

LELAND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, October 5, 2022
Leland Township Library, Munnecke Room
203 East Cedar Street, Leland, MI 49654

I. Call Meeting to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

Vice Chairman Telgard called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance. Telgard is conducting tonight's meeting due to Chairman Korson's absence.

Present: Clint Mitchell, Township Board Rep; Ross Satterwhite, ZBA Rep; Sam Simpson, Secretary, Skip Telgard, Vice Chairperson

Excused: Dan Korson, Chairman

Staff Present: Tim Cypher, Zoning Administrator; Allison Hubley-Patterson, Recording Secretary; Larry Sullivan, Planner

There were fifteen (15) members from the public in attendance at various times throughout the meeting. Guests included Mark and Mandy Moseler who are the owners of Northern Latitudes.

II. Motion to Approve Agenda

Vice Chairman Telgard asked for a motion to approve the October agenda as presented. **Satterwhite moved to approve the October agenda as presented; Simpson seconded. All present in favor; motion carried.**

III. Declaration of Potential Conflicts of Interest - None

IV. Approval of Minutes from August 24, 2022

Vice Chairman Telgard asked for a motion to approve the August 24, 2022 minutes as presented. **Satterwhite moved to approve the August 24, 2022 minutes as presented; Mitchell seconded. All present in favor; motion carried.**

V. Correspondence

Cypher stated that he has two items of correspondence that will be addressed during the Public Hearing.

VI. Public Comment (three minutes per person unless extended by Chairperson)
– no public comment

VII. Reports

Township Board Rep: no report

ZBA Rep: no report

VIII. Public Hearing – SLUP Application for Northern Latitudes

The Public Hearing opened at 7:03 p.m.

1. Presentation by Applicant

Mr. Mark Moseler stated that he did not have any additional information to share with the PC from what Mr. Michael Fitzhugh presented at the August 24, 2022 meeting. Mr. Moseler brought correspondence from some of the various regulatory agencies to tonight's meeting; all other correspondence required in this matter has been submitted.

2. PC Questions/Discussion with Applicant – none

3. Discussion with staff, if needed

Cypher stated that the 300-foot letters were sent out and the public notice was placed in the Leelanau Enterprise on September 8, 2022. He received two items of correspondence from Mr. Peter Barnes and Ms. Mary Linguar; both individuals support the Northern Latitudes SLUP application. Mr. Barnes and Ms. Linguar are neighbors of the proposed site that Northern Latitudes will occupy.

4. Public Comment (limited to three minutes per person unless extended by chair)

Initially there was no public comment despite several members of the public being present at the meeting. Vice Chairman Telgard asked if there are any problems with the proposed SLUP application.

Mr. Rick Royston stated that he supports Mark and Mandy and that this project will be an asset to the county. He has worked with Mark for the past couple of years and stated that Northern Latitudes is a great organization.

Another member of the public stated that she has worked for Mark and Mandy for over five years. She explained that they have created an atmosphere where people want to be and have developed a family at work. She stated that many of the Northern Latitudes employees are

seniors and that employment with this business has helped them continue to be productive members of society.

Mr. Bill Schmidt stated that he supports this project and added, “We need the space” in jest.

Vice Chairman stated that he loves to see small businesses move forward in this positive direction.

5. Applicant’s Response to Public Comment

Mrs. Moseler thanked the members of the public who attended the meeting in support of this project. She added, “We would be nowhere without these people so thank you”. Mr. Moseler concurred.

6. Further discussions with staff or applicant, if needed – none

7. Findings of Fact

Cypher reviewed the Findings of Fact document with the PC members.

Page 1; Section 6.03.B.2 – Zoning Ordinance Standards

Cypher stated that the applicant can ask for a waiver for the vicinity sketch and he inquired if the PC members would find this acceptable. All PC members agreed that this is acceptable. He stated that we are already aware of who the neighbors are as 300-foot letters were sent out.

Page 2; Section 6.03.B.5

Mr. Moseler stated that the number of employees will vary based on the day of the week and the season. Many of the employees are retirees who head south for the winter. There will be a maximum of 10 to 12 employees per shift; on Saturday, there will be roughly 20 employees in total working, with approximately 12 on site at one time. There are typically two shifts during the day. The building is 11,000 square feet.

Section 6.03.B.6

There is a 15-foot drainage easement on the south side of the property line. Some issues have been alleviated over the years as it has been noted that this area is now less wet than in the past. Cypher stated that a condition will be to indicate this on the site plan.

Page 3; Section 6.03.B.8

It was confirmed that utilities will be underground. Cypher noted that approvals have been received and there are no issues on behalf of any of the regulatory agencies; approvals on file include: MDOT, Fire Chief (forthcoming), Soil Erosion, Water/Well, Health Department, and Sewer.

Section 6.03.B.11

It will be a condition that all lighting must meet the requirements of the zoning ordinance.

Section 6.03.B.12

Mr. Moseler stated that, if their application is approved this evening, they will have a landscape design prepared by Inhabitect in Traverse City. Cypher noted that this company leans more toward the natural side of things in their plans.

Section 6.03.B.14

It was confirmed with the applicant that there will be no above or below ground storage.

Page 4; Section 6.03.B.16

Mr. Moseler indicated that they have a commercial building contractor and hope to break ground as soon as possible. He was going to begin this fall but they have held him off for the time being until all approvals are received. Cypher added that he cannot issue a final land use approval until all agencies submit their approval.

Section 6.03.B.17

Mr. Moseler will provide a copy of this statement to Cypher; this document will identify all other federal, state and local permits that are required of Northern Latitudes. Mr. Moseler has been operating with this statement for approximately ten years.

Section 6.03.B.20

No waivers have been requested. This section was discussed by the PC members and the 300-foot letters and vicinity sketch were discussed; this was granted.

Page 5; Section 6.04.A – Submittal and Distribution of Site Plans
(Amendment 2014-01)

Approvals have been received from the required regulatory agencies.

Section 6.05.A – Site Plan Review Standards

Vice Chairman Telgard asked about Article 10, Number 4 for Special Land Uses. He specifically inquired if the outdoor seating area would affect the neighbors. Cypher stated that at the August 24, 2022 meeting, Mr. Fitzhugh stated that there would be no outdoor entertainment which is different than vocal noise. Cypher noted that Northern Latitudes is still subject to the nuisance laws.

Section 6.05.B

The final landscape plan will be reviewed and approved by staff to ensure compliance with Article 23.

Page 6; Section 6.05.C

Cypher requested a copy of the drainage easement for the file. He stated that Mr. Peter Barnes and Bruce and Betty Price would be the benefactors affected by this easement. Cypher stated that MDOT and the Road Commission were involved in this project previously.

Section 6.05.D

There is no fencing proposed at this time.

Section 6.05.G

Mr. Moseler confirmed that there is a wraparound area and that there would be no problem with the pedestrian or parking circulation system based on the way this is designed. Cypher noted that Mitchell previously had questions about this area in relation to the snowplow. Inhabitect informed Mr. Moseler that they could eliminate the pond because of the living roof; the pond would then allow snow to be moved back to the south side of the parking lot. The living roof will be on the two shed roofs. Mitchell indicated that he would like to make it a condition that there will be a protective barrier around this area; all PC members concurred.

Section 6.05.H

It will be a condition that all exterior lighting will meet zoning ordinance requirements.

Section 6.05.I

It will be a condition that the site plan must reflect a pedestrian circulation system.

Page 7; Section 6.05.M

Cypher requested that Mr. Moseler notify the PC when the proposed utilities are in place so that they can be shown on the site plan; this will be helpful to Mr. Patmore.

Page 8; Section 6.05.O.2

Mr. Moseler confirmed that there are no underground tanks and no floor drains. If there were drains, Cypher explained that the Sewer Department would regulate this. With regard to the LUP approval from Leland Township, Cypher stated that he will make sure that everything is legal in this area.

Section 16.01 – General Standards Applicable to All Special Land Uses

This will be consistent with the Master Plan. Cypher asked the PC members if they want to make it a condition that, if something happens to the natural buffer, that landscaping will be added as a buffer. All PC members agreed. It was explained that there are several residences in this area; these homes are used as residential dwellings but they are located in the commercial district.

Page 10; Section 16.01.c – Impact of Traffic

Cypher stated that the intersection is very close to the corner. There are no concerns on behalf of the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT). Telgard added that normally there are very strict requirements regarding the curb cut.

Section 16.01.d – Detrimental Effects

The PC members did not find anything that would be a detrimental effect.

Section 16.01.e – Economic Well-Being of the Community

Cypher stated that the location of this commercial project is great for the community. Northern Latitudes has been a mainstay at the east end of the village and they have been very active.

