

LELAND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, November 2, 2022
Leland Township Library, Munnecke Room
203 East Cedar Street, Leland, MI 49654

I. Call Meeting to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Korson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance.

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

Absent: Sam Simpson, Secretary

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

There were two (2) members from the public in attendance at various times throughout the meeting.

II. Motion to Approve Agenda

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

III. Declaration of Potential Conflicts of Interest - None

IV. Approval of Minutes from October 5, 2022

Chairman Korson asked for a motion to approve the October 5, 2022 minutes as presented. **Satterwhite moved to approve the October 5, 2022 minutes as presented; Telgard seconded. All present in favor; motion carried.**

V. Correspondence - none

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

VII. Reports

Township Board Rep:

Mitchell reported that the township is beginning Phase 2 of the sidewalk project. The engineer still needs to get a bid package together but hopefully this project will begin in the next fiscal year which starts in April. Mitchell also informed the PC that a couple of parking spots have been eliminated on Lake Street at the corner of Fishtown so that vehicles can turn around safely and so that pedestrians walking in this area are also safe. Eventually, the township will consider some ADA-type slope (Americans with Disabilities Act) for this area.

ZBA Rep:

Cypher stated that he asked Ms. Boomer to set-up a Doodle poll to schedule a ZBA hearing regarding the variance requested by Falling Waters Lodge. The request is being made to allow them to put a roof over the top portion of the building; however, the issue is that they are only five feet off the water's edge. This is a change of use request as the space will be used as an open-air deck.

VIII. New Business – none

IX. Old Business

A. Bunbury Zoning Amendment – Review proposed draft language

Sullivan began by stating that we are past looking at options A, B and C; the PC is primarily looking at developing Option E. The AC, AR and R-1 footprint was expanded for lots up to 10,000 square feet and 10% for areas of property from 10,000 to 45,000 square feet and 5% for everything over 45,000 square feet as opposed to dealing with a quarter acre, a half-acre or a full acre. AC is Ag Conservation, AR is Low Density Residential, R-1A is Medium Density Lakeshore Residential and R-1B is Medium Density Inland Residential. The total side area setbacks will be based on the height of the home. If one has a 30-foot-high home, the total setback requirements on the two sides would total 30 feet. For a 20-foot building, the total would be 20 feet. These figures are for the AC, AR and R-1 zoning.

With regard to AC and AR, uninhabitable accessory buildings are exempt from being a portion of the lot area coverage. Sullivan has some concerns regarding this but will mention those later in the discussion. For R-2, the height is limited to 30 feet lot coverage; in the R-2 area, lots are typically smaller, typically 5,000 to 6,000 square feet. This could be expanded with a couple of adjacent lots. We would be looking at 40% of the first 5,000 square feet which would be 2,000 square feet if it was a 5,000 square foot lot. There would be 10% for the additional area from 5,000 to 20,000 square feet. If larger than 20,000 square feet, you would add on 5% of the additional.

Satterwhite asked if the rules are summarized in writing. Sullivan replied, "Yes". The rules can be found in the document titled, "Lot Coverage to Preserve the Character of Leland Township". If we go with these percentages, Sullivan stated that this would be the language that he recommends be included in the zoning ordinance. Based on previous discussions, R-3 is classified as high density residential and this has been left out of the document. With Option E, this is showing a reduction but a reduction should not be shown in the amount of square footage. Satterwhite confirmed that we are only looking at AC, AR, R-1 and R-2. Sullivan replied that this is correct; R-1A is lakefront property and R-1B is inland property; the same formula has been applied to each.

Telgard stated that he looked through the zoning information and he could not find R-1B with a map when looking online. Cypher replied that this was originally going to be available with the new zoning ordinance which was defeated.

For Option E, it is 35% of the first 10,000 square feet; this would be 3,500 square feet if it is a 10,000 square foot lot. Sullivan added that you would add 2,000 square feet to this for a 20,000 square foot lot. Mitchell stated that, for part 2, it is 40% up to 5,000 and 10% thereafter. This may be up for some discussion as Mitchell was not sure if anyone would like to make some adjustments here to increase this to 10,000 square feet rather than 5,000. This would mean that if two lots were put together, one could have an 8,000 square foot house which seemed oversized to Mitchell. AC pertains to habitable structures only.

Satterwhite stated the rule for AC, AR, R-1A and R-1B and confirmed that AC is only for habitable structures. Mitchell replied, "Yes; these are exempted".

Satterwhite expressed some concern because he stated that one cannot discern what the rules are by looking at the document but we can see the results. He would like to get the information into an organized manner. He summarized that for AC, AR, R-1A and R-1B, their rule is 35% for the first 10,000, 10% of 45 and 5% thereafter. The only asterisk is within AC due to the uninhabitable structures. In R-2, it is not 35, 10, 5, it is 40 up to 5 and 10 thereafter. Sullivan clarified that it is 10 up to 20,000 square feet and then 5 thereafter. It is 10 from 5 to 20. Sullivan sent a copy of Mitchell's email to Satterwhite.

Satterwhite inquired about the changes to the heights. Mitchell stated that, in R-2 medium, it has changed from 35% to 30%; this is the only change. In R-1A and R-1B, there is no change. There is no limit on the total square footage that is permitted. The setbacks have changed. In the R-2 district, if it is a one-story building, it would be 20 feet. Sullivan noted that he did not specify in the document that it had to be 10 feet on each side. Setbacks in R-1 would be

equal to the maximum height of the building. Satterwhite confirmed that the maximum height of the building can be 35 feet or 20 feet if the building is less than 20 feet tall. With regard to R-1 which is 15 feet; Satterwhite confirmed that there will be five feet on one side and ten feet on the other side.

Cypher asked a question about the heights. He stated that people sometimes like to add a second story onto their home. The unintended consequence is that they already have their setbacks defined, they would not be able to add the second story because they could not meet the setback requirements. Cypher asked if this is acceptable to everyone, and if not, is there a potential workaround. Mitchell stated that this is a good point. Satterwhite stated that they would save the footprint but they could knock the house down. Sullivan stated that if the house is knocked down, they will most likely change the footprint. However, if they want to add a second story onto a one-story building, it is very conceivable that the footprint will be the same. Satterwhite stated that we should focus on the 99% of the requests that the PC would be dealing with and focus on the outliers at a later time.

Satterwhite stated that the information in this document and on the spreadsheets is close. He asked, "Are we there or do we still need to do some final tweaking"? He stated that the size reductions are meaningful reductions. Satterwhite stated that for a 5,000 square foot lot, one could build a 6,000 square foot house in town now. This is a very large house on a 5,000 square foot lot. Mitchell stated that people are not building 10,000 square foot houses in Leland; all homes are within character now. He believes this is what people want. Telgard asked why the PC is doing such a deep dive into this matter if Mitchell's statement is correct. Mitchell replied that, for him personally, this gets at the issue of short-term rentals and regulation. He was going to suggest that the PC table this topic until the lame duck session but Mitchell feels that if we can regulate short-term rentals, this helps the PC get ahead of the issue. If we can't regulate short-term rentals and there is an increase in development, we could see 6,000 square foot boxes with flat roofs being built one after another. He does not believe this would be the case or that anyone would want to see this. Telgard stated that we could look at occupancy in terms of how many people are living in one house. Mitchell noted that this cannot be regulated differently than someone else. We cannot treat an owner of a property and a short-term rental differently.

Mr. Bunbury stated that we are trying to preserve our residential character, too. People tell him that the Glen Lake area is not what it used to be due to the very large homes in this area; people feel that this area has lost its character. Chairman Korson asked Mr. Bunbury his thoughts on this and if it works based on the formulas that have been created. Chairman Korson was curious if Mr. Bunbury were to apply these formulas, what does it make the houses look like.

Satterwhite stated that with a 10,000 square foot lot such as when two lots are put together, a 12,000 square foot home can be built. We are protecting the guerilla house; now the owner can only build a 7,500 square foot house. Mitchell stated that it is not as much about size as it is density. If someone wants to build a 20,000 square foot house, they still can. You could see acre by acre by acre of 15,000 square feet repeatedly. This would be easier for someone to do than to come in and accumulate three or four acres continuous on the lake and build a very large home. This reduces the density so that if there are very large houses, they are seen every three acres or so, as opposed to every one acre.

Satterwhite inquired about the rule for R-1 and stated that the rule here does not seem to be the same as for R-2. Mitchell stated that the idea with the height is that, when discussing character, we are talking about what can be seen from the road. He cited Juniper Street as an example. A house that is on the water is probably only 30 feet high from the road because it has the walkout in the back. The house that is across the street and not on the water will have the same 30 feet from the road. Satterwhite suggested that next to the Option A column on the spreadsheet, "Estimated Maximum Home Size" should be added. Based on where we are today, we have not done anything for the 5,000 square foot lot but we have helped with the double lot combination. He is not sure that we have done enough for the 5,000 or 6,000 square foot lots. Showing the math in the column that Satterwhite suggested would give a little more context to help people understand further.

Mitchell and Satterwhite discussed garages, porches and decks; Mitchell would take off 1,000 square feet for porches and garages. Satterwhite confirmed that covered porches and garages count but open decks, driveways and walkways do not. A two-story house could be 10,000 square feet on an acre whereas right now, it could be closer to 15,000 or 20,000 square feet. Mitchell stated that one can currently build a 30,000 square foot home on a two-acre lot. Mr. Bunbury made reference to a large home in Cemetery Point. Mitchell stated that it is not that you cannot build a large home, but it cannot be constructed on only two acres.

Mr. Bunbury stated that we need to give people a message when they come into the area to build. Mitchell stated that this is why he was focused on density and this is why the bigger homes could be seen every couple of acres but not on every acre. Satterwhite agreed and stated that we are the "gatekeepers". He added that it is our charge to give the community a chance to knock this back a bit. If it is too much, it will not pass but Satterwhite stated that at least we can say that we did our job. Satterwhite commented that the information as it has been prepared is very close; he cannot think of how we can make it any tighter at this point without making it more challenging.

Telgard stated that this is not a simple task. He believes that eyes will glaze over and that people will believe we are taking something away from them. He believes that Mr. Mikowski will spread the word that the PC is attempting to take away your rights. He stated that individuals like Mr. Mikowski are needed as a guard rail and to keep us honest but noted that how we sell this to the public is critical. Telgard added that this will be a tough sell to the Township Board since they have to approve this, too.

Satterwhite added that if people are concerned about very large homes being built, this takes something away from the person with the gargantuan appetite. This is not taking anything away from a person who does not have the appetite for a very large home.

Mitchell stated that once we focus on one column, it will be easier to understand the spreadsheet. We have been looking at a lot of numbers but the information will be less complicated. Sullivan stated that people may still be in opposition.

Mitchell stated that with 35% for the first 10,000 square feet, we do not need to make rules people have to live by forever. In ten years, it can be moved to 40%, etc. based on whether people feel the percentages are too restrictive or not restrictive enough. Satterwhite stated that we are not the first community to try to regulate excessive home size; this happens all over the country. Satterwhite stated that if the community does not want this, it is fine; however, the PC has spent hundreds of man hours on this and we should not be looking at this again next year.

Sullivan gave an example of an individual he spoke to who does not own property in Leland Township but who stated she would like to have a four-bay garage in order to park a camper inside; Sullivan added that this would be at least 1,150 square feet. In this situation, the height is increasing so the footprint would not expand but the camper is probably not 24 feet deep when adding the tongue and everything else. He asked what this would do to the numbers.

Sullivan asked whether the public would buy this or not. Satterwhite stated that this is a natural progression as to what happens. He believes it is the right time to get this in front of people. He would like to see some estimated maximum home size indicated based on the size of the lot. This could be done based on what the ordinance currently allows. Mitchell commented that, with regard to R-2 medium density, we could subtract 500 for the garage and covered, and subtract 1,000 on the others. In general terms, we could take this off and double the rest and this would be the maximum.

Mr. Bunbury stated that it would be key to use the term “residential preservation” if we want to show that we are preserving the character of the

area. However, Mitchell noted that we must be careful with the term “preservation” as it can sometimes be interpreted as limiting in terms of what you can and cannot do with your property. Satterwhite stated that this is a way of tamping down the extravagant-sized homes; we are taking this out of the zoning ordinance. Mitchell stated that he wants people to know that this is not overly restrictive.

This proposal would go through the Township Board; it would not appear on the ballot. There will be a Public Hearing in this matter, too. Telgard stated that this would also go to the Leelanau County Planning Commission.

Mitchell asked if we could have a public vote. Sullivan replied this would only be possible if there is a referendum to overturn the adoption of this language; he explained the process that would occur in the event of a referendum. If the Township Board votes to adopt these changes, the public has the right to request a referendum to put the changes on the ballot. A petition would be submitted with a certain number of signatures from registered voters and it would then appear on the ballot at the next scheduled election.

Chairman Korson agrees with Telgard on the complexity of this matter; he believes that people will assume we are hiding something in the document. He added that, as a Commission, it is our job to be sure that people understand the information.

Sullivan reminded the PC that, at the last meeting, Cypher mentioned that he has a friend who can prepare a digital rendering to depict this information visually; all agreed that this would be a good idea.

Cypher stated that we have a schedule of regulations which is a one-stop look-see that shows what you can do based on the zoning. He stated that we should write down what we have done on one sheet of paper, columnize it and allow people to read this information easily; this will be our sales tool. In order for this to work, people will need to see it and read the information.

Satterwhite stated that we must convince ourselves why we are doing this, and that it is the right thing to do, so that it can be explained to the Township Board as well as to the public. If the public does not desire this, they can have a referendum to remove this. We do not have to convince everyone in the community to vote for this. Chairman Korson added that this is not drastic, but it is complicated. Telgard stated that the PC should not be afraid of public opinion. Sullivan noted that typically the naysayers will come to the meeting; he stated that typically people do not come to meetings when they support an initiative. Satterwhite stated that, with regard to this matter, we may actually have a great deal of support here.

The PC members primarily focused on Column E of the spreadsheet. Chairman Korson stated that we should toss it out there. We can always tweak the information after the Public Hearing. Cypher added that we first need to have the tools to show the public. Satterwhite stated that if we add the column with maximum sizes and use Mitchell's information for covered porches, garages, etc., this would work.

Cypher asked Sullivan to get a schedule together that he can send to his friend. Cypher will request that a schedule of regulations and graphics with a bird's eye view and street view be prepared for the next meeting. Cypher stated that we should put four lots together and show four examples of what could happen; this could be shown for the various zoning districts. Without tools, we will not be doing anything but explaining the information in words. Mitchell stated that he will do the maximum square foot calculations. Cypher can get with the assessor as she has measurements, various information and photographs that could be used in the database.

Sullivan stated that the AC and AR districts are of concern. Because we are putting a size limitation on the buildings and uninhabited accessory buildings are exempt from the coverage formula; theoretically, a person could cover their property with pole barns, etc. He asked if this is a concern. Mitchell stated that this is an unintended consequence and he would prefer that this be less restrictive rather than be accidentally restrictive to farmers, wineries, etc. He would rather see a few who overbuild as opposed to one who has problems. Sullivan stated that the language "uninhabitable accessory buildings", could be changed to "agricultural buildings are exempt from coverage". Mitchell pointed out that then we would have to define "agricultural"; he indicated that defining "uninhabitable" is easy but defining "agricultural" is more difficult.

Chairman Korson asked a question regarding Right to Farm and lot coverages; are they restricted by zoning percentage lot coverages or are they exempt. Cypher stated that a recent court case in Solon Township resulted in them trumping our lot coverage for commercial farm operations. He added that between this and the setbacks, anything which deals with the Right to Farm Act will be suspect. Cypher can confirm this with a colleague at MDARD. Sullivan stated that while a large percentage of property in the AC and AR district is zoned to allow farming, a vast majority of it is not farmed. From an acreage standpoint, 50% may be farmed but this would not be true if you looked at parcels. Mitchell expanded on this using an example of a shed which contains chickens. Sullivan explained that the issue is that if one egg is sold, this constitutes a commercial farming operation. Mitchell stated that we want to be very straightforward.

Mitchell noted that in regard to Cypher's original point, it might be a good idea to leave R2 medium density at 15 feet. There may be someone with a 1,200 square foot cottage but they desire to make this a 2,400 square foot house.

Sullivan mentioned about the fire wall; within five feet, windows and other openings are not allowed in the side of the building. It is not only the zoning that comes into play here, but also the zoning code. He stated that the average person may share the view that they do not want one side of the building to not have any windows.

As the only member of the public in attendance, Satterwhite asked Mr. Green his thoughts and did he follow what the PC was trying to do. Mr. Green stated that he believes the PC members have a very difficult job but he likes the idea of keeping the language simple, as well as how they plan to sell this to the public.

Sullivan stated that members of the Lake Leelanau Lake Association may have some positive support for this initiative. Satterwhite concurred and stated that many people attended a Public Hearing to regulate the size of boat houses along the river and briefly discussed the various changes that were made regarding boat houses.

B. Master Plan – Status update from Planner

Sullivan discussed Chapters 1 and 3 of the Master Plan and stated that he is following the sequence of the existing plan; these were sent via email to the PC members. Satterwhite asked what must still happen until we get to the end of this project. Sullivan replied that the current plan has nine chapters; these were identified. He asked the PC members to let him know if they have changes to the introduction section. There will be some additions to the sections on transportation and utilities. Sullivan will add publicly owned properties as well as identify where the new Leland Township offices will be located. Mitchell added that there has been no decision on the new location of the township office; Facilities is still looking into this matter.

Sullivan is waiting for some additional census information. He will write up a chapter pertaining to the labor force. This will address whether most people who reside in the township are working within the township or outside of the township; he stated that most people are working outside of the township. With regard to natural resources, he may make a few changes to the text regarding water quality, well water, etc. He is waiting on the land use maps and indicated that Cypher has met with the mapping department personnel at Leelanau County; they will be updating some of the maps that are contained in the current plan. Sullivan explained who he contacted for certain information; this includes Steve Patmore, the Harbormaster and others. School enrollment figures will also be added. Sullivan will obtain figures from

both Leland Public Schools and St. Mary's. Mitchell will share a link with Sullivan where he can obtain some of the school-related information.

Satterwhite asked if the PC still needs to provide Sullivan with any further comments regarding the document. He confirmed that Sullivan is the aggregator of information that will appear in the final document. Sullivan replied that he will still need comments from the PC members on the sections pertaining to Community Goals and Objectives, as well as Future Land Use Recommendations; these are two of the total nine chapters that will appear in the Master Plan. Sullivan will complete the other seven chapters sometime this month. Satterwhite confirmed that, at this point, we would be finished. Sullivan stated that the PC can then submit the document to the township board to have them release it for a Public Hearing.

With regard to the Master Plan, Cypher asked the PC where they would like to see additional R3 zoning. He stated that Lake Leelanau would be a good area for this due to the available space; the space is not available in Leland to further expand R3.

Satterwhite asked Sullivan when we would have the two chapters that the PC will need to review and comment on. Sullivan replied that the future land use recommendations will be based in part on what the existing land use is now. Cypher stated that we will have maps for the December meeting. Sullivan added that he will need some time to put everything together; Cypher noted that we already have an existing future land use map and a zoning map that Sullivan can work from to show the expansion in the individual districts. Sullivan must make his recommendations to the Leelanau County Planning Commission and then he will receive their response.

Sullivan stated that he envisions completing the draft of the Master Plan by the end of the calendar year. The timeline may seem aggressive but Sullivan indicated that this is what he is aiming for. Satterwhite stated that the PC will need some time to digest the information but he wants to be sure that the PC is not holding up Sullivan.

Mr. Green stated that he appreciates the timeline information. In the two chapters that Sullivan discussed at tonight's meeting, Mr. Green stated that reference should be made to "land and water use" and not only "land use". He commented that the decisions that the PC could make would have an effect on Lake Leelanau and asked that this be kept in mind. Sullivan reached out to the Lake Leelanau Lake Association and they provided some information to him. Sullivan added that he may come out to the township to meet with some people from the Lake Association, Health Department officials and the County Planning Department face-to-face to further discuss this matter; these discussions may move things along more quickly.

With regard to R-3 zoning, Sullivan stated that this could have a substantial impact on water quality. He reached out to Steve Patmore to obtain information on the handling of a sewer system if we are looking at expansion; for example, if there were to be a new apartment complex. Telgard stated that he served on the Sewer Commission many years ago and, at the time, there was enough room in the drain field, but he is not sure if this is still true. How the charges would be allocated is another matter. Additional discussion ensued regarding the sewer system. With regard to this, Satterwhite stated that the job of the PC is to make recommendations; we are not experts in the management of the sewer system. Sullivan stated that the PC could make recommendations to the appropriate agency regarding expansion of the sewer system, if necessary.

Chairman Korson asked about highlighted changes and asked if Sullivan re-wrote the entire document. Sullivan stated that he did re-write the document. Mitchell offered several suggestions based on his review of the chapters that Sullivan distributed. He asked about transportation and inquired if North Lake Leelanau should be included, too, since people who live on the lake use it. Under utilities, Mitchell noted that the use of natural gas has expanded quite a bit in this area. He also mentioned broadband and Bay Area Recycling for Charities (BARC) and stated that this organization provides curbside recycling. It was stated that there should be a discussion about the future renovation plans for the library as this will be an expensive undertaking.

Mitchell asked how many firefighters we are budgeted for; he proposed using language that stated, "We can have up to nine firefighters" instead. At any time, what we are budgeted for and what we actually have differ. Recently, for two days, we had nine firefighters, but one firefighter announced he would be returning to school in January so the head count will decrease.

Satterwhite stated that the Leelanau Children's Center next to the Leland Public Schools should also be included; this is a preschool. Mitchell added that St. Mary's has a pre-school program, too. Chairman Korson inquired as to the exact location of the Leelanau Montessori Public School Academy. Cypher replied that this building is in Leland Township; therefore, this should be added in the Master Plan as well. Mitchell will forward his notes to Sullivan.

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

Cypher stated that there will be a big push regarding short-term rentals with the lame duck session after the upcoming election. Whether or not this will come to fruition remains to be seen.

D. Other Business

Sullivan spoke to a property owner near Cypher's property and noted that there is a matter from which Cypher has recused himself. This property is zoned C2. Sullivan asked if multiple family housing units are allowed in the PUD district and asked Cypher if it is appropriate for him to raise this question. Sullivan also asked if it is appropriate for him to raise this question with the PC and added that the ZA normally makes this determination prior to the matter coming before the PC. Cypher stated that he is unable to comment. Cypher suggested that Sullivan look at the zoning ordinance and form his own interpretation based on the language therein.

Satterwhite inquired as to why Cypher is recusing himself in this matter. Cypher replied that the property in question is next to the properties owned by he and his son. There was an issue with the previous landowner who is related to the current applicant. Cypher informed the PC members that, per his discussion with the township supervisor, he should recuse himself. The township supervisor also informed Sullivan that he should step in and handle this matter since Cypher recused himself. Sullivan stated that he will make a recommendation to the PC.

X. Zoning Administrator Comment

Cypher thanked the PC members for allowing him to attend the meeting virtually.

XI. Planning Commission Comment

Satterwhite thanked everyone for the work they have put forth on matters that were discussed at tonight's meeting.

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

Mr. Jeff Green thanked Sullivan for working with the Lake Leelanau Lake Association and he reiterated the importance of considering both land and water use in the Master Plan. He added that the lake is very important and is a big part of the township; population density will have a major impact on the lake. Sewage, boat launches and the increased traffic that would be on the lake would also be factors. He stated that the goal of the Lake Leelanau Lake Association is to preserve the health and beauty of the lake.

XIII. Adjournment

There being no objection, Chairman Korson adjourned the meeting at 8:45 p.m.

APPROVED

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

Respectfully submitted,
Allison Hubley-Patterson
Recording Secretary

APPROVED

APPENDIX A – Leland Township ZA Report (October 2022)

Leland Township
Zoning Administrator's
OCTOBER 2022 REPORT

To: Leland Township Board & Leland Planning Commission

From: *Timothy A. Cypher* 10/31/2022

Land Use Permits Issued:	5	YEAR TO DATE	56
Signs / Home Occupation	0		
Single Family Residences (SFR)	2		
Additions to SFR	2		
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	1	PENDING	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	9		
Violations/Investigations	0	**VIOLATIONS**	
	1	INVESTIGATIONS PENDING	
		RV USE AS SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING	

I supplied information via 31 phone calls & 24 emails to Township residents & others.
I attended the Township Board and Planning Commission meetings.
Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

tim@alpermits.com

Phone 231-360-2557

APPROVED

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

LELAND TOWNSHIP - ZA'S MONTHLY SUMMARY

Period: OCTOBER 2022

DATE	PERMIT #	NAME	USE	REC. #	CK.#	AMOUNT
10/19/2022	LUP 22-52	ACKER	LAND USE	202252	2084	\$ 90.00
009-134-019-10	5220 E. EAGLES NEST LN.	NEW DWELLING 2 DECKS PORCH			1,981 S.F.	
10/20/2022	LUP 22-53	JAMISON	LAND USE	202253	1724	\$ 40.00
009-027-015-20	738 S. FRENCH ROAD	DECK EXPANSION			228 S.F.	
10/20/2022	LUP 22-54	PARKS	LAND USE	202254	3974	\$ 50.00
009-022-011-00	5655 E. DUCK LAKE RD	CHG OF USE TO GUEST QUARTERS - EGRESS WINDOW			12 S.F.	
10/20/2022	LUP 22-55	BRACKEN TRUST	LAND USE	202255	80999	\$ 90.00
009-009-043-20	740 S. INDIANA WOODS	DWELLING ADDITIONS COV.ENTRY BEDROOM 2ND LEV.			1,446 S.F.	
10/20/2022	LUP 22-56	HELMICK	LAND USE	202256	80996 / 80875	\$ 90.00
009-730-113-00	507 S. LAKE STREET	STORAGE STUDIO 2ND LEVEL REMODEL			1,422 S.F.	
10/12/2022	LDA 22-03	SPRATTMORAN	LAND DIV.	LDA22.03	2065	\$ 100.00
009-014-002-40	1480 N. LAKE LEEANAU	LAND DIVISION CREATING ONE NEW PARCEL				
10/31/2022	ZBA 22-01	FALLING WATERS LODGE		ZBA22.01	3816	\$ 300.00
	200 AVENUE A	DIMENSIONAL VARIANCE TO ALLOW FOR A DECK ABOVE A ROOF				

TOTAL \$ 760.00

SIGNED:

TIMOTHY A. CYPHER

DATE: 10/31/2022

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

APPROVED

APPROVED