

ACME TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
ACME TOWNSHIP HALL
6042 Acme Road, Williamsburg MI 49690
7:00 p.m. Monday, May 24, 2004

Meeting called to Order at 7:00 p.m.

Members present: H. Smith (Chair), B. Carstens, D. Hoxsie, D. Krause, O. Sherberneau, M. Vermetten
Members excused: P. Salathiel
Staff present: S. Corpe, Recording Secretary
J. Christopherson, Township Counsel
R. Clark, Planning Consultant
B. Kaye, Planning Consultant

1. Consent Calendar:

Motion by Vermetten, support by Sherberneau, to approve the Consent Calendar as presented, including:

Receive and File:

- a) **April 24, 2004 *Record Eagle* Forum article by Keith Charters, “Joint Planning Makes Things Easier” (Attachment A included and incorporated by reference)**
- b) **Spring 2004 edition of *Planning Commissioners Journal***

Action:

- c) **Approve minutes of April 26 and May 10, 2004 meetings (Attachments B and C included and incorporated by reference)**
- d) **Review and approve agenda, inquiry as to conflicts of interest: approved with no conflicts noted**

Motion carried unanimously.

2. New Business:

- a) **Johnson Lawsuit Update by James Christopherson, Township Counsel:** Last fall, a number of hearings were held regarding a request to amend the Mixed Use Development SUP for Acme Village. The most controversial portion of the request would have allowed for a 205,000 sq. ft. retail store with parking on a certain portion of the property that contains steep slopes. The Commission recommended that the Township Board not approve this use, and the Board followed the Commission’s recommendation. The Johnson Family Ltd. Partnership sued the township over the decision. Yesterday at oral arguments, Judge Power ruled in favor of the township, saying that the decision to deny the portion of the amendment request appeared to have been made in an appropriate manner.
- b) **Presentation by LochenHeath LLC introducing new partners in preparation for forthcoming SUP applications:** Joe Elliot, Gourdie-Fraser, began the presentation. They, along with R. Clark Associates are representing LochenHeath LLC and Pinnacle Group as they seek to amend the existing LochenHeath PUD SUP and obtain a new SUP under the township’s Open Space Development (OSD) Ordinance. The current development contains 88 homesites. The new portion would be created on the 360+ acre “Veliquette” parcel on the north side of Dock Road, west of US 31.

The formal preliminary hearing is expected to take place next month; tonight's presentation seeks to introduce the new partners. The property owners also hope to hold some meetings with adjacent property owners.

Mr. Elliot briefly covered the OSD concept, which would leave at least 50% of the open space on the Veliquette parcel open, clustering the rest of the development. He introduced John Lang, Pinnacle Group, who presented the PowerPoint materials. His group is based in Scottsdale, AZ and was contacted by the Maitlands and Krakows to join in their development. The presentation contained some pictures and statistics about their existing residential golf course developments in Arizona. LochenHeath will be repositioned as a high-end, exclusive, private course/community. 359 new housing units are proposed on slightly over 40% of the current Veliquette orchard, but they believe the final count will be somewhat lower. Some extensive new water features are also planned – a system of 30 acres of lakes and streams with some housing on islands. A fitness center of approximately 8,000 sq. ft. is also planned. A new common, gated driveway just north of The Music House is planned. They have sought to preserve designated view corridors by setting homes well back from US 31 and imposing an architectural and building location review process.

At this point, Smith stated that he had just been informed that a quorum of the Township Board is present at the meeting.

- c) **Presentation by Ron Reinhold, Waterfront Recreation Facility Task Force:** Reinhold reported that the committee is working on some final engineering drawings, a PowerPoint presentation and a public questionnaire. The goal is to hold a public information session at some point in June or July to introduce the work to date and seek input in a visioning-session format, and to let the public know what work has been performed over the past year and what they have learned about area boating patterns and needs. They now need guidance so they can fine-tune their approach to meet public needs.

Smith introduced Roger Williams, Williams Consulting, who has been hired to represent the township regarding the LochenHeath applications, as both Gourdie Fraser and R. Clark, our designated consultants, are working for the applicant in this case.

3. Public Hearings:

- a) **Continuation of Public Hearing on Application #2003-11P made by Michael & Sheryl Hedden for approval of a 16-unit, single-family dwelling Open Space Development on property located at the intersection of Kay-Ray Road and US 31 North** (Attachment D included and incorporated by reference): Smith noted Corpe's memo stating that the applicant has requested a continuance to the June 28 meeting.

Motion by Sherberneau, support by Vermetten to continue the Public Hearing on Application #2003-11P to the June 28 meeting. The Chair cast an unanimous ballot, there being no objection.

- b) **Continuation of Public Hearing on Special Use Permit/Site Plan Approval Application #2003-16P to amend SUP #94-4 for Mercedes Benz of Traverse City (aka Acme Motors or Black Forest Motors), 6060 US 31 North, to permit expansion of an existing car dealership on property currently zoned B-2, General Business** (Attachment E included and incorporated by reference): Smith noted Corpe's memo stating that the applicant desires to withdraw their application at

this time. Krause noted that cars still parked on the empty lots behind the dealership, and asked if this represents a zoning violation. Corpe stated that the question will be relayed to Zoning Administrator Hull for follow-up.

Motion by Hoxsie, support by Krause to terminate Application #2003-16P as requested. The Chair cast an unanimous ballot, there being no objection.

- c) **Public Hearing on Application #2004-1P made by Dave Fielstra for Special Use Permit/ Site Plan Review to allow for the development of an office/warehousing/storage building for Concrete Systems on property located at 6127 South Railway Commons** (Attachment F included and incorporated by reference): Corpe reported that Mr. Fielstra was here and has left, and has been unable to reach the head of the neighborhood association, Bob Boeve, to discuss the fire suppression situation. She recommends at this point that the township and Metro Fire work together to invite all neighborhood property owners to a meeting to move this issue forward.

Motion by Hoxsie, support by Sherberneau to continue the public hearing on Application #2004-1P to the June 28 meeting. The Chair cast an unanimous ballot, there being no objection.

- d) **Public Hearing on Application #2004-3P made by Grand Traverse Resort and Spa for Special Use Permit/ Site Plan Amendment to allow for the development of a new boat dock and operation of a water sports equipment rental business on said dock on the waterfront at The Shores Condominiums, on property located off Shores Beach Road** (Attachment G included and incorporated by reference): Andrew Bateman, Resort General Manager, Jon Kubiak, GT Band Counsel and Bill Rastetter, GT Band Counsel were present in support of the application. Smith asked Christopherson to speak to the limitations of township jurisdiction in this situation. Christopherson responded that because the dock touches the shore, he feels that the dock and any attached hoists can be regulated by the township; any independent moorings would fall under the purview of the DEQ and the Army Corps of Engineers (ACE)

Russ Clark gave his planning consultant's report via PowerPoint presentation. The Resort is requesting a 3.7 acre bottomlands lease to operate a boat rental facility in Grand Traverse Bay. In 1986 a 90' dock was approved, which enabled the Resort to reach a water depth of 3'. Today 750' of dock is required to reach the same water depth. A 10' x 10' portable kiosk would be placed at the water end of the dock. A 100' swath of exposed bottomlands beach vegetation would be mowed, and a 6' wide path of sand would be placed near the dock. There would be 20 boat hoists for rental vehicles, and additional buoy moorings. Along with broadside dock moorings, 28 watercraft could be accommodated; a variety of sailboats, kayaks, windsurfers, powerboats, pontoon boats, ski boats and jet skis. Mr. Clark reported that questions raised at the preliminary hearing regarding this request have been answered. There will be one employee parking space at the Resort real estate building, with the rest of the employees shuttled from the main property. Hours and gasoline storage and management have been addressed. The applicant stated that facility usage will be limited to Resort guests only, and will agree to shorten the dock at such time as the water rises and the full 750' length is no longer needed to reach a 3' water depth. Most facility users will be shuttled from the main Resort property.

Due to concerns about water traffic flow, the applicant has agreed to implement a

directional buoy system to lead watercraft rental users to deeper water and define a no-boat swimming area.

Mr. Clark recommends that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the application to the Township Board if they are satisfied with Dr. Chris Grobbel's environmental report and subject to the conditions set forth in his report. Dr. Grobbel was not available for comment, but Mr. Clark agreed to answer questions if he could.

Vermetten asked if the township can require that motorized vehicles remain away from the mouth of Acme Creek. Christopherson said that the Township Rural Zoning Act permits the attachment of reasonable conditions to an SUP. All representations made at a meeting are also binding on the applicants, whether they are placed in writing in the SUP or not. It is his opinion that if the applicant is agreeable, this condition could be included. John Corriveau, Director of Recreation for the Resort stated buoys would be placed in accordance with Dr. Grobbel's recommendations. Carstens noted that Dr. Grobbel recommended that motorized vehicles be prohibited north of the dock near the shore. Mr. Rastetter stated that the Resort is prepared and willing to follow Dr. Grobbel's recommendations and have them incorporated into the final SUP. He noted that the Tribe's Natural Resources Department has worked with the Resort regarding this application as well. Also, he noted that the DEQ and ACE are awaiting a response from the Township prior to granting final approval for the bottomlands lease. The ACE has agreed to adopt any conditions the township places on the operation in terms of beach grooming as part of their bottomlands lease permit. The same requirements will also be carried over to nearby Bayside Park, for which the township has sought beach grooming permission as well. The key component of the approvals will be a prohibition against tilling up beach vegetation. Carstens reported that John Nelson, the Baykeeper, is enthusiastic about the final arrangements being discussed for the Resort and the Bayside Park Beach.

John Corriveau stated that the Resort will be taking the buoy system and the signage very seriously. He plans to personally monitor the situation on a daily basis and ensure that boat traffic approaches the dock directly from deep water at an idling speed. Vermetten asked Mr. Corriveau to confirm verbally that they are adopting Dr. Grobbel's recommendations; which Mr. Corriveau did.

Public Hearing opened at 7:47 p.m.

Virginia Tegel, Bartlett Road, stated that she has vacationed in areas where there is significant jet ski usage, and asked who will be responsible for policing the users. Mr. Corriveau replied that the vendor will be policing the users, and he will be policing the vendors. Ms. Tegel is concerned, as a deep-water swimmer, about reckless jet-ski uses. Mr. Corriveau offered his direct line, 938-5743, for those who need to call with concerns.

Public Hearing closed at 7:50 p.m.

Smith stated that the Commission visited the site and had numerous concerns, all of which has been addressed. He stated that the township looks forward to working with the boating vendor.

Motion by Carstens, support by Sherberneau to recommend approval of Application #2004-3P to the Township Board subject to the five conditions enumerated by the Ball Environmental report. Motion carried by unanimous

roll call vote.

4. **Preliminary Hearings:**

- a) **Preliminary Hearing on Application #2004- 9P by Great Lakes Trim for SUP/Site Plan Approval amending SUP/Site Plan Approval #2001-16P to construct a 60' x 65' commercial building addition and parking lot expansion on property located at 6182 S. Railway Commons and zoned B-4, Material Processing & Warehousing** (Attachment H included and incorporated by reference): Tom and Jeff Crandall, the business owners were present, and were also represented by Elmer's Construction. Brad Kaye presented his consulting planner's report on behalf of the township. The proposed addition to the building will increase the structure by 50% to encompass storage; there will be no additional staff added. Mr. Kaye feels that a full impact assessment will not be necessary, but noted that approvals from the Health Department and Soil Erosion Department, as well as Metro Fire is required. He recommends setting a public hearing pending receipt of the further required information.

Carstens felt it important to note the fire protection issue. Hoxsie asked for landscaping update. