

LELAND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Wednesday, June 1, 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 7:02 p.m. with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Present: Dan Korson, Chairperson; Clint Mitchell, Township Board Rep; Ross Satterwhite, ZBA Rep (excused himself at 10:10 pm due to an early airline flight); Sam Simpson, Secretary; Skip Telgard, Vice Chairperson

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

There were nine (9) 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 June agenda.

Satterwhite moved to approve the June agenda as presented; Mitchell seconded. All present in favor, motion carried.

III. Declaration of Potential Conflicts of Interest

Satterwhite stated that he is on the school board for the Leland Public School; the school building is located next to the Leland Lodge which is seeking approving for a PUD amendment.

IV. Approval of Minutes from May 4, 2022

Chairman Korson asked for a motion to approve the April minutes.

Satterwhite moved to approve the May 4, 2022 minutes as presented; Telgard seconded. All present in favor, motion carried.

V. Correspondence – Cypher stated that he will discuss correspondence that was received during the public hearings.

VI. Public Comment (three minutes per person unless extended by Chairperson)

Mr. Jeff Green, Ms. Laura Paine and Ms. Nancy Popa of the Lake Leelanau Lake Association addressed the forum and stated that they wish to contribute to the Master Plan process. Mr. Green stated that this is due to the fact that the Association understands the importance of land usage as well as keeping the lake healthy. Ms. Paine distributed a document to the PC members and Ms. Popa spoke on behalf of the Lake Stewards Committee. They are pleased with the language in the Master Plan but discussed items in red type that they believe should be added to the document.

With regard to Chapter 6, the Association would suggest that language be added under "Septic and Sewer Issues" to support a sewer inspection upon the sale of a home. They also believe that a section on "Sensitive Areas" and "Keyhole Development" should be added to the Master Plan and suggested language was provided. The Association is willing to help craft any language needed for the Master Plan.

Mr. Chris Bunbury stated that he has noticed increased foam and PFAS around the lake but noted that the septic systems are contributing to this.

VII. Reports

Township Board Rep: no report

ZBA Rep: no report

VIII. New Business

A. Leland Lodge – SLUP Amendment - Public Hearing

1. Presentation by Applicant

Mr. Pete Miller and Mr. Mark Lutz presented on behalf of Leland Lodge. Mr. Miller's office is located at 201 North Main Street, Leland, Michigan. Mr. Miller began by requesting that the documents that he distributed be made a part of the record. These documents include: (1) e-mail exchange between Mr. Miller and Mr. Steve Patmore; (2) updated comments regarding the SLUP and PUD Site Plan Amendment; (3) e-mail exchange between Mr. Miller and Bill and Donna Steel; (4) Leland Lodge PUD/Site Plan Amendment Application Revision & Supplement; (5) proposed findings; (6) Leelanau Country Road Commission (LCRC) permit; (7) updated site plan and construction documents. It is noted that the revised site plan includes changes related to the parking spaces and traffic flow.

The documents also include a letter from the sewer authority. The Leland Lodge must pay attention to the cottage as it is changing from two rental units to four rental units; this will impact the sewer benefit cost. Attention must be paid to where the tanks are located so access is not impaired.

Mr. Miller discussed his conversation with Bill and Donna Steel whose home is located near the campus. He reported that the concerns that Mr. and Mrs. Steel expressed in their e-mail message have been addressed.

The amendment will reduce by two the total approved lodging units at this time. The open space on the parcel will be about 47% and five parking spaces will be added. The LCRC informed the applicant that a turnaround space will be needed. The setback issue related to the Joy/Janice Sue Cottage will be cured and the Bogey's deck space will be expanded.

Mr. Miller added that there will be no change in the types of use and this is noted in the findings that the applicant presented. It is also noted that the back cottage request to re-build has been cancelled; the plan now is to re-build the Joy/Janice Sue Cottage located at the front of the property.

Fred and Elizabeth Siegmund expressed concern in writing about noise coming from music on the premises; their concern is primarily regarding bass noise. They reside in a low-rise cottage that is surrounded by cedar hedges. Mr. Miller commented that the Lodge has reduced the number of dance band events that will take place. Mr. Siegmund stated he was not comfortable talking about this matter with board members but Mr. Miller spoke to the management personnel at the Lodge and provided Mr. Siegmund with their telephone numbers. He added that the Lodge plans to continue to have outdoor music but Mr. Siegmund now has the appropriate contact information should an issue arise.

Cypher asked how many seats will be in the deck space; Mr. Miller responded that there will be 24 spaces based on the additional tables that will be added in this area. Discussion ensued regarding additional screening that will be added based on what the ordinance requires and to address Mr. and Mrs. Steel's concerns. Plans for storage and paving and striping of the parking area were also discussed.

Timing of the project was discussed. Phase I will include all items with the exception of the Joy/Janice Sue Cottage which will be addressed in Phase II. It is estimated that Phase II will begin within four years of approval. Each phase will be complete after one year of commencement.

The parking was originally proposed to be perpendicular; however, this conflicts with the zoning ordinance. Perpendicular and angular parking were eliminated from the site plan. The LCRC has approved the proposed traffic

flow. To address the concerns expressed by Mr. and Mrs. Steel, a landscape plan will be submitted to the Zoning Administrator for approval. The applicant has agreed to the request from Mr. and Mrs. Steel to not have the main entrance on the western façade; the primary entrance will be on the north or east side.

Mr. Miller addressed the proposed findings document that he assembled for Section 6.08, items A, B and C; two of these items refer to the proposed project not having an adverse effect relative to the ordinance.

The applicant now has approvals from the Fire Department, the Drain Commission and the LCRC for the rear area. They do not yet have a permit for the Joy/Janice Sue Cottage because this permit would only be in effect for one year. Regarding the sewer, comments were provided via e-mail by Steve Patmore, Sewer Administrator for Leland Township. The construction code office will not render a pre-approval as they must first review the project plans. There is also a letter of support from the Leland Country Club.

Mr. Miller briefly discussed the findings of fact document that he prepared; however, the PC agreed to continue this discussion under the "Findings of Fact" section of tonight's agenda.

2. PC Questions/Discussion with Applicant

Mitchell asked about parking to the north of the property. He commented that there are locations where it would be difficult to park a boat trailer. Mr. Lutz stated that a gravel parking area could be added but that there will be no additional parking further to the north. Regarding the striping of the pavement, Mr. Lutz indicated that delineated spaces will be clearly defined. It was noted that a vehicle could park and detach a trailer in some areas. Telgard added that anyone can pull into certain parking spots and park as the LCRC owns the property. Mr. Lutz stated that there will be a "No Parking" sign to the north. Cypher stated that the parking and flow of traffic could be conditions that are noted in the Findings of Fact.

Satterwhite asked Mr. Lutz to show how traffic would flow coming in and out of the Lodge; Lutz explained. Satterwhite and Ms. Stephanie Long, Superintendent of Leland Public School noted that the neighboring school has a different approval from the LCRC regarding traffic flow. Satterwhite stated that the LCRC may not have the call to tell us what we can do on Church Street. Cypher stated that the LCRC has jurisdiction regarding road right-of-way matters. He added that a condition of approval could be that the applicant must meet all LCRC requirements.

Mr. Miller stated that this does involve LCRC jurisdiction but that this should be a three-party agreement; the LCRC must be a part of the discussion. He

added that the Lodge is currently proceeding with the proposed plan for paving and striping.

Mitchell offered a suggestion regarding use of a "Stop" sign; however, it was noted that this option will not work for delivery vehicles entering the Lodge premises. The area in question is currently under construction and Team Elmer's is moving along quickly on the project.

Simpson inquired if there is anything structurally different that would need to be done depending on approval of the application. Mr. Lutz commented that some "tweaking" could be done, if needed.

Discussion ensued as to whether the area in question could be made one-way. Satterwhite commented that it would be beneficial if the Lodge could discuss this matter with the LCRC and state that both the school and the Lodge would like this to be one-way.

Ms. Stephanie Long, Superintendent of Leland Public School stated that she was recently told that the LCRC indicated that they would be turning Church Street into two-way; she added that the traffic pattern has been approved three times since 2000. The flow was turned into one-way to address issues related to picking up the children who attend the school. Ms. Long is looking into whether this area is publicly owned but feels that they should grant an easement to the lodge for guests to use the loop. Ms. Miller stated that he will contact the attorney for the Leland Public School to obtain the prior court documents regarding past decisions on this matter. Satterwhite asked if they could vacate the remainder of the area but Cypher noted that this would be the LCRC's decision.

Mitchell inquired about the outdoor music and asked if acoustic panels could be used or could music be moved to the opposite end of the deck. Mr. Miller suggested that we see if Mr. Siegmund's concerns will be addressed now that he has the contact information for the managers of the Lodge. The management team is now sensitive to this issue. Cypher stated that if there is a nuisance complaint, he will investigate and would tell the Lodge that music must be turned down.

Cypher stated that the additional seating on the deck equates to eight extra parking spaces that will be needed and asked if the site plan incorporates these spaces. Mr. Miller responded that since the Lodge is relieved of four lodging units, they now have enough capacity since only two units will be added. Cypher added that on-street parking will not count. Mr. Lutz reviewed for the PC members the parking that is being added. Cypher requested to see the increase of five parking spaces and net decrease of two lodging units on the site plan or have this information stated in an e-mail message. Mr. Lutz stated that overlap is permitted in the ordinance.

Simpson asked about plans to work with the school. Mr. Miller explained the boundaries for Church Street and reiterated the need for a three-way conversation between the school, the Lodge and the LCRC. Simpson commented that he does see this as a major safety concern. Mr. Miller noted that if there is a minor change made, Cypher can approve the change.

3. Discussion with Staff, if Needed

Cypher stated the three findings that Mr. Miller briefly mentioned are correct; everything falls into the LCRC jurisdiction.

4. Public Comment (limited to three minutes per person unless extended by chair) – no public comment

5. Applicant's Response to Public Comment – none

6. Findings of Fact / Conditions

Cypher led the PC members through a discussion of the Findings of Fact.

Page 1:

Mr. Miller addressed all items on page 1.

Page 2:

Section 6.05.H:

Mr. Lutz commented that there are two proposed streetlights that direct light downwards; these match the school lighting exactly. Cypher added that all lighting must meet the ordinance requirements.

Sullivan requested to return to Section 6.05.D regarding fence height. Our ordinance allows for not less than six-feet; other places allow for five-feet but the Lodge is proposing an eight-foot fence. Cypher stated that this could be extended with lattice. Mr. Miller explained on the site plan where the eight-foot fencing is proposed; this is consistent with Section 23.04 (Screening by Fences or Landscaping). He added that in an R2 district where there is commercial, and eight-foot fence is permitted. Satterwhite stated that the Lodge could do what they want because they are not screening from residences but from the parking lot. Chairman Korson noted that this cannot be stated just because no party is affected. Satterwhite asked what the decision is of the PC members on this item. Cypher stated that language must be included to support the eight-foot

fence and that a finding is needed. Mr. Miller suggested that the language in the finding state, "Up to eight feet".

Section 6.05.I:

This is subject to LCRC approval.

Section 6.05.K:

This is subject to LCRC approval.

Page 3:

Section 6.05.O2:

Cypher confirmed that there are no floor drains.

Section 6.08 – Changes and Appeals:

Mr. Miller prepared a findings document for items A, B and C in this section. His comments will be incorporated into the Findings of Fact prepared by Cypher.

Page 8:

Section 17.02 – Waiver of Standards

Cypher stated that these standards have been met and we are all set here.

The applicant will provide updated information showing the additions and subtractions of parking spaces.

7. Further Discussions with Staff or Applicant, if Needed

Chairman Korson asked what the storage will look like. Mr. Miller responded that there will be a steel structure that will be hidden from view. Mr. Lutz added that this structure will be painted so it will be camouflaged with what is next to the storage structure.

8. Consideration of Motion by PC to Approve, Approve with Conditions, or Deny Application per Zoning Ordinance Requirements

Chairman Korson asked for a motion to approve the SLUP Amendment for The Leland Lodge with conditions noted in the Findings of Fact. **Simpson moved to approve the SLUP Amendment for The Leland Lodge with conditions noted in the Findings of Fact; Mitchell seconded.**

Roll Call Vote:

Mitchell – Yes

Satterwhite – Yes

Simpson – Yes

Telgard – Yes

Korson – Yes

All present approved; motion carried.

B. Mountain Harbor - SLUP Amendment - Public Hearing

1. Presentation by Applicant

Mr. Peter Barnes presented on behalf of Mountain Harbor, LLC and began by explaining the revised site plan. A copy was also distributed to all PC members.

2. PC Questions/Discussion with Applicant

Chairman Korson inquired about the “18 private parking spaces” denoted on the revised site plan. Discussion ensued regarding the definitions of the words “Parked” and “Stored”. Mr. Barnes used the example of an airplane. If the airplane is “stored”, it has been taken out of use. If the airplane were accessible and ready to fly, it would be considered “parked”.

Cypher read the definition of “mini-storage” from the ordinance. “Mini Storage (warehouse) Facilities: A building or group of buildings in a controlled access or fenced area that contains individual compartmentalized and controlled access stalls or lockers for the storage of customer's goods or wares which are generally not used on a daily basis, including recreational vehicles and watercraft.”

Mitchell differentiated between a vehicle with a hitch and a boat trailer in relation to the concept of being “stored” versus “parked”.

Cypher read the language in section 16.16.B.5 of the ordinance regarding mini-storage facilities. “5. All storage shall be within the enclosed building area. There shall be no outside storage or stockpiling.”

Mr. Barnes stated that his facility will offer private parking use, not storage use. Chairman Korson commented that we do not want to see plastic flapping in the wind in Lake Leelanau; we want the appearance to be nice, not junky.

Telgard inquired about the buildings on the plan; Mr. Barnes explained the intended use for these buildings. Cypher requested a note stating that two buildings will be added; these are to be constructed in the future. Simpson inquired as to the use of these buildings; Cypher replied that they are used for storage.

3. Discussion with Staff, if Needed

Chairman Korson asked how we enforce junk from accumulating outside. Cypher stated that he checks the property for compliance.

4. Public Comment (limited to three minutes per person unless extended by chair) – no public comment.

5. Applicant's Response to Public Comment – none

6. Findings of Fact / Conditions

Cypher led the PC members through a discussion of the Findings of Fact.

Page 1:

Section 6.03.B – Met

Section 6.03.B.3:

Mr. Barnes is currently working with EGLE and Rick Prince (engineer).

Page 2:

Section 6.03.B.6:

There may be an easement if 7336 is split off; Cypher stated that he is waiting for a response from legal counsel on this matter.

Page 3:

Section 6.03.B.12:

Cypher and Sullivan will review the landscaping plan along with the plan for signage and lighting.

Section 6.03.B.14:

The applicant confirmed that there is no above or below ground storage.

Page 4:

Section 6.03.B.16:

The phasing plan was not provided; however, Mr. Barnes indicated that he intends to start with the back two storage buildings this summer. For building 7334, there is a change of use. Other additions will be three to five years into the future.

Page 5:

Section 6.05 – Site Plan Review Standards

Section 6.05.A – Met

Section 6.05.B:

Cypher and Sullivan will sign off that the applicant is compliant.

Page 6:

Section 6.05.C:

The approval to be received from the Drain Commission and EGLE is a condition of this item.

Section 6.05.D:

Fences have been denoted on the site plan.

Section 6.05.G:

Cypher requested that the additional pedestrian circulation system be added to the site plan.

Section 6.05.H:

Any exterior lighting must meet the zoning ordinance and be night sky friendly.

Satterwhite asked about the night sky friendly requirement. Cypher stated that compliance with this is the intent. He added that we prefer lights to be on motion detectors.

Simpson inquired about landscaping. Mr. Barnes stated that several maples and other trees were recently put in for screening.

Cypher stated that the PC would return to their discussion of parking on page 7.

Section 16.01 – General Standards

Cypher stated that the only question that remains is on page 7 in terms of how parking spaces are referenced.

Discussion ensued regarding the hours of operation. Mr. Barnes stated that there will be no lighting so it will be difficult for people to enter at night. The system will require code access.

Ms. Susan Falkiewicz stated that she is a neighbor who resides across from the Mountain Harbor location.

Satterwhite stated that he does not see any issues; this is simply an expansion of what exists on the premises now.

Page 11:

Section 16.16 – Mini Storage Facilities

Section 16.16.A.3:

Cypher noted that, at the last meeting, the site plan was three spaces short but Mr. Barnes has added these spaces. The code requires the spaces to be eight feet in length but Mr. Barnes stated that the spaces will be 9.5 feet in length.

Section 16.16.A.4:

This item has been met.

Sullivan asked if 7336 is split off, how large will the parcel be? Cypher replied that it could be as small as 8,000 square feet. Mr. Barnes stated that a building would be approximately 50x150.

Cypher added that we allow joint parking from two properties. "E. Location and Joint Use of Parking Areas: All off-street parking areas shall be

located on the same lot, or on the adjacent premises in the same district as the use they are intended to serve. The joint use of parking facilities by two or more uses may be granted by the Board of Appeals whenever such use is practical and satisfactory to each of the uses intended to be served, and when all site development requirements of Section 21.04 are met.”

1. “Computing Capacities: In computing capacities of any joint use, the total space requirement is the sum of the individual requirements that will occur at the same time. If space requirements for individual uses occur at distinctly different times, the total of such off-street parking facilities required for joint or collective use may be reduced below the sum total of the individual space requirements.”
2. “Record of Agreement: A copy of an agreement between joint users shall be filed with the application for a zoning permit and recorded with the Register of Deeds of the County. The agreement shall include a guarantee for continued use of the parking facility by each party.”

Satterwhite inquired about the current use of 7336. Mr. Barnes replied that this is for bulk storage. Cypher commented that a land division could trigger changes here.

Section 16.16.A.5:

Parking spaces will be gravel; there will be asphalt down to the storage units.

Cypher stated that it is not mandated in the ordinance that parking be asphalt; grass with gravel meets the requirements of the ordinance. Mr. Barnes added that drivable grass can be used.

Section 16.16.B.1:

With regard to shipping containers, Mr. Barnes would like one in the front that would measure 8x20 and one in the back that would measure 8x40.

Section 16.16.B.5:

This section will tie back to page 7, Section 6.05.K.

7. Further Discussions with Staff or Applicant, if Needed

Satterwhite stated that the issue is the 18 parking spaces. The debate is whether this is classified as “storage” (inside) or “parking” (outside). Satterwhite asked how boats will be stored on the premises during the

winter months. Cypher mentioned that at Manitou Marine/Schomberg Storage, everything is stored inside during the winter.

Satterwhite asked Mr. Barnes what is stated in the lease that he provides to tenants. He replies that the lease permits parking but that one cannot camp out on the premises. Satterwhite also inquired as to what items are allowed on the premises.

With regard to “outside storage or stockpiling”, Cypher stated that he was assigned to research this further. Cypher and Sullivan discussed this and they concur. Satterwhite stated that we cannot make changes to the ordinance and Cypher stated that this is correct. However, Cypher added that the PC can require whatever they like.

Chairman Korson commented that if one is paying for the space, this seems like “storage”. Cypher stated that parking is normally transient and then asked what does “transient” mean? Cypher commented that he looks at the intent of the ordinance which is to not have a lot of things sitting outside for others to see.

Mr. Barnes stated that the roof will consist of solar panels but the buildings are three-sided and are not enclosed.

Chairman Korson inquired as to how we would police this situation. Cypher read the definition of “temporary”. Mitchell agrees with both Cypher and Mr. Barnes on certain aspects. Chairman Korson asked about boats that are shrink-wrapped and Mitchell commented that this constituted “storage”.

Satterwhite commented that the solution here is a modification of the zoning ordinance. He added that we are attempting to give our community more ways to store cars, boats, etc. but we want the premises to look decent. Simpson added that this could be an eye sore for the town; however, Mr. Barnes noted that things cannot be seen from the road.

Satterwhite asked if the Zoning Board of Appeals can require a roof and four sides; Cypher replied, “Yes”.

Satterwhite asked if this is a one-time approval or will the decision apply to other potential businesses going forward. Cypher stated that when a decision is made, it usually becomes the “law of the land”.

Cypher stated that Mr. Barnes can go to the Zoning Board of Appeals thirty days after the June Planning Commission minutes are approved in July.

Simpson stated that he would vote for the site plan but not for the overall project; the issue that remains pertains to outside parking.

Sullivan added that if the PC approves this application as presented, the Zoning Administrator requests interpretation from the Zoning Board of Appeals and the project is delayed, Mr. Barnes could be facing a three-month delay.

Satterwhite stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals could simply address the matter of the definition of "parking".

8. Consideration of Motion by PC to Approve, Approve with Conditions, or Deny Application per Zoning Ordinance Requirements

Chairman Korson asked for a motion to approve the SLUP Amendment for Mountain Harbor, LLC subject to the removal of the 18 private parking spaces as noted, and with all conditions noted on the Findings of Fact as discussed at this meeting. **Mitchell moved to approve the SLUP Amendment for Mountain Harbor, LLC subject to the removal of the 18 private parking spaces as noted, and with all conditions noted on the Findings of Fact as discussed at this meeting; Simpson seconded.**

Roll Call Vote:

**Mitchell – Yes
Simspon – Yes
Telgard – Yes
Korson - Yes**

Abstained: Satterwhite

It is noted that Satterwhite abstained because he is a member of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

All present approved; motion carried.

IX. Old Business

A. Bunbury Zoning amendment

Mr. Chris Bunbury was present and stated that Mr. Bob Biggs informed him that a house was razed north of town and that a 12,000 square-foot home will be constructed in this location.

Discussion ensued regarding the Residential Lot Coverage table; a revised copy was distributed to all PC members. For R2 Medium Density Village Residential, Option A, Mitchell stated that the figure of 3,611 should be 3,922. When preparing this table, Mitchell stated that he did not consider people combining lots. Sullivan stated that for a platted lot, a zoning permit must be issued.

Sullivan addressed the options presented by Mitchell in this document in terms of how these could be addressed in the zoning ordinance. The document, "Lot coverage to preserve the character of Leland Township" was discussed, specifically Section 18.10: Front Setback Reductions and Increases. Sullivan proposes deleting some text denoted in red and adding text that is highlighted in yellow to the document. His proposed changes apply to Article 10 (Conservation Districts) and Article 11 (Residential Districts).

In Section 11.02 R1A, Sullivan proposed eliminating the words "nearby" and "stable" as these terms are difficult to define. He suggested adding the step method that Mitchell proposed. For Section 18.10, Mitchell stated that he is concerned with setbacks.

Simpson asked about the location of R3. Cypher stated that this is the area north of Leland and in the village of Lake Leelanau. This would be a structure such as an apartment building. Sullivan commented that there may be a need for additional R3; Cypher concurred with Sullivan.

Simpson inquired about the definition of an "agricultural building" and asked where do wineries and wine tasting rooms fit in? Cypher read the definition of an agricultural building. "Agricultural Building: A structure designed and constructed to house farm implements, hay, grain, poultry, livestock, or other horticultural products and that is clearly incidental to an agricultural activity, excluding retail trade."

Simpson asked for further clarification and inquired if this language included wineries due to the prevalence of these types of businesses in the area. Cypher read the definition of a winery. "Winery: A state-licensed facility where agricultural fruit production is maintained; juice is processed into wine; and sold at wholesale or retail to the public with or without the use of a wine tasting facility." (Amendment 2013-04)

Chairman Korson inquired as to how many houses there would be an issue with based on the calculations presented in the Residential Lot Coverage table. He asked how many homes have violated the figures presented under Option A.

Mitchell referenced the Stephenson home which is a large house that also sits on a large parcel. He added that if we were to see this type of home sitting on one acre, this would be a problem. Mitchell commented that what can be built on five acres cannot be built on one acre. He stated that this is not too much of an issue at the present time but we could see larger homes built on smaller lots in the future.

Simpson inquired if the proposed calculations pertain only to the inside of the home or does this also include decks, etc. With regard to lot coverage, the position is that we are looking down on the house, not counting the number of stories in the home.

The proposed figures for R2 will change but all others are limited to 35-feet in height. Cypher stated that three stories can exist within a 35-foot height span.

Chairman Korson stated that we need to think about this for a month or so; people will need to have a good understanding of how to perform these calculations regarding their home. Sullivan and Mitchell will recalculate some of the numbers based on tonight's discussion.

B. Master Plan – Status Update from Planner

Sullivan stated that he is still trying to obtain census data; he will try to obtain some data from the state demographer's office. He would also like to meet with Cypher to further discuss this topic. Sullivan and Cypher will have a draft prepared of the two articles for the next meeting.

C. Short Term Rentals

Cypher stated that there is nothing to report at this time.

X. Zoning Administrator Comments

Cypher discussed a pending keyholing lawsuit but noted that we are not a party to this lawsuit. Additional use has come up with people who own property on Lake Michigan.

Cypher also addressed the comments made earlier this evening by the Lake Leelanau Lake Association representatives. He stated that more townships are getting rid of keyholing but added that any party can grant riparian rights.

Sullivan requested to inform the PC of a project being proposed regarding 5-unit residential structures on C2 commercial property. Cypher has a conflict of interest and Sullivan will be acting as the ZA on this project. He asked if short-

term rentals would be allowed or grandfathered. If this proceeds, the legislature may make a change...motel/hotel...these are some other options.

XI. Planning Commission Comment

Chairman Korson noted that the next meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, July 6th and proposed that this meeting be cancelled as many PC members are very busy at this time with business operations.

Chairman Korson asked for a motion to cancel the July 6, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting and hold the next meeting on the scheduled date of Wednesday, August 3, 2022. **Simpson moved to cancel the July 6, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting and hold the next meeting on the scheduled date of Wednesday, August 3, 2022; Telgard seconded. All present in favor; motion carried.**

XII. Public Comment (limited to three minutes per person unless extended by Chairman) – no public comment

XIII. Adjournment

There being no objection, Chairman Korson adjourned the meeting at 10:50 p.m.

Pursuant to the motion that passed this evening, there will not be a meeting of the Leland Township Planning Commission in July. The next scheduled meeting will be held on Wednesday, August 3, 2022 at 7:00 p.m. at the Leland Township Library (Munnecke Room).

Respectfully submitted,
Allison Hubley-Patterson
Recording Secretary

APPENDIX A

Leland Township
Zoning Administrator's
MAY 2022 REPORT

To: Leland Township Board & Leland Planning Commission

From: *Timothy A. Cypher* 6/7/2022

Land Use Permits Issued:	13	YEAR TO DATE	23
Signs / Home Occupation	0		
Single Family Residences (SFR)	4		
Additions to SFR	1		
Garages / or additions to	1		
Decks & Porches / MISC.	2		
Accessory Buildings	1		
Commercial Construction	2		
Stairs & Landings	0		
Agriculture construction	2		
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	2	2 INQUIRY	
Lot Consolidations	0	1 INQUIRY	
Land Divisions	0	1 INQUIRY	
Property Line Adjustments	0	1 INQUIRY	
Private Roads / Driveways	0	1 INQUIRY	
Zoning / Site Plan Reviews	2	2 INQUIRY	
Construction Inspections	19		
Violations/Investigations	0 **VIOLATIONS**		
	1 INVESTIGATIONS PENDING		
	RV USE AS SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING		

I supplied information via 59 phone calls & 42 emails to Township residents & others.
I attended the Planning Commission meeting & was excused from the Township Board meeting.
Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

tim@alpermits.com

Phone 231-360-2557

APPENDIX B

LELAND TOWNSHIP - ZA'S MONTHLY SUMMARY

		Period: MAY		2022			
DATE	PERMIT #	NAME	USE	REC. #	CK.#	AMOUNT	
009-010-021-00	5/8/2022 LUP 22-11 387 N. TERRACE COURT	LELAND COUNTRY CLUB	LAND USE	202211	23783	\$ 100.00	
		ACCESSORY BUILDING - STORAGE			1,200 S.F.		
009-025-017-26	5/8/2022 LUP 22-12 113 W. ANTHONY ST.	SCHAUB	LAND USE	202212	7503	\$ 90.00	
		NEW DWELLING DECKS & PORCHES			1,189 S.F.		
009-648-001-00	5/9/2022 LUP 22-13 100 N. TERRACE LANE	LIEVENSE	LAND USE	202213	7872	\$ 130.00	
		NEW DWELLING ATT.GARAGE DECK PORCH			3,072 S.F.		
009-730-503-00	5/11/2022 LUP 22-14 2475 N. MANITOU TRAIL	BRENISER	LAND USE	202214	390	\$ 40.00	
		ACCESSORY BUILDING			320 S.F.		
009-125-013-10	5/16/2022 LUP 22-15 5515 N. LELAND WOODS	VENKLASEN	LAND USE	202215	2268	\$ 50.00	
		ADDITION TO ACCESSORY BLDG. & GAME ROOM			790 S.F.		
009-134-014-00	5/21/2022 LUP 22-16 4170 N. MANITOU TR.	BRACCIA	LAND USE	202216	6326	\$ 130.00	
		NEW DWELLING ATT.GARAGE DECK COV.PORCH			13,457 S.F.		
009-025-008-15	5/21/2022 LUP 22-17 6488 E. DUCK LAKE RD.	KIRT, JR.	LAND USE	202217	3205	\$ 130.00	
		NEW DWELLING ATT.GARAGE DECKS			2,920 S.F.		
009-014-006-51	5/21/2022 LUP 22-18 1111 PRESERVATION WAY	PHILLIPS TRUST	LAND USE	202218	9226	\$ 50.00	
		AG STORAGE BUILDING - W/LEAN TO			1380 S.F.		
009-750-271-00	5/21/2022 LUP 22-19 109 N. GRAND AVE.	MADEY	LAND USE	202219	2107	\$ 40.00	
		DECK			280 S.F.		
009-024-001-00	5/23/2022 LUP 22-20 730 N. SYLT RD.	BLUESTONE PARTNER	LAND USE	202220	2321	\$ 50.00	
		AG MIGRANT WORKER HOUSING			1,071 S.F.		
009-750-401-00	5/25/2022 LUP 22-21 102 N. MAIN STREET	MAIER	LAND USE	202221	187	\$ 100.00	
		REPLACEMENT FENCES COOLER SLAB			299 S.F.		
009-003-025-00	5/31/2022 LUP 22-22 3458 N. MANITOU TRAIL	WENSTRUP	LAND USE	202222	2176	\$ 50.00	
		DWELLING ADDITION			244 S.F.		
009-024-020-00	5/31/2022 LUP 22-23 94 N. EAGLE HWY.	WILSON	LAND USE	202223	6130	\$ 40.00	
		PORCH			400 S.F.		
TOTAL						\$ 1,000.00	

SIGNED:

TIMOTHY A. CYPHER

DATE: 6/7/2022

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