>
<p><i>8 Proposed location of accessory structures, buildings and other appurtenances, including, but not limited to, all flag poles, light poles, bulkheads, docks, storage, sheds, transformers, air conditioners, generators, and similar equipment and the method and details of screening, where applicable. (Commercial)</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Applicant states that no other structures, buildings and appurtenances are anticipated in the future. Location of proposed buildings and appurtenances are shown on the site plan. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.</p>
<p><i>9 Location of existing public roads and streets that abut or cross the site, plus, rights-of-way and private easements of record.</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The commission finds that the location of existing public roads and streets are shown. Location of underground utilities are shown. There are no private rights-of-way. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.</p>
<p><i>10 Location of and dimensions of proposed streets, drives, curb cuts, ad access easements, as well as acceleration, deceleration and passing lanes or tapers (if any) serving the development. Details of entryway and entryway sign should be separately depicted with elevations views.</i></p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The commission finds that the location of the features required by this section are shown on the site plan. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.</p>

<i>11 Location, design and dimensions of existing and proposed curbing, barrier-free access, carports, parking areas (including indication of all spaces, method of surfacing and striping), fire lanes and all lighting and signing thereof. (Especially applicable to commercial).</i>	Yes	The commission finds that the location of the features required by this section are shown on the site plan. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.
<i>12 Location, size and characteristics of all loading and unloading areas. (Commercial)</i>	Yes	The commission finds that the site does contain formal loading and unloading areas. Therefore, the commission finds that this requirement is met.
<i>13 Location and design of all trails, walkways, bicycle paths, and other areas for public use.</i>	N/A	The commission finds that there are no trails, walkways, bicycle paths, or other public use areas on the site. Therefore, the commission finds that this requirement is not applicable to this application.
<i>14 Location of water supply lines and/or wells, including fire hydrants and shut-off valves, and the location and design of storm sewers, retention or detention ponds, waste water lines, clean-out locations, connection points and treatment systems including septic systems, if applicable.</i>	Yes	The commission finds that the property owner will be installing a water well for irrigation of the proposed trees and a new proposed onsite bathroom. A septic system will also be installed for onsite sewage. Other items of this requirement do exist but will be handled through the Soil Erosion Control Health Department offices.
<i>15 Location and routing of all other utilities on the site including, but not limited to, natural gas, electric, cable TV, telephone and steam.</i>	Yes	The commission finds that the electric will be underground and therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.
<i>16 Proposed location, dimensions and details of common open spaces and common facilities, such as community buildings or swimming pools, if applicable.</i>	N/A	The commission finds that this requirement is not applicable to this application.
<i>17 Exterior lighting locations with areas of illumination illustrated, as well as the type of fixtures and shielding to be used. (Especially applicable to commercial).</i>	Met	The commission finds that there is exterior lighting proposed and will be controlled by photo-cells. Therefore, the commission finds that this requirement is met.

<i>18 Location and specifications for all fences, walls and screening features with cross sections.</i>	Yes	PC is satisfied that the proposed screening is adequate to screen/buffer the site from the nearby residential uses. Verify
<i>19 General location and type of significant existing vegetation, including the location and size of all existing trees with a trunk of six (6") inches or more in diameter, four and one-half (4 ½) feet above the ground if not located in a forest. Forest and larger vegetation areas to be preserved shall be de-marked and designated so.</i>	Yes	The commission finds these features are noted on the site plan. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.
<i>20 Location and specifications for all proposed perimeter and internal landscaping and other buffering features.</i>	Yes	PC is satisfied that the proposed screening is adequate to screen/buffer the site from the nearby residential uses. Verify
<i>21 Location, size and specifications for screening of all trash receptacles and other solid waste disposal facilities. (Especially applicable to commercial).</i>	Yes	The commission finds that trash receptacles for the operation are not necessary; however, the property owner has stated there will be trash receptacles and that they will be screened from public view. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.
<i>22 Location and specifications for any existing, proposed or required above, or below ground storage facilities for any chemicals, salts, flammable or hazardous materials as well as any containment structures or clear zones required by government regulations and a Pollution Incident Prevention Plan as required by government regulations as required by Act 245 program.</i>	Yes	The commission finds that there are no existing, proposed or required above, or below ground storage facilities for any chemicals, salts, flammable or hazardous materials as well as any containment structures or clear zones required by government regulations. However, the property owner has agreed to hazardous materials placarding requirements as defined in Attachment C of the Public Hearing minutes.
<i>23 Identification of any significant or unique site features.</i>	N/A	The commission finds that there are no significant or unique site features.
<i>24 Indication of any significant views onto or from the site.</i>	N/A	The commission finds that there are no significant views onto or from the site.
<i>25 The zoning classification of the site and adjacent properties.</i>	Yes	The commission finds that the zoning classification of the subject property and adjacent properties are shown on the site plan. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.

26 North arrow, scale and date of original submittal and all revisions.	Yes	The commission finds that all items are shown on the plan dated November 30, 2021. Therefore, it is found that this requirement is met.
<p><b>Section 4.9.3 C.</b>  <b>C. PERIPHERAL AREAS OF COMMERCIAL DISTRICT</b>  1. Unless peripheral areas abutting highways and arterials contain existing mature trees, a mixture of indigenous species trees shall be planted to provide visual and noise screening to the area. Trees must be 1.5” inch caliper minimum at the time of planting.  2. Peripheral areas should have lower density uses, including where appropriate light manufacturing or warehousing, with large open areas to define the edges of the commercial park development.  3. Peripheral areas may be used for agricultural purposes or forests, as long as the uses are not nuisances to the commercial / community facilities/institutional/ religious building use area.  4. Natural vegetation and other existing attractive natural features within peripheral and within commons or green areas shall be properly maintained.</p> <p><b>Section 4.9.4 Performance Standards</b>  A. All uses in this district shall be subject to Chapter 8, Development Site Plan Review.  B. Any use allowed in this district shall be so situated and operated that it shall not become a nuisance to the neighbors.  C. All commercial activities and operations shall be carried on within an enclosed structure unless specifically permitted to do otherwise by a Special Use Permit.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>N/A</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>Met</p> <p>TBD</p> <p>TBD</p>	<p>PC to discuss</p> <p>PC to discuss</p> <p>PC to discuss</p> <p>PC to discuss</p>

<p><b>Section 5.17 Landscaping, screening, greenbelts, buffers, and fencing</b></p>		
<p>A. The intent of this section is to promote the public health, safety, and general welfare.</p>		<p>See previous section of these findings.</p>
<p>Generally, landscaping shall at least equal surrounding landscaping in newer areas and tend toward upgrading older areas. Landscaping needs will be determined by using the standards set forth in this Section, and other applicable sections of this Ordinance.</p>		
<p>B. The following standards shall be followed:</p>		
<p>1. Additional landscaping shall be added to the retained natural landscaping features, to reduce the apparent mass and height of buildings, to visually break expanses of paving, to reduce the visibility of paved areas from adjacent roadways and properties, and to provide an attractive appearance from both within and without the site.</p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>PC to discuss.</p>
<p>2. Ground cover shall be permeable to prevent erosion.</p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>PC to discuss.</p>
<p>3. Areas that are intended to be landscaped shall be provided with a minimum depth of topsoil of four (4) inches and mulched appropriately.</p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>PC to discuss.</p>
<p>4. All plantings shall be maintained in a vigorous, healthy, and weed-free state. Any dead or diseased plants shall be removed and replaced.</p>	<p>TBD</p>	<p>PC to discuss and make this a condition for final approval.</p>

NOTE: The Planning Commission may require such other data as may be required to ensure that the purposes of Chapter 8 are satisfied. The Commission shall state for the record its reasons for taking such action. Further, the Planning Commission may waive a requirement or requirements in Section 8.7 if not deemed necessary for a thorough review. The Commission shall state for the record its reasons for taking such action.

**ATTACHMENTS TO FINDINGS OF FACT: Have Applicant’s guidelines for renters submitted to Township ZA**

DRAFT