

LELAND TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Regular Meeting
Wednesday, June 7, 2023
Leland Township Library, Munnecke Room
200 North Grand Avenue, Leland, MI 49654

I. Call Meeting to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

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

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

Staff Present: Tim Cypher, Zoning Administrator

Staff Absent: Allison Hubley-Patterson, Recording Secretary

There were approximately 14 members from the public in attendance at various times throughout the meeting.

II. Motion to Approve Agenda (additions/subtractions)

Chairman Korson stated that this evening is officially his last meeting; however, he would be willing to remain on the PC and in the Chair position until the Master Plan is completed. After speaking with Cypher, they believe that this can be accomplished by year-end. He would like to change the agenda for this meeting to work on the Master Plan first and then the Residential Lot Coverage Amendment. Agenda item X-B will be moved ahead of agenda item X-A.

Chairman Korson moved to approve the June agenda as amended; Simpson seconded. All present in favor; motion carried.

Satterwhite commented that the reality is that the PC will probably not address the Residential Lot Coverage Amendment this evening; Chairman Korson concurred. Satterwhite made sure that members of the public were aware of this in case they attended the meeting due to this one particular agenda item.

Mr. Chris Bunbury asked the PC when they might get back to addressing the Residential Lot Coverage Amendment. Chairman Korson replied that he was unsure of the timeline. There is a lot to review this evening regarding the Master Plan.

Satterwhite stated that he is fine with tabling the Residential Lot Coverage Amendment for this evening, but he is not okay delaying this for six months until the Master Plan is completed. He believes that the PC can work on two things at once. Satterwhite noted that we recently had a Public Hearing on the Residential Lot Coverage topic and he believes the PC should keep moving on this project; Simpson concurred. Korson stated that the Master Plan is required by law but the Residential Lot Coverage Amendment is not; it is important to wrap-up the Master Plan. Discussion ensued regarding the order of business this evening and what length of time would be devoted to each topic.

It was discussed that there is no scheduled meeting in July and Cypher stated that, in the past, a summer meeting has been difficult due to the lack of a quorum.

III. Declaration of Potential Conflicts of Interest - None

IV. Approval of Minutes from May 3, 2023

Chairman Korson asked for a motion to approve the May 3, 2023 minutes as presented. **Mitchell moved to approve the May 3, 2023 minutes as presented; Telgard seconded. All present in favor; motion carried.**

V. Correspondence

Cypher stated that he received a few letters in opposition to the Residential Lot Coverage Amendment and added that these items of correspondence came in late in the evening after the last meeting/Public Hearing.

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

Ms. Maude Babington resides at 409 S. Main Street. She reviewed the minutes of May 3, 2023 and noticed that the PC was going to create a question and answer sheet for the public. She stated that this was not in the handouts for tonight's meeting and asked what happens to homeowners who have already submitted plans to obtain building permits and who are prepared to start building. She stated that there were many negative comments at the Public Hearing and asked the PC how the public is expected to know what they are planning going forward. She has great concern about the proposal to cut lot coverage for 15,000 square feet by 30%; this is down from about 40% lot coverage allowed today to about 26.5% lot coverage allowed under the new proposed ordinance. She added that she is not an attorney but she believes that, in legal terms, this is considered a "taking" and would greatly reduce the value of property even if the landowner decided not to build due to the proposed changes. She also has great concern that the PC is giving decision making control on the very subjective issue of whether a house

design is “compatible in design and appearance” to only one person—the zoning administrator. If the zoning administrator decides to reject the plan, she believes that a homeowner should have a path to appeal this decision. If this is the role of the ZBA, she asked that this be added to the Q&A sheet. Ms. Babington stated that the proposed zoning ordinance will prevent them from building an elegant, primarily one-story house designed for aging in place.

Mr. Shep Burr thanked the PC for considering this new rezoning for the Township. He also thanked Cypher for his responsiveness and for offering thoughtful direction in the past. He has three primary questions. He lives in a modest house on a modest lot at 492 N. Mill Street along the river; it is zoned R-1A. He believes his lot size is less than one-third the size of the smallest R-1A illustration provided by the PC and that is a lot size of 38,600 square feet. He asked if it would make sense to illustrate what would happen to small lot sizes in the R-1A district similar to his lot. He believes that there are many properties that fall into this category and added that it would be helpful to see the effect of the proposed Amendment; the effect on the larger lots do not mean anything to him due to the difference.

Mr. Burr’s second question was to ask the PC if they should consider different lot size coverages for one-story versus two-story structures. He is not sure as to the actual purpose of this exercise other than trying to eliminate the “McMansions”. He does not reside in Leland year-round and was unable to attend the last meeting. He believes there are many people like him who have a one-story home or want to build one. To the extent that their roofs are not soaring, he asked if it would make sense to allow the same lot size coverage for a one-story building as opposed to a two-story where things can start to get very large.

Mr. Burr’s third question noticed on the footnote on the Residential Lot Coverage spreadsheet that the 24-foot maximum building height at the minimum setback line...is this a proposed rule or a golden rule? Cypher replied that this is a proposed rule and confirmed that it is currently at 35-feet. Mr. Burr confirmed that this would be reduced to 24 feet at the minimum setback line; Cypher stated that this is correct. He does not feel that people understand what the impact of this will be and he believes it is necessary for this to be crystal clear to everyone. He has spent many hours trying to figure this out. He asked the PC if they would be open to suggestions if the public wanted to propose other ideas. He feels this is a good idea but noted that people must understand the proposed Amendment or it will create a great deal of controversy and fear.

Mr. Jeff Green stated that he is with the Lake Leelanau Lake Association. He wanted to remind the PC that the Lake Association would very much like to work with the PC as they progress through the Master Plan.

VII. Reports

Township Board Rep:

Mitchell did not have any information to report.

ZBA Rep:

Satterwhite did not have any information to report.

VIII. New Business

A. Fiddlehead's – Site plan Review (proposed food truck)

Cypher discussed the process that brought us to where we are today. In the past, there has not been a process for connecting a food truck to a specific site in either Leland or Lake Leelanau. Many of the food trucks that have been proposed were proposed for public parkways. The Township Board has a policy that has been in place for over 15 years that their preference is to support the brick-and-mortar businesses.

Under the current zoning in the C1 district, there are standard restaurants which have a use by right. However, there are also accessory uses and structures customarily incidental and subordinate to the permitted principal use. In our definition, Cypher stated that a "building" is anything that is either temporary or permanent and which is used for the purpose or carrying on of different business activities.

On the site of Fiddlehead's, there is an existing restaurant that has been in place for years. Cypher searched the Township archives and discovered that there was never a site plan review because it was a pizza place before zoning came into play. There was never an opportunity for a site plan review with the previous business.

Cypher stated that standard restaurants have expanded with exterior seating, etc. but they have all come through a process. Unless they were pre-existing and grandfathered long ago, they have come before the PC for a review through the site plan review process.

Cypher introduced Josh Deters who will speak to his overall plan. Cypher also prepared draft findings of fact which the PC can go through this evening.

1. Presentation by Applicant

Mr. Josh Deters stated that he has owned the V.I. Grill in Suttons Bay for almost 13 years and opened Fiddlehead's in October of 2021 during Covid. Mr. Richard Roberts was his former business partner but they have parted ways and Mr. Deters now has sole ownership of both V.I. Grill and Fiddlehead's.

He would like to put a food truck on the Fiddlehead's property. He has access to a 1977 Air Stream that is fully built-out with running water, handwashing sinks and refrigeration. The food truck would go in the outdoor seating area running east to west in the parking lot. He will be removing two parking spots but relocating them on his property which will be supplemented with flower pots. The Fire Chief was on vacation when he submitted his packet of information. The food truck does have a propane tank attached to it. The Road Commission has provided a permit to Mr. Deters to possibly shut down the west exit of the parking lot so that people would no longer be able to drive through the lot. The Health Department has technically given their approval pending a final inspection. In order for this to take place, the unit must be at the facility. The food truck is currently located on Secor Road in Traverse City. Fire, safety, plumbing, propane and wastewater tank inspections have already been conducted on the food truck. The Health Inspector is on vacation until June 18th but the unit must be at Fiddlehead's for the inspection to take place. The application has been approved contingent on the final inspection.

Mr. Deters has spoken to Steve Patmore. There will be no drainage into the sewer. Williams & Bay will be pumping the unit as needed; there is very little water coming from the food truck as it will primarily be for hand washing. The correct tanks are in place and there is an on-demand hot water heater.

Mr. Deters stated that he needs to install a 30-amp connector similar to that for a camper that the food truck will plug into. He has lined up an electrician who will be installing the plug by the end of the week.

Mr. Deters would like to undertake this project because he is a business owner and he must increase the business on the restaurant that he just purchased. Fiddlehead's has come a long way and they do a very good business. The volume that they have now achieved and the additional volume that they will experience as more people learn about Fiddlehead's is very hard on the building, especially the kitchen. They will continue to operate inside but will be closing down the kitchen to do prep work in order to support the food truck at 3:00 p.m. daily. The food truck will operate on a very limited basis and will offer express breakfast sandwiches and express lunches. They are trying to expedite the dining experience for their customers because they are a small operation and must turn as many people over as possible.

Fiddlehead's is very affordable but Mr. Deters stated that, in order to make money, he needs to also be open for dinner. He believes the best way to do this is from the food truck in order to take pressure off of the building. The dining experience for people may be as long as 30 to 40 minutes but the food truck will expedite this experience for those who do not want to wait in line or who have small children. Food trucks are typically unprecedented in the County.

They will be closed before it gets dark; however, there are external lights on the food truck. It is a unique vehicle and measures 21-feet in length; it is a silver Air Stream. Mr. Deters stated that the vehicle fits the quirky vibe that Fiddlehead's has to a tee. They will be providing more employment as people will be needed to operate the food truck. He actually is over-staffed at the present time but a couple of existing employees can be used to manage the food truck. The vehicle will be temporary and will be moved by November 1, 2023. Mr. Deters is leasing the food truck and has a copy of the lease in his possession; the lease has been submitted to all necessary parties.

Mr. Deters stated that he has not done this before but he is happy to expand on anything that he stated.

2. PC Questions/Discussion with Applicant

Telgard inquired about bathrooms in the restaurant. Mr. Deters stated that they have one unisex, accessible bathroom inside and they are fully compatible with requirements.

Chairman Korson asked about the exact purpose of the food truck—is it for seating, cooking or food distribution? Mr. Deters stated that they will not be doing any raw cooking in the food truck; all food will be prepared in the commercial kitchen. A hand-held payment system will be used and the food truck will accept credit cards only. Payment will take place at the counter and the customer will receive their food. No alcohol will be served from the food truck. Fiddlehead's does have a license to serve alcohol but the customer will be required to go inside. The vehicle does not provide any seating and no additional seating is planned.

Simpson inquired about the number of parking spaces. Mr. Deters discussed the flower pots and stated that they are actually zoned by the MLCC. They could have extended their fence out to where they could serve the liquor inside but the decision was made to shorten the seating area in case they decided to put extra tables in this area. The parking spaces are being shifted to a different part of the lot so they are not losing any parking.

Chairman Korson asked about room to expand and inquired if lot coverage is the reason they are adding the food truck. He asked Mr. Deters if they have

room to expand. Mr. Deters stated that this is strictly due to cost; he is renting the food truck for \$1,000 per month. His intention with the building is not to build a giant restaurant.

3. Discussion with staff, if needed

Chairman Korson inquired as to the process. Cypher explained that the PC can move to public comment. He added that he heard a few things this evening that have prompted some additional questions, such as the number of trash cans. This will be discussed when the findings of fact are reviewed. Mr. Deters stated that there are already more trash cans in the area than what is needed and explained that it is such a small area that people are only 20-feet from just about everything on the property.

Cypher asked about the seating. This will be in the front, in the back along the side and the restaurant will be open for inside seating, too; existing seating arrangements will be used. Telgard asked if they have reached the limit for seating. Mr. Deters replied that the seating limit has been reached inside but he can add another 15 seats outside. As of right now, there are only 18 seats outside and there is plenty of room for additional seating. He does not plan on adding unnecessary seating but wants to make it easy for people to obtain food. He reiterated that the food truck will help to expedite the food process.

Cypher asked about closing the west drive and inquired if people may be parking on Main Street close to the corner where they are coming off of 204. Cypher stated that this is not a striped area but everyone has the right to use this for parking. Cypher mentioned that he is primarily concerned about the street when people are making the turn. He asked if a barricade would be used. Mr. Deters stated that people pull out of the parking lot near the chiropractor's office and do not look so he believes the arrangement he is proposing will be safer.

Cypher stated that he is not excited about an orange snow fence. Mr. Deters indicated that it is actually a wooden slat fence and he agrees that he does not want the fence to be an eyesore or be offensive to anyone.

Telgard asked if Fiddlehead's is currently on the sewer. Cypher replied that they are on the sewer system. Cypher indicated that Steve Patmore had a note in the packet that his only concern was regarding grease traps. Telgard stated that he is asking due to increased bathroom use which will result in greater input into the sewer; however, if this is metered, everything should be all set.

Mr. Deters hopes to increase his business but is essentially planning to improve the experience for his customers.

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

Ms. Lynn Telgard stated that she has concerns and feels that a food truck is going down a slippery slope. She is concerned about the bathroom and how many people will be using it. She asked where the regulation comes into play that two bathrooms (one for men and one for women) are required. She is also concerned that there is no way to increase the property tax on Fiddlehead's under this proposal. She is aware that business owners need to make money during the season but indicated that she would like to see the community stay with brick-and-mortar structures. She is also concerned about the food truck only having a handwashing sink but added that pots and pans will be in there and these will need to be washed. Water usage will be increased inside the building because these items will need to be washed. Overall, her concerns pertain to other people bringing in food trucks, property taxes, etc. She stated that Mr. Deters is adding on to his building but nothing is being done about this. She stated that the PC must address this in the Master Plan if there is nothing in the zoning ordinance that prohibits food trucks.

Ms. Joy Lang Anderson stated that she feels that Lynn and Skip should recuse themselves from this discussion since they own the Bluebird. Telgard asked if he could reply. Someone stated that they were confused as to why they could not talk and Cypher stated that they should have every right.

5. Applicant's Response to Public Comment

Mr. Deters stated that even if the food truck is not approved, Fiddlehead's will be open for dinner. He will either do the business outside or it will be conducted inside the building. He believes that adding the food truck will not be a big issue because they will be open for dinner anyway. He also discussed the issue of the bathroom with Williams & Bay and an enclosed portalet could be placed out back that would be out of view. Mr. Deters reiterated that the kitchen will close at 3:00 p.m. if the food truck is approved; otherwise, it will be open until 10:00 p.m. so that dinner can be served inside.

Satterwhite informed Mr. Deters that he has a lot of flexibility with the restaurant now in terms of when he can be open. He added that it is nice to know when the restaurant will be open but it is not relevant to the topic being discussed. Mr. Deters repeated that his primary intention is to not be open inside at night so the food truck will act in place of the indoor restaurant experience. If this is successful, Mr. Deters stated that he would continue with the food truck next season. However, he added that there is no guarantee that his lease will be extended although he would like to purchase the food truck. He will not leave the vehicle outside in the winter but it will return in about mid-June of the following season.

Cypher asked about the wiring and how Mr. Deters would prevent this from becoming a trip hazard. He replied that the wiring will be buried.

Cypher stated that, for purposes of clarification, if there was not an existing restaurant on the property, a food truck would not be allowed. The only way this can happen on any site is when there is already a standard restaurant and the accessory uses are structured incidental to the restaurant. A food truck cannot exist by itself because it is not customarily incidental to anything. Mitchell inquired about a second restaurant that might come in and put a food truck on the first restaurant's property if they wanted to lease it out. Cypher stated that this could be an option. Mitchell clarified that he is asking because he believes these are two different things. Mr. Deters' situation is a camper/food truck that is selling his product but this is different than if he went to another restaurant and told them to bring their food truck and place it on his lot. Cypher stated that the issue is that the food truck is leased and controlled by the applicant. Cypher mentioned that many people have inquired about having food trucks in the area. One individual sought to place a food truck at Van's Garage but there is not an existing restaurant in this location. There must be an established business on the permitted uses by right in existence already. Cypher discussed how food trucks have become more popular and stated that he made the determination that this was incidental to the existing restaurant business. Cypher informed the PC that language dictating this can be found under section 12.01 of the ordinance.

Chairman Korson confirmed that Mr. Deters could not add a second food truck next year without coming back to the PC; Cypher stated that this is correct. Cypher noted that C1 is somewhat unique because there are no parking requirements; however, there is a caveat that the existing parking cannot be removed or this will result in parking on the street. This would not be a safe corner for this to happen.

Satterwhite asked to return to the ordinance. Cypher stated that section 12.01B.7 talks about standard restaurants. He added that section 12.01B.5 discusses accessory uses and structures customarily incidental to standard restaurants. Cypher added that a building is defined as a structure that is either temporary or permanent which is used for the purpose of carrying on business activities. Mr. Deters' application is appropriate under this definition. Cypher explained again that this is a use by right but does still require a site plan review. Cypher explained that Article 6 denotes what is required to come before the Planning Commission; Mr. Deters' application must still be vetted for health and safety reasons.

6. Findings of Fact / Conditions

Cypher led the PC through a discussion of the findings of fact.

Page 1:

Item 6.04.A – A condition would be for the Fire Chief to come in and give us an inspection and an approval of the site. Cypher requested that Mr. Deters send him the permit that he received so it can be made an official part of the record.

Cypher stated that verification will be needed from the Sewer Administrator as to whether or not the site is metered; the PC had concerns regarding this as well as the general public regarding water flow.

The Health Department will need to finalize their requirement, too.

The County Construction Code office may decide as they have in other locations and with commercial businesses to mandate additional restrooms; however, this will be their call or will be up to the Health Department. This is not an issue that pertains to the PC

Item 6.05.A – Cypher inquired if the project would impede the normal development of the surrounding property; he asked the PC members to discuss this among themselves. Chairman Korson stated that he has serious concerns. He does not feel that a trailer in the front of downtown Lake Leelanau is a good idea. He added that they look like trailers for a reason and noted that they look great in a campground. Chairman Korson does not believe that the front of our town should have a temporary trailer. He believes this may be different if the business was limited on space. He informed Mr. Deters that if he believes he is putting the trailer out front because it is attractive, he stated that this is wrong; this is not an attractive vehicle. Chairman Korson stated that this is why Leland has not given in to the idea of food trucks whether they are public or private. This was not driven by whether it was a restaurant owner who wanted to have the food truck; he believes the reality is that Leland simply does not want them. They look like food trucks. Chairman Korson stated that there is a storage facility on the other side of town and commented that we do not want trailers parked outside of this business. This is for a reason which is that the trailers are not attractive. Chairman Korson understands that this is an Airstream trailer and added that it is a nice looking trailer, but not parked in the front of Lake Leelanau. He does not believe that this is the right place for the trailer.

Mr. Deters asked to respond to Chairman Korson's remarks. He stated that the food truck would be tucked back as far as possible on the property and added that it will not impede the view of the building. He understands

Chairman Korson's concerns and plans to place the food truck as far back into the parking lot as possible. Chairman Korson stated that he is also concerned about the idea of portable bathrooms being on the property. He stated that this is not what we want in our town. Chairman Korson stated that he represents Lake Leelanau and he does not want to see this. Mr. Deters stated that he does not necessarily want to see portable restrooms either but if this is what it takes for this to happen, he is willing to do what is required. He believes this would be a small price to pay and will make it so that visibility to the public is minimized.

Cypher stated that screening would be required for portalets; Mr. Deters replied that this is fine. Cypher asked if there was consensus among the PC members. Satterwhite stated that he does not believe it is the role of the PC to make judgments in terms of what looks good and what does not. He believes that this is a person who simply wishes to grow their business which is permitted by right and the PC should look at it from this perspective. If they do not feel that this meets the zoning ordinance, Satterwhite stated that this is a different matter. He does not believe the PC can pass judgment simply because they do not like the look of something. The PC needs to stick to the ordinance and address the things that they should be talking about.

Chairman Korson responded that Satterwhite's answer is a safe one but that this is not true. In the Leland Township Zoning Ordinance, Chairman Korson noted that it stated that it must be "harmonious" and he believes that trailers on Main Street are not harmonious. He feels that this is addressed in the ordinance and if it were not, he would not be commenting on this matter. Chairman Korson stated that the safe answer is to say that this does not matter when the PC knows it does matter. He believes this is a planning issue. Satterwhite stated that he reads the sentence from the zoning ordinance to mean something different. He noted that not all of the PC members will have the same interpretation. Cypher asked how the PC would like to have the finding read.

Chairman Korson asked Mr. Deters why he would want to tuck the food truck so far back. He does not like the idea and does not believe it belongs in a commercial district. However, he inquired if it could be parked along side of the building rather than right out in front of town. Mr. Deters said this could possibly be done but stated that this was not his intention. The food truck would be parked right up against the fence and Cypher informed the PC that there is a split rail fence in this location.

Telgard stated that he has less of a problem with the trailer than he does with the idea of porta-john bathrooms. If these were also part of the deal, he can understand the issue with the harmonious aspect of the project. Mr. Deters reiterated that he does not want to have porta-johns if people can use the

restroom inside. He stated that he also believes they do not look good and they would cost additional money.

Mitchell asked if the existing bathroom is tied to seating capacity. Cypher replied that this could be the case. Mr. Deters stated that seating capacity will not change. Mitchell stated that he does not understand why additional bathrooms would be needed if seating capacity will remain unchanged. Cypher replied that this is up to the Health Department and the Building Safety Department; this comes under their jurisdiction. Cypher stated that the PC can only require screening, buffering, and landscaping. What could happen is that the Health Department or Building Safety Department could mandate this based on whatever reason they have to justify it. Simpson asked if the PC could place this as a condition but Cypher commented that the PC normally does not override other regulatory agencies. He added that the jurisdiction over things such as this where there is public gathering, seating requirements, etc. is going to come from either the Health Department or the Building Safety Department. If they mandate something and the PC does not want to see porta-johns on the site, the applicant has the right to come back to the ZBA for further clarification; he is permitted to go through this process.

Mitchell asked if the PC could require any additional bathroom capacity that is required by the County be indoors. Cypher stated that this could be requested but this does not mean that the County will agree. Mitchell confirmed that if the PC states that they do not want bathrooms outside, the County can say that a bathroom is needed and they will allow the applicant to put one outside. Cypher confirmed that this could indeed happen. Mr. Deters stated that Mr. Nick Dow indicated that there should be no problem with the bathroom if the seating is not being increased. Cypher commented that the Building Safety Department is different and the Township recently went through something similar with an application from Picnic Leland where they were trying to use the bathroom of a neighboring property. Although this is not comparing apples to apples, the Building Department weighed in on this matter with a variety of requirements related to this request. This ultimately stopped the outdoor seating for Picnic Leland this summer. Satterwhite stated that the PC should allow the Health Department and the Building Safety Department to make the determination. Cypher added that if they say it is okay, the PC would have a difficult time overriding their decision but we can place a condition on the applicant that the porta-john be well-screened and out of sight.

Satterwhite stated that we should leave the decision to these other two departments to do what makes sense. Chairman Korson stated that this does not make sense. He commented that we would have to live with this decision if they approve outside bathrooms or the PC can take a vote on this tonight and not take the risk. He added that he is not willing to take this risk but informed the PC members that they should vote how they choose. Cypher

asked for clarification on item 6.05.A. He explained that PC members can vote at the end whether they agree or disagree but things are normally put to a vote.

Satterwhite moved that the finding for this section should be that if the Health Department requires outside bathrooms, they must be well-screened and out of view from the public roadways; Simpson seconded. The motion passed with 4 ayes and 1 nay.

Mitchell inquired about the type of fence and also asked what type of porta-johns these would be. Cypher replied that we do not really know at this point. Mr. Deters commented again that he has no desire to put a porta-john outside. Cypher reiterated that this decision is not within the jurisdiction of the PC but added that if the PC trusts him, he will ensure that it cannot be seen. Satterwhite stated that the term “unidentifiable” has been used in the past.

Mitchell asked if the PC could tie a request to this for the Health Department and Building Safety Department to not allow a porta-john. Cypher confirmed that this can be done but added that they may not accept this if they mandate the applicant to place porta-johns on the site for whatever reason. Mitchell stated that he would like to add this request but does not want to hold anything up. Cypher stated that he learned from the Picnic application that you must add bathrooms when adding seating but noted that there could be something else that he is not aware of; a requirement may be in the state building code.

Mitchell asked Mr. Deters what would happen if the other regulatory agencies came back and stated that he would need a porta-john unless he cut two seats. Mr. Deters indicated that he would cut seats. Mitchell commented that it is evident Mr. Deters does not love the idea of porta-johns either. Cypher stated that we must get the facts and find out what will be required.

Item 6.05.B - No landscape plan has been reviewed but this may be required depending on what the Health Department and/or Building Safety Department request.

Page 2:

Item 6.05.C – No changes are required relating to the site drainage but Cypher asked Mr. Deters to check to see if he is mandated to have anything.

Item 6.05.D – Cypher requested that the PC discuss this matter. This is directly in the C1 Commercial Zoning District. If porta-johns are mandated, Cypher asked if the PC agrees that screening would be required. Chairman Korson asked Mr. Deters if this screening would be better than the snow fence that will go around the trailer. Mr. Deters replied that it would not be

visible to the public and Satterwhite stated that this should be a condition of this finding.

Item 6.05.E – Cypher stated that approval is still required from the Fire Chief but this will hold up a land use permit if Mr. Deters is approved tonight. He encouraged the applicant to obtain the Fire Chief’s approval as soon as possible. Cypher stated that one of Chief Besson’s staff members may be able to look at this for Mr. Deters.

Item 6.05. F – Final approval must be obtained from the LCRC.

Item 6.05.G – Applicant does not propose any changes with regard to pedestrian circulation.

Item 6.05.H – No changes are proposed regarding exterior lighting but any new lighting must be night sky friendly according to the zoning ordinance.

Item 6.05.I – The site plan already reflects the proposed vehicular circulation system in terms of closing off the entry on Main Street. Cypher stated that the PC had concerns with the Peninsula Provisions application in terms of how close cars could be to the M-204 and South Lake Leelanau Drive intersection. Cypher added that we will see what the LCRC says about this matter. Cypher asked if a recommendation is needed depending on the LCRC’s safety review. Satterwhite replied that the PC should allow the LCRC to do what they need to do. If a “no parking” sign is to be placed in this area, Cypher reminded the PC that this must go before the Township Board.

Chairman Korson asked if Mr. Deters is required to apply for this every season since the trailer will be removed from the site. Cypher replied that the PC could request this but an annual renewal is not required. He added that any complaints that are submitted could bring this matter back to the PC for further review. At this time, Mr. Deters is asking for this for the 2023 season until November 1st. Satterwhite stated that the PC does not want to go through the renewal process every year and he believes that this request should just be approved. Cypher stated that the use permit can be changed if complaints are brought forth; this is an option at every step of the way. Cypher explained that there are major and minor categories of things with regard to approvals. The normal site plan reviews run with the land where an applicant does not need to keep coming back. If complaints are lodged, this changes things. Cypher or his successor would have the ability to bring something back to the PC depending on the complaint. Minor complaints can be handled administratively but Cypher would still report on this when giving his monthly report.

To reduce the load, Satterwhite reiterated that this should not be done each season. Cypher asked the PC members if there is a desire to have this

approved for only one season. Simpson stated that this would not be his desire.

Page 3:

Item 6.05.J – N/A

Item 6.05.K – Met

Item 6.05.L – Met

Item 6.05.M – Cypher stated that a condition would be to obtain the electrical permit from the County Building Safety Department prior to any construction. This will be in the works no matter what.

Item 6.05.N – Cypher stated that all other regulatory agencies must sign off before a land use permit is issued even though there may be an approval tonight.

Item 6.05.O – There is no concern regarding hazardous materials but the Fire Chief will tell the PC if there are any problems.

Item 6.05.O1 – Met

Page 4:

Item 6.05.O2 – The finding that was discussed earlier regarding the Sewer Administrator's comment that no food truck waste can be discharged in the Leland Township sewer system has been noted. Cypher stated that this is crystal clear and Mr. Deters is aware of this; he understands all conditions and will adhere to this request.

Cypher reminded Mr. Deters that he must adhere to all conditions. If the property is sold, the conditions will run with the land.

Item 6.05.O3 – The other regulatory agencies must sign off prior to issuing the land use permit.

Mr. Deters asked about the regulatory signoffs that are required. For the Health Department to inspect the food truck, it must be on the premises so it can be properly inspected. He asked if this would be possible. Cypher asked if all other approvals are granted, is the PC comfortable with the trailer being brought to the site. He explained to Mr. Deters that if it does not pass inspection, the food truck must go away. Satterwhite asked the trailer being parked on the site for a day but it is not yet operational. Cypher is not ready at this point to respond to this hypothetical. Mr. Deters stated that Mr. Dow is on

vacation until June 19th. He asked if he is permitted to bring the unit in and begin to get it ready if all other regulatory agencies have granted their approval with the exception of the Health Department. He wants the food truck to look nice with plants around it and it will take time to prepare the site. Cypher replied that the PC could be on a slippery slope because we do not know what is going on. He added that normally all approvals are obtained and then the land use permit is issued. He stated that a conditional permit could be granted to allow for this but it would be up to the PC to make this determination. Mr. Deters stated that Mr. Dow has pre-approved the application but added that prepping the unit will take time.

Cypher asked Mr. Deters how long the trailer would be sitting on the property if Mr. Dow does not return until June 19th. Mr. Deters replied that there are ten days between now and the 19th. Mr. Deters replied that the trailer would be brought to the site around the 13th or 14th of June. He added that if it does not pass inspection, it will be removed immediately.

Cypher stated and provided a sample motion in the findings document. Satterwhite asked Cypher to point the PC to the passage in the zoning ordinance regarding temporary structures. Cypher stated that it can be found in Article XVIII, Section 6 under "Accessory Buildings"; the scope is very limited.

Mitchell asked how the food truck would face when people walk up to order—does the trailer face the street or the back side. Mr. Deters replied that the service window will face into the grass area; the street view will be the back of the Airstream and there is an entrance door. Mitchell stated that his concern is the noise for Mr. and Mrs. Couterior who live next to the site. There will be more people likely to sit out in this area. Mr. Deters stated that people like outdoor seating. Mitchell also asked about music. Mr. Deters replied that they did an open mic night but there will not be any bands. Mitchell asked this question because he is concerned about sound. There may be music outside from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. but nothing later, other than perhaps a radio.

Simpson asked, from the street view, is there a way to visually create more of a buffer so that people are not looking at the back of a silver trailer. Simpson suggested a landscaping screen; Satterwhite asked about a potted screen. Mr. Deters stated that this will be done so that people are not looking directly at the silver trailer. Simpson is concerned that this may be an eyesore from the road. Mr. Deter indicated that it would be cost prohibitive to provide a landscape screen that would cover the entire unit but he is willing to entertain suggestions. He added that Fiddlehead's is a quirky place and he reiterated that the food truck fits with the motif. Mr. Deters believes the Airstream is cool and fits well with the hip culture. His intention is not to put a trashy trailer out in Lake Leelanau. Mitchell commented that there is an Airstream out in

Northport that he feels looks good. Mr. Deters stated that this is where his idea came from.

Mitchell asked Cypher if there is a way for the PC to approve the structure and inquired what would happen if next year it is not an Airstream. Simpson stated that this can be handled by placing a duration on the permit for either one or two years. The brand of trailer could be different in the future. Cypher reminded the PC that Satterwhite stated that the PC normally does not get involved in aesthetics. Simpson stated that the PC can regulate landscaping. Discussion ensued regarding whether the PC is approving a trailer or a structure and the question was asked if they can approve this particular type of trailer. Cypher stated that the PC can do whatever they wish to do. If this is a major concern, Simpson proposed putting a time limit on the permit approval. Cypher stated that he tends to err on the side of caution and will bring things back to the PC if there are any problems. Mitchell asked if the applicant should be required to come back every couple of years or if there are any problems; Cypher replied that the PC may put a time limit on this if they so desire. The PC would give the zoning administrator the flexibility to bring the matter back to the PC if things changed substantially.

Satterwhite stated that he would like to see landscaping. Discussion ensued regarding what type of landscaping could be used and Cypher stated that there are standards in the zoning ordinance that Mr. Deters should follow.

Returning to Satterwhite's question on 18.06, the temporary uses of residential buildings and structures has virtually word-for-word exactly what the requirements of Article VI require in the standards so it is almost the same. This is mandated to come through the site plan review process based on Article 6.

Telgard asked if the applicant does change trailers next year, can the PC require him to come back because there has been a major change. Cypher confirmed that this is correct. Satterwhite stated that PC must change the landscaping condition to be "consistent with the ordinance".

Chairman Korson allowed the public to speak at this point.

Ms. Telgard asked Cypher if the applicant does not have to come back each year, does the permit go in perpetuity and if the property is sold, can the new owner do this, too? Cypher replied that what he heard tonight is that there will be a two-year limit. Discussion ensued that this has not yet been voted on. Cypher stated that the PC members should finalize this matter.

Mitchell stated that he is somewhat torn. He does not want to have the applicant be required to come back each year but also does not want to extend the permit indefinitely. Mr. Deters stated that he is happy to come

back to explain himself in the future. He added that he may decide to not do this next year. He is fine with the PC placing a two-year limit on the permit. Chairman Korson confirmed that the PC cannot put a condition in the findings that states that if the Health Department requires outside bathroom facilities, this is null and void. Cypher stated that he believes the PC will be exposing themselves to a possible challenge with such a condition. Chairman Korson stated that if bathrooms are put outside, this makes it not “harmonious” according to the zoning ordinance; he believes the issue would then be null and void. The project cannot go forward if the applicant is mandated to add bathrooms but he does not want to do this. Cypher stated that this is very similar to what happened with Picnic Leland.

Satterwhite stated that this matter has already been solved with a motion. Chairman Korson stated that there was consensus among the PC that if bathrooms were put outside, it would not be harmonious. Mitchell indicated that he is less concerned if there will be a two-year review. If there are problems, the PC could state that this is not working. Chairman Korson is not sure how this would go.

Mitchell moved to approve the Fiddlehead’s Site Plan Review application with the condition that the findings of fact statements are incorporated into the record and all standards will be met prior to the issuance of the Land Use Approval by the zoning administrator; seconded by Satterwhite.

7. Further discussions with staff or applicant, if needed

Prior to voting, Chairman Korson asked about the snow fence and where it would be located. The fence will block off the west exit of the parking lot; there will be shrubbery placed here, too. Mr. Deters stated that the shrubbery would be on both the inside and the outside and the reflectors would be on the outside.

Chairman Korson stated that he would like to see this happen in Leland and asked the PC members what they thought about this; he added that he does not believe this would occur in Leland. Mitchell stated that he would not treat the two locations, Leland and Lake Leelanau, differently. Chairman Korson inquired as to why food trucks have not been approved in Leland. Cypher stated that he tried to explain this previously. Applicants that have come before the PC proposing a food truck have not fit this scenario. Telgard stated that his only concern is that they are metered; Cypher replied that this has been added as a condition and this will be verified with Mr. Steve Patmore.

Satterwhite inquired about the taxes and if this would affect the applicant’s assessment. Cypher stated that the assessor gets a copy of all land use approvals. He does not want to speak on behalf of Ms. Krombeen and added

that she is very good at what she does. Ms. Telgard commented that there is also a personal property tax issue here and stated that because this is a rental, the applicant does not own the trailer and will not be taxed on this. Cypher stated that there may be a use tax. The member of the public indicated that the State of Michigan is changing this to get rid of all personal property taxes on businesses as of 2024; there will be no way that personal property can come into play here. Satterwhite concurred and stated that the County should be paying attention to things like this. Cypher reminded everyone that the PC is not the body that addresses this matter.

Simpson returned to the topic of the snow fence and asked if this is required by the LCRC. Mr. Deters stated that they approved the slat fence. Simpson asked if there is something that would be more visually appealing. Mr. Deters stated that he is confident that once things are put together and the shrubbery is incorporated, it will look nice. Mitchell stated that to be fair to Mr. Deters, he has done a nice job with the V.I. Grill and he believes that the applicant wants his businesses to look good. Mitchell stated that the PC knows Mr. Deters and knows that he has two businesses that are very attractive. Mr. Deters added that he will do everything he can to make this look good but he feels he deserves this opportunity. Chairman Korson stated that this does not pertain to a personal relationship; this is a matter of planning and zoning. If we have the term "harmonious" to refer to, we must follow this. Mr. Deters indicated that he believes he has complied with everything up to this point. Simpson reminded the PC that there is a motion on the table for a two-year permit renewal. Cypher added that this time limit can be placed.

8. Consideration of Motion by PC to approve, approve with conditions, or deny application per Zoning Ordinance requirements.

The PC returned to voting. There were four ayes and one nay; motion carried.

***At this point, the PC took a break.**

IX. OLD BUSINESS

A. Residential Lot Coverage – tabled to July meeting

B. Master Plan – continue with Chapter 6

Chairman Korson asked Cypher to bring the PC up to date with the Master Plan. Cypher stated that the PC has reviewed Chapters One through Five. At that time, it was discussed that the version of Chapter Six that was prepared by the previous planner would be used due to the fact that considerable time was spent on this chapter; this section was completely rewritten. Simpson wanted to review Chapter Six again, in particular the section pertaining to Ag

Tourism. Cypher confirmed that Simpson is looking to add a section on Ag Tourism. Simpson stated that he did not have the prior planner's version but he could speak to generalities. Chapter Six is a hybrid of what existed previously and what Mr. Sullivan wrote.

Satterwhite asked about Chapters One through Five. The idea is that these chapters will not be reviewed again. However, Cypher stated that there will be a Public Hearing on the entire Master Plan. Chairman Korson asked Cypher to distribute the most recent version of Chapter Six from Mr. Sullivan and the PC will review it. Chapter Six will then be discussed at the next meeting. A portion of Chapter Seven was also previously discussed.

Chapter 7:

Section 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 merely need to have the dates updated.

Section 7.3.1 (Land Use Goal) - Discussion ensued regarding Ag tourism. Simpson stated that he believes the Centerville Township Master Plan contains language that would be appropriate to use in the Leland Township Master Plan as it focuses on growing products.

7.3.1A – “including in collaboration with area organizations where possible” will be added to the end of this sentence.

7.3.1D – “Control” will be changed to “manage”.

7.3.2 - Heading will remain as is.

At this point, the PC members realized that sections 7.3.1 and 7.3.2 had previously been discussed. The PC jumped to Section 7.3.3.

Section 7.3.3A

The language “and enforce standards regulating” was discussed and the PC members realized that this had been discussed as well. Satterwhite recalled that the language that has been changed on this page came from the Lake Leelanau Lake Association.

7.3.3E – Satterwhite proposed a change in the language for this section which was previously discussed.

7.3.3F – Cypher discussed this section in relation to his time as the head of the Sewer Operations Task Force. Approximately ten years ago, the Task Force concluded that what is stated in this section is not a feasible outcome due to an

existing task force recommendation that was adopted by the Township Board many years ago. Cypher stated that different jurisdictions handling sewer systems does not normally work. He added that the township could still pursue a district if it got to this point and we would not want to not have this option; however, the issue may be with “other jurisdictions”. “Explore and pursue” will be changed to “Consider the possible establishment...”.

7.3.3G – Satterwhite proposed language for this section that was suggested previously. These proposed comments reflect the comments from the Lake Association. Satterwhite added that we have a group of citizens for whom this topic is very important so the language should reflect their concerns.

7.3.3H - Cypher stated that we have this in place now. He asked if there are other words that should be used in place of “preserve and protect”. He said this could come back under our jurisdiction if we are talking about the natural buffer. All PC members stated that they are fine with how this section currently reads.

7.3.3K – This section will now read “Discourage additional expansion of lake access through keyholing or permitted dock sharing”. Mitchell stated that he does not have as much of an issue with dock sharing as he has with keyholing. Cypher asked exactly what he means by “dock sharing”. He informed the PC that the ordinance currently reads “under shared common water frontage when more than two share”. Mitchell stated he would like to define what “dock sharing” means. Riparian rights were discussed briefly. Cypher stated that if he sees a violation, the Sheriff’s Office will not give him the name of any boat owner. Cypher normally does not audit docks for MC numbers. He stated that keyholing is the use where multiple property owners can use the water frontage. Mitchell stated that he agrees with this but would prefer to stop at keyholing with item 7.3.3K. Cypher mentioned that the township does not have a dock regulation other than when it is common use waterfront. This is triggered under Section 18.23.

Satterwhite asked where the PC can say something about light pollution in the Master Plan. Cypher replied that this falls under night sky information. Cypher stated that this is becoming more and more relevant. He cited an individual on Big Glen who took a series of photographs over a ten-year span and showed the horizon looking towards Glen Arbor. The individual tried to keep the conditions the same in the photographs. Cypher stated that it was amazing to see the aura of lighting even though there is a night sky ordinance in this area. Light will reflect and bounce quite a bit. Discussion ensued regarding individuals who use motion sensing lights versus lights that are left on throughout the night. Satterwhite stated that the Master Plan addresses many important concepts but that we should add that we also want to be mindful of the effects of light pollution. There was consensus that the PC would like to include language about lighting and

night sky friendly, specifically; it will be determined where this language will be placed.

Referring back to Chapter 5, Simpson stated that he learned that the Leland Public School is the designated owner of a parcel of land on North Manitou Island; this is approximately a one-acre parcel. He believes this should also be noted in the Master Plan where the document discusses geography.

Mr. Jeff Green asked if it would be possible for the number of docks/boat houses to be addressed in the Master Plan. He has noticed a proliferation of longer docks and boat houses being added around the lake. He inquired if a limit could be placed on this. Cypher stated that the PC is not normally in the dock business. EGLE will determine the length of a dock. Mr. Green stated that he is not really talking about the length. Cypher stated that this is now referred to the court system because it is unknown where the riparian boundaries of properties are.

Satterwhite stated that the right to have a boat house is covered in the existing ordinance both on the big lake and on the river. Mr. Green asked if the PC could include language about the number of boat houses in the Master Plan; however, Satterwhite explained that this is not the zoning ordinance. The Master Plan brings a lot of demographic, geographic and economic items together to lay out the general direction of where the township is headed. Satterwhite stated that language could be added to say that the township would “give consideration” or “be mindful of” the issue of the number of docks and boat houses. Satterwhite stated that, at some point, this issue will be addressed because there are currently no rules or regulations.

Ms. Telgard asked if the PC can discuss keyholing and dock sharing, why can they not discuss the length of docks. Cypher stated that this is normally determined by how you get to the navigational area of the lake. He explained that EGLE looks at things and has granted approvals based on dredging that has been done and takes into consideration how far out the individual must go to get into the navigational area of the lake. Cypher likened this to how EGLE specifies how many slips can be in front of the restaurant. For temporary docks, they do not regulate. Cypher also explained that zoning cannot be retroactive. He also explained that for residents around the lake who have many docks, this would be grandfathered. It was stated that, at some point, grandfathering should be stopped. Cypher stated that if a nuisance is being created, this is the catch-all for everything.

Mr. Green stated that the PC is going through a great deal of effort to minimize “McMansions”; Mitchell stated that this is not how he would characterize this effort. Members of the public asked if we are limiting the sizes of houses, why is the PC not limiting the number of docks. Mr. Green stated that he is surprised at what he is seeing on the river now and discussed one situation, in particular.

Chairman Korson stated that it is difficult to control all of these things on a micro level. It was suggested that the Master Plan specify that a resident can only have one dock. Satterwhite stated that the PC may take on this issue but not right now. The different categories of docks, permanent and temporary, were discussed. Cypher stated that when one is a riparian owner, you get to use your property. He added that if a nuisance is created, EGLE will get involved and reiterated that this issue may go to the court system. This could be a civil issue between neighbors.

A member of the public (woman speaking again?) asked about a resident in Leland who rents their dock to boaters throughout the season. Cypher stated that this is not allowed because it would be considered a marina. The member of the public stated that she does not like the complaint basis process of the zoning ordinance and the Road Commission. She believes that this pits neighbor against neighbor but added that we all have to live together. She suggested that we be more specific in the language in order to move forward.

7.3.3K – This item was discussed again. Chairman Korson asked what is considered a “dock”? He stated that this becomes very complicated and believes that language regarding the natural capacity for a particular piece of real estate should be added.

Satterwhite proposed “Evaluate allowable docks, dock usage parameters and boat capacity”. A member of the public stated that there must be other communities that are wrestling with this topic, too. Mitchell stated that the PC has looked at keyholing as well as providing easements to other people to allow them to use one’s property. He stated that now the PC is getting to the point where they are limiting how people can use their own property and he believes this is an entirely different thing; he added that this is a slippery slope. Mitchell stated that he does not want to tell people how many docks they should or should not have, but he is fine with addressing keyholing and easements.

Satterwhite proposed another passage: “Evaluate, as appropriate, allowable docks, dock usage parameters and boat capacities”. All PC members agreed that this language is acceptable. Mitchell stated that this should be placed in Section 7.3.3. The language that Satterwhite proposed will now be section 7.3.3L.

Section 7.3.4 (Residential Goal)

Section 7.3.4A - Cypher stated that one thing that may be coming to the PC is that PUDs are currently allowed in Ag Conservation zoning districts. Cypher read section 7.3.4A and stated that, in a sense, someone could argue that the PUD language that is currently on the books is not compatible with this statement. He wanted to bring this to the attention of the PC members. Cypher stated that this goes against the Master Plan. The language in Section 7.3.4A is restricting the PUD. Chairman Korson proposed crossing out this section. Cypher is not sure

why “Agricultural Considerations Areas” was used; it should be “Agricultural Conservation Areas”. Cypher showed a zoning map and asked if the PC wants to control growth in the area. He explained that what he is seeing in other townships is that the rural character is very important to the Ag zoning districts; people want these to remain intact. Satterwhite and Cypher discussed this passage and it was agreed that the change should appear in the zoning ordinance.

Telgard stated that he would like to get across the point that we are not cutting off the possibility of doing such things in the Ag Residential district. Cypher agreed that this makes sense. Telgard stated we need to think about pulsing out into this area a little bit with some other options.

Cypher stated that Section 7.3.4B also needs to be discussed and asked if this is irrelevant. He stated that this goes back to the form-based concept; we do not care what you are doing behind all of the screening, buffering and landscaping but it does potentially have a side effect in that pastoral property is changed. He used the example of Bay Hill but added that the individual had the right to do this development. Cypher confirmed that there will be no change to section 7.3.4B.

Simpson asked a side-bar question. If an operator wanted to come forward with an opportunity to develop their own property with some type of business and had the ability to do campsites, for example, he asked if the individual would not be using a PUD to make this happen. Cypher replied, “No” and added that there is a campground ordinance that is allowed in the Ag Conservation District. Cypher stated that this ordinance is very strict.

Cypher asked the PC their thoughts on section 7.3.4F and read the passage. Mitchell stated that he would prefer the term “Workforce Housing” rather than “Affordable Housing”. All agreed that an “expedited process” does not really exist. Cypher stated that people all over the County do not want things coming in so referendums, etc. are held. It was agreed to remove section 7.3.4F and add “workforce housing options” to section 7.3.4G. Discussion ensued regarding people who live and work in the County versus those who do not but wish to have cheap housing. Mitchell stated that there are different ways that you can promote workforce housing. Cypher stated that we do not have the term “affordable” in the zoning ordinance. Simpson stated that “affordable housing” has a negative connotation and explained why “workforce housing” is a more appropriate term.

The PC is currently not scheduled to have a meeting in July. Regarding the Master Plan, at this point, the PC only needs to work on the rest of Chapter 7 and Chapter 8. A Public Hearing will be held in this matter sometime this fall.

Simpson commented that he believes it is important to continue working on the Residential Lot Coverage Amendment since more people are in the area now. Discussion ensued regarding which date would be best for a July meeting. It was

stated that the Public Hearing on the Residential Lot Coverage Amendment has already taken place; however, Chairman Korson noted that the public will continue to want to hash out this topic. Satterwhite stated that we still need to create materials that will help the public better understand the proposed Amendment based on the comments the PC has already heard. He noted that this is a very confusing topic. Satterwhite and Telgard both commented that the PC has received some very good feedback from the public on this topic.

X. Other Business (as required)

Satterwhite moved to hold a meeting on Thursday, July 6, 2023 at 7:00 p.m.; Simpson seconded. All present in favor; motion carried.

Satterwhite confirmed that the agenda will include one-half of the “Old Business” being devoted to the Residential Lot Coverage Amendment and one-half of the time being spent on the Master Plan. Chairman Korson inquired if any agenda items had been deferred to August since there was originally not going to be a July meeting. Cypher replied that there are no other agenda items pending.

XI. Zoning Administrator Comment – no comment

XII. Planning Commission Comment – no comment

XIII. Public Comment – (limited to three minutes per person unless extended by Chair) – no comment

XIV. Adjournment

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

The next scheduled meeting will be held on Wednesday, July 6, 2023 at 7:00 pm at the Leland Township Library in the Munnecke Room.

Respectfully submitted,

Allison Hubley-Patterson
Recording Secretary

APPROVED

APPENDIX A – Leland Township ZA Report (May 2023)

Leland Township Zoning Administrator's MAY 2023 REPORT

To: Leland Township Board & Leland Planning Commission

From: *Timothy A. Cypher* 6/3/2023

Land Use Permits Issued:	3	YEAR TO DATE 28
Signs / Home Occupation	0	
Single Family Residences (SFR)	1	
Additions to SFR	0	
Garages / or additions to	1	
Decks & Porches / MISC.	0	
Accessory Buildings	1	
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	0	2 INQUIRY
Lot Consolidations	0	1 INQUIRY
Land Divisions	2	1 INQUIRY
Property Line Adjustments	2	1 INQUIRY
Private Roads / Driveways	0	1 INQUIRY
Zoning / Site Plan Reviews	0	
PUBLIC HEARING ON RESIDENTIAL CHARACTER		
Construction Inspections	7	

Violations/Investigations 2 ****VIOLATIONS****
0 INVESTIGATIONS PENDING
2 RV USE AS SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING
APPLYING FOR PERMIT TO BUILD DWELLING

I supplied information via 28 phone calls & 19 emails to Township residents & others.
I attended the Planning Commission meeting and the Township Board was attended by staff
Please feel free to contact me with any questions.

staff@allpermits.com

Phone 231-360-2557

APPROVED

APPENDIX B – Leland Township ZA Monthly Summary (May 2023)

LELAND TOWNSHIP - ZA'S MONTHLY SUMMARY

Period: MAY 2023

DATE	PERMIT #	NAME	USE	REC. #	CK#	AMOUNT
5/13/2023	LUP 23-26	LOCKWOOD	LAND USE	202326	2735	\$ 180.00
009-730-701-00	517 WEST STREET	NEW DWELLING ATT.GARAGE/BREEZEWAY GUESTH			4,901 S.F.	
5/15/2023	LUP 23-27	WENG	LAND USE	202327	392	\$ 50.00
009-029-005-30	649 WOODSMOKE DR.	ACCESSORY BUILDING			1,700 S.F.	
5/17/2023	LUP 23-28	VOID - WITHDREW	LAND USE	202328		
5/17/2023	LUP 23-29	PARKE	LAND USE	202329	TREAS. HAS 895046	\$ 140.00
009-023-028-00	104 N. ST. JOSEPH ST.	DETACHED GARAGE W/PARTMENT BREEZEWAY			DI 2,024 S.F.	
5/3/2023	PLA 23-01	NESBITT/MCVAY	PROP. LINE	PLA202301	13562	\$ 50.00
009-009-003-00 & 001-432 GRAND & 210 CHERR		PROPERTY LINE ADJUSTMENT BETWEEN TWO LOTS				
5/3/2023	LDA 23-03	BIGGS	LAND DIV.	LDA202303	4333	\$ 50.00
009-023-026-00	316 W. MAIN STREET	LAND DIVISION WITH PAID SEWER BENEFIT				
5/17/2023	PLA 23-02	HERMAN & HERMAN	PROP. LINE	PLA202302	2035	\$ 50.00
009-015-041-00 & 20	5033 & 5040 E. BLUE SPR	PROPERTY LINE ADJUSTMENT BETWEEN TWO PARCELS				
5/31/2023	LDA 23-04	CARLSON	LAND DIV.	LDA202304	9757	\$ 50.00
009-750-601-00	302 N. MAIN STREET	LAND DIVISION WITH PAID SEWER BENEFIT				

TOTAL \$ 570.00

SIGNED:

TIMOTHY A. CYPHER DATE: 6/3/2023

TIMOTHY A. CYPHER
LELAND TOWNSHIP ZONING ADMINISTRATOR
231-380-2557