Section 16.01.f – Compatibility with Natural Environment

The PC discussed the compatibility of this special land use with the natural environment. No concerns noted.

Page 11; Section 20.01 – Access Control and Private Roads - Intent

An update of these plans is required as there has been no update since July 5, 2022.

Page 13; Section 21.03 – Parking Space Requirements

For drainage purposes, the parking is currently gravel and it was noted that the zoning ordinance does allow for gravel. Mr. Moseler would like to keep it this way. The road will be paved coming into the business; the commercial side will be paved but the other side will be gravel starting at approximately halfway in. There will be six rustic parking spots.

Page 14; Section 21.04.C. - Site Maneuverability

Mitchell inquired about the delivery schedule. Mr. Moseler replied that the deliveries will be received around 2:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. because he is at the end of the delivery route in Leelanau county. There is normally a maximum delivery of once per week; this may go to two deliveries per week during the summer season. Cypher asked if delivery trucks have enough room in the proposed space; Mr. Moseler replied, "Yes".

Page 15; Section 21.04.F – Lighting

This has been previously covered; all exterior lighting must comply with the zoning ordinance.

Cypher inquired about parking lot lighting. Satterwhite commented that, for safety purposes, sometimes a lot of light is needed. Mr. Moseler stated that there will only be parking lot lighting and noted that the business will not be open past 7:00 p.m. Lighting can be put on a timer once everyone has left the premises. He will provide additional details to the PC regarding this. Cypher added that the light lumens cannot extend directly beyond the property line and it was stated that downlight is acceptable. Mitchell added that the homes in the surrounding area have small yards and indicated that the light may be seen easily. Mitchell asked Mr. Moseler to consider providing screening, if necessary, in order to remain on good terms with the neighbors. Mr. and Mrs. Moseler agreed that they would do so and stated that they would be good neighbors.

Section 22.01 – Signs

Mr. Moseler indicated that there will be a stand alone sign that is similar to what is at the storage building. He stated that the sign may be lit with a light but that it cannot be a lighted sign. Cypher stated that the business is allowed to have one freestanding sign.

8. Consideration of Motion by PC to set Public Hearing for October 5, 2022

Vice Chairman Telgard moved to approve the Northern Latitudes Special Land Use Permit application subject to the conditions agreed to in the Findings of Fact as stated herein. **Satterwhite moved to approve the Northern Latitudes Special Land Use Permit application subject to the conditions agreed to in the Findings of Fact as stated herein; Mitchell seconded. All present in favor; motion carried.**

IX. Old Business

A. Bunbury Zoning Amendment – Review Proposed Draft Language

Spreadsheets were presented and Satterwhite confirmed that we have language and math calculations for three different options; option A, option B and option C. Sullivan stated that actually no language has been developed yet for option B but he can put this language together quickly. The suggested changes would go into the zoning ordinance but Sullivan indicated that the idea would be to select one option that would go into the ordinance; all three options would not be adopted.

Mitchell noted that in his email to the PC members, calculations were based on lot square footage. He explained that the formula would be 35% up to 10,000, 10% up to 45,000 and 5% after 45,000. In the future, these percentages could slide up or down; however, the calculations based on the square footage of the lot would remain the same. Future boards could decide what they would like to do.

Satterwhite stated this is true because the lots are static in size. Mitchell said the square footage would remain the same and the percentages could vary. Mitchell addressed Telgard's previous concern of reducing the lot size too much on in-town lots (R2) would be to keep this single-story. This would remain at 40% but square footage allotment would be reduced the taller the house. Once you get to a two-story house and the setback is at 30, you are limited by the setback. Mitchell stated that this addresses both concerns; this will encourage lower houses in the R2 district and does not punish you if you only want a ranch.

Satterwhite confirmed that it is 40% in R2 with different percentages in different areas. Mitchell suggested plugging in 35% in case someone

wanted to combine six lots. Satterwhite inquired about some of the numbers and Mitchell explained further.

Satterwhite asked Cypher about the requests that are currently in the pipeline and wanted to know what is coming through at this time. He asked if volume is still high. Cypher replied that we would not set a record this year but that we are in the mid- to high-50s now; his mailbox is more than full on a regular basis. Simpson asked about the average size house in Leland Township. Cypher replied that it is 2,600 square feet to 4,500 square feet but added that these figures are skewed due to the larger homes. For lot coverage, Cypher only looks at the bird's eye view. He does not care how many stories the home has because some things are "under roof".

PC members discussed that option C is not viable; Mitchell stated that it is most likely between option A or option B. Mr. Bunbury commented that personally he leans towards option C.

Satterwhite stated that it would be ideal to see Mitchell's math. He asked Sullivan about some of the numbers. Sullivan's numbers are what Mitchell provided early on, before the PC looked at option A. Sullivan looked at what is currently allowed versus what would be allowed. The spreadsheet gives an idea of what would be allowed for a typical lot size. For clarification, it was explained that lot size is defined as the gross land square footage of the lot.

Satterwhite asked if current lot coverage means what the zoning ordinance will permit as far as the lot coverage for a house. Sullivan confirmed this and stated that bird's eye view on the ground could mean that there are multiple stories to the home. Cypher stated that we allow accessory buildings, porches, garages, and guest houses if they are "under roof"; this is how the definition reads.

Satterwhite asked about an R2 hypothetical situation under option A that reduces the footprint. Mitchell clarified how the footprint would be narrowed under the 40%; he discussed how you would be limited by the setback. Sullivan provided an additional example with a setback using a 20-foot setback; he explained how one-story and two-story homes would be positioned.

Cypher clarified that there can be 15 feet total between the two sides of the home with a minimum of five feet on one side. Cypher noted that, with the 50 x 100-foot lots, people are very concerned about the orientation of their home today in terms of what they are looking at. If there is already an established home here, the design element can be difficult. Cypher noted that open decks cannot be counted under lot coverage. Architects will be

challenged by this but will also figure out how to manage this for their clients.

Discussion ensued about the total side setback; Mitchell proposed that this is the greater of 20-feet or the height of the home. If you have a 20-foot home, the total side setback is 20 feet. Sullivan stated that there should probably be a minimum side distance on each side of the home. Mr. Bunbury commented that this is very tight. Cypher stated that the tight lots create many issues for the Fire Chief.

Satterwhite stated that we need one model that has this idea explained. He is concerned about setbacks and reducing them too much. Discussion ensued about certain homeowners that would not have been able to build their homes under the proposed criteria.

Sullivan asked Cypher about a two-story home that has a deck over a deck; he inquired if this is considered an open deck on the first floor. Cypher replied that if the second floor deck is protecting the first floor with a waterproof membrane, it is deemed a covered porch. If there is an overhang on the second floor for sun shade, that is covered, too. This would not be the case if the decks were stacked on top of each other.

Satterwhite suggested that at the top of the spreadsheet a rule should be stated with details, and some specific examples provided. He proposed language giving examples such as: If there is a 10,000 square foot lot, it would allow a one-story home of X square feet, a two-story home of Y square feet and a three-story home of Z square feet.

Cypher stated that we will need to sell this concept to the public. He has a friend who could do some computer modeling if the PC establishes a formula; the digital model would show the bird's eye view. This will give us something to show the public. The PC members liked this idea and agreed that it would be beneficial.

Cypher stated that the courthouse property is R2 zoning and this could have a detrimental effect on the value of nearby property; there is one home here now. Satterwhite noted that everyone's maximum build will go down so there will be a mad dash to obtain permits. Cypher agreed and stated that people will act if they know that changes are coming.

Mitchell asked Satterwhite what his maximum would be for a two-story home on a 5,000 square foot lot. Satterwhite replied 3,500 to 3,800 square feet and this would include a garage, porches and other covered areas.

Cypher inquired about half stories as there are height restrictions. He noted that the PC must be very careful with the language that is being

used. Mitchell stated that we could just do a blanket 20-foot side setback. Cypher confirmed that there would also be a minimum on one side. This would give one a 3,800-3,900 square foot option.

For a corner lot, Cypher stated that people get to choose their front yard based on how language was written in the zoning ordinance. The front setback is 25 feet and the minimum on the street side is ten feet. The back side is also ten feet. Satterwhite stated that houses close together are not necessarily a problem.

Both Mitchell and Sullivan will make some changes to the spreadsheet based on tonight's discussion.

Regarding R3 zoning, Simpson asked about high density apartment complexes and noted that, as a community, we continue to discuss this matter. If we become more restrictive on lots that should go into this, his concern is that if there is a request to convert something to R3 zoning, we may be working against the whole intent of R3 zoning. Satterwhite asked where our R3 zoning is located; Cypher replied that the north end of Leland is R3 zoning. Cypher confirmed that it is currently 40% in R3. The issue of density was discussed. Satterwhite suggested that we leave the R3 area alone. Cypher stated that most of R3 is not platted. The way that the ordinance is now written, we need 20,000 square feet with 100 feet of lot width in order to have a parcel. The setbacks are 25 feet in the front and in the rear with 10 feet on each side.

Vice Chairman Telgard stated that we should consider having a future discussion to expand the R3 zoning. Cypher agreed and stated that, in Lake Leelanau, there is room to expand to more R3 zoning; there is Ag residential and agriculture open land that could be available for this. One issue that has been encountered on St. Joseph Street is that the road that services this is a private easement and it is only so wide. The Road Commission plows this every now and then so it will never become a county road under their jurisdiction. We have a minimum 40-foot easement width for land divisions, so if we could find something compatible with the Fire Chief regarding where to store snow, yet still have access and turnarounds, this number could be reduced to help future development. Cypher stated that access to get larger parcels is what matters.

Mitchell brought up the issue of workforce housing both locally and semi-locally and stated that there is always a maximum income but never a minimum income. We cannot call it this if it's not truly workforce housing, and it is not. If we say that we want an income minimum to show the person is actually working, then we lose the opportunity for subsidies. Cypher stated that we cannot regulate this but noted that if we could, this

would be a slippery slope. Mitchell said we talk about workforce housing but from what he has seen, in approximately half the units, a person can make between nothing and minimum wage and live in this type of housing. Cypher asked Mitchell where he has seen this happening and he replied on Carver Street in Traverse City. Satterwhite stated that this is low-income housing but Mitchell noted that it is called workforce housing. Mitchell provided an example of two people who live in Maple City but work in Traverse City. Cypher shared that Habitat for Humanity came to the Kasson Township Board and was denied for Tax Increment Financing (TIF).

Sullivan gave an example of retirees working at Northern Latitudes; they are not necessarily employing younger people. Simpson stated that there is a lack of supply. He does not want to be overly restrictive in this area. Simpson asked why AC and AR are in here and asked the PC members to share their opinions. Sullivan stated that a lot of “view property” is AC and AR. Mitchell stated that Ag Con is not necessarily only farmland. Simpson shared a story of an agricultural building and building department approvals. He stated that some local departments do not view a winery as Ag and shared his personal experience in this area. People in Leland Township could run into a problem in five to ten years.

Mitchell, Satterwhite and Sullivan will collaborate on the spreadsheet for the next meeting. They will leave R3 out of it. Based on tonight’s discussion, they will be careful about AC and AR. Mitchell suggested that we use the term “non-residential”. Vice Chairman Telgard stated that we are doing a deep dive into the ordinance; we are beyond the point of just thinking about having large houses on the lake.

B. Master Plan – Status Update from Planner

Sullivan stated that he previously sent the Chapter 1 and Chapter 3 information to Cypher. Sullivan stated that the PC may wish to sit tight on this for now as he and Cypher are going to have a meeting to discuss this further. When the new version is sent out, Sullivan asked PC members to mark-up the document and send their comments only to him so that the group does not violate the Open Meetings Act. Sullivan would like to put the maps together and then share the document with state, county and federal agencies as well as with the Leelanau Conservancy. He noted that there is some important information that still needs to be in the Master Plan.

Sullivan stated that he would like to have a final draft by the end of the calendar year; Cypher added that we absolutely must meet this timeframe. Sullivan reiterated that he needs some maps and will then work on this

with Cypher; he added that Rob Herman has access to some excellent data in the GIS system.

Cypher asked the PC members to think about the Future Land Use Map when considering this information. Sullivan sees an expansion of the R3 district on the west side of the village. He noted that this may also require an expansion of the waste disposal system. Sullivan stated that there may be grant money available to provide housing.

He stated that Part 41 systems have a large drain field with no lagoon. Normally just a larger drain field. Cypher stated that the private sector work goes much faster as there is no bonding involved.

Mr. Jeff Greene asked about keyholing and Cypher stated that other townships he works for are getting rid of keyholing. He added that riparian rights are very important to people now. If more than two people share a common use parcel, a property owner can give another a 20-foot easement with full riparian rights. Cypher stated that keyholing enforcement rests with the township.

Satterwhite suggested writing a dock ordinance. He added that getting rid of keyholing might be a good idea. Cypher stated that the PC should try to get keyholing out of the zoning ordinance.

C. Short Term Rentals – Update status from State of Michigan

Cypher stated that the House Bill 4722 will be passed at the lame-duck session. He added that we do not know what power the townships will have. Mitchell shared some information previously regarding this with Cypher and had some good questions. Cypher noted that there may be several things that we cannot regulate.

Mitchell discussed the limits on short-term rentals. He asked how we are to know the difference if we cannot tell who the short-term rental owners are. Data in this matter cannot be released.

It was announced that there would be an agricultural tire recycling event at the Grand Traverse Career Tech Center on Friday, October 14, 2022 from 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

- X. Zoning Administrator Comment – no comment
- XI. Planning Commission Comment – no comment
- XII. Public Comment (limited to three minutes per person unless extended by Chairman) – no public comment

APPROVED

XIII. Adjournment

There being no objection, Vice Chairman Telgard adjourned the meeting at 9:32 p.m.

The next scheduled meeting will be held on Wednesday, November 2, 2022 at 7:00 p.m. at the Leland Township Library (Munnecke Room).

Respectfully submitted,
Allison Hubley-Patterson
Recording Secretary

APPENDIX A – Leland Township ZA Report (August 2022)

Leland Township
Zoning Administrator's
AUGUST 2022 REPORT

To: Leland Township Board & Leland Planning Commission

From: *Timothy A. Cypher* 9/9/2022

Land Use Permits Issued:	4	YEAR TO DATE	40
Signs / Home Occupation	0		
Single Family Residences (SFR)	2		
Additions to SFR	1		
Garages / or additions to	0		
Decks & Porches / MISC.	1		
Accessory Buildings	0		
Commercial Construction	0		
Stairs & Landings	0		
Agriculture construction	0		
Demolitions	0		
Boat houses	0		
Solar Panels	0		
Renewal of / Change of use	0		
Z.B.A. proceedings	0	1 INQUIRY	
Special Land Use Permits	1	NORTHERN 2 INQUIRY	
Lot Consolidations	0	LATTITUDES 1 INQUIRY	
Land Divisions	0	1 INQUIRY	
Property Line Adjustments	0	1 INQUIRY	
Private Roads / Driveways	0	1 INQUIRY	
Zoning / Site Plan Reviews	0	2 INQUIRY	
Construction Inspections	6		
Violations/Investigations	0 **VIOLATIONS**		
	1 INVESTIGATIONS PENDING		
	RV USE AS SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING		

I supplied information via 28 phone calls & 24 emails to Township residents & others.
I was excused from the Township Board meeting and attended the Planning Commission meeting.
Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

tim@allpermits.com

Phone 231-360-2557

APPROVED

APPENDIX B – Leland Township ZA Monthly Summary (August 2022)

LELAND TOWNSHIP - ZA'S MONTHLY SUMMARY

Period: **AUGUST 2022**

DATE	PERMIT #	NAME	USE	REC. #	CK.#	AMOUNT
009-600-127-00	8/9/2022 LUP 22-38 313 E. OAK STREET	DROUILLARD	LAND USE NEW DWELLING COVERED PORCHES	202238	7221 \$ 2,462 S.F.	90.00
009-550-405-00	8/16/2022 LUP 22-39 311 S. 4TH STREET	CLENNY	LAND USE DWELLING BEDROOM ADDITION	202239	119 \$ 182 S.F.	50.00
009-660-005-00	8/25/2022 LUP 22-40 6705 N. OMIGISI BEACH	FOX	LAND USE NEW ACCESSORY DWELLING ATT.GARAGE PATIO	202240	189 & 190 \$ 1,486 S.F.	130.00
009-580-609-01	8/15/2022 LUP 21-46 REVISED 502 E. RIVER STREET	SCHNEIDER	LAND USE DECK REVISION & STEPS	202146	2257 \$ 166 S.F.	40.00
009-024-024-00 & 009-024-018-10	8/24/2022 SLU 22-05 7150 E. DUCK LAKE RD.	NORTHERN LATITUDES	SPECIAL LU NEW DISTILLERY, TASTING ROOM & INFRASTRUCTURE PH 10/5/2022	2022SLU05	6512 \$	300.00

TOTAL \$ 610.00

SIGNED:

TIMOTHY A. CYPHER

DATE: 9/9/2022

TIMOTHY A. CYPHER
LELAND TOWNSHIP ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
231-360-2557

APPROVED

APPENDIX C - Leland Township ZA Report (September 2022)

Leland Township
Zoning Administrator's
SEPTEMBER 2022 REPORT

To: Leland Township Board & Leland Planning Commission

From: *Timothy A. Cypher* 10/7/2022

Land Use Permits Issued:	12	YEAR TO DATE	52
Signs / Home Occupation	0		
Single Family Residences (SFR)	2		
Additions to SFR	5		
Garages / or additions to	0		
Decks & Porches / MISC.	3		
Accessory Buildings	1		
Commercial Construction	1		
Stairs & Landings	0		
Agriculture construction	0		
Demolitions	0		
Boat houses	0		
Solar Panels	0		
Renewal of / Change of use	0		
Z.B.A. proceedings	0	1 INQUIRY	
Special Land Use Permits	APPROVED	NORTHERN	2 INQUIRY
Lot Consolidations	0	LATITUDES	1 INQUIRY
Land Divisions	1		1 INQUIRY
Property Line Adjustments	0		1 INQUIRY
Private Roads / Driveways	0		1 INQUIRY
Zoning / Site Plan Reviews	0	2 INQUIRY	
Construction Inspections	6		
Violations/Investigations	0	**VIOLATIONS**	
		1 INVESTIGATIONS PENDING	
		RV USE AS SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING	

I supplied information via 43 phone calls & 34 emails to Township residents & others.
I attended the Township Board and Planning Commission meetings.
Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

tim@allpermits.com

Phone 231-360-2557

APPENDIX D - Leland Township ZA Monthly Summary (September 2022)

LELAND TOWNSHIP - ZA'S MONTHLY SUMMARY

Period: **SEPTEMBER 2022**

DATE	PERMIT #	NAME	USE	REC. #	CK.#	AMOUNT
009-022-024-00	9/2/2022 LUP 22-42	5674 E. DUCK LAKE RD COUTURIER	LAND USE	202242	1021 \$ <small>Done Trans. Have ? 432 S.F.</small>	50.00
009-770-202-00	9/2/2022 LUP 22-43	COMMERCIAL MRS VENTURES	LAND USE	202243C	PAID SLU \$ <small>4,140 S.F.</small>	300.00
009-630-112-00	9/3/2022 LUP 22-43	801 N. LAKE STREET TSUNAMI FILMS	LAND USE	202243	19390 \$ <small>204 S.F.</small>	130.00
009-600-102-00	9/17/2022 LUP 22-44	206 S. GRAND AVE. PETERSON	LAND USE	202244	19601 \$ <small>1,186 S.F.</small>	90.00
009-035-001-20	9/17/2022 LUP 22-45	1247 S. RUBY LANE SIMPSON	LAND USE	202245	26900 \$ <small>4,656 S.F.</small>	130.00
009-022-029-00	9/20/2022 LUP 22-46	5303 E. MARY JANE LN. NAENY	LAND USE	202246	17329 \$ <small>605 S.F.</small>	50.00
009-022-029-00	9/20/2022 LUP 22-47	5677 E. RYANS WAY REED	LAND USE	202247	5505 \$ <small>8,298 S.F.</small>	90.00
009-009-040-00	9/24/2022 LUP 22-48	750 S. INDIANA WOODS KUNZ	LAND USE	202248	80980 \$ <small>716 S.F.</small>	90.00
009-567001-16	9/24/2022 LUP 22-49	212 S. FOURTH STREET SCHLUETER	LAND USE	202249	80979 \$ <small>378 S.F.</small>	40.00
009-550-603-10	9/24/2022 LUP 22-50	503 FOURTH STREET KEEN	LAND USE	202250	5506 \$ <small>46 S.F.</small>	40.00
009-025-028-00	9/24/2022 LUP 22-51	898 S. LAKE SHORE DR. MOUCH	LAND USE	202251	174 \$ <small>1,377 S.F.</small>	130.00
009-025-006-30	9/15/2022 LUP 21-59	6460 E. DUCK LAKE RD. ROBB	LAND USE	202159	1,024 \$ <small>3,420 S.F.</small>	40.00
009-001-004-00	9/22/2022 LDA 22-02	E. ALPERS ROAD EGELER	LAND DIVISION	22-02	24716 \$	50.00
TOTAL						\$ 1,230.00

SIGNED:

TIMOTHY A. CYPHER

DATE: 10/7/2022

TIMOTHY A. CYPHER
LELAND TOWNSHIP ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
231-360-2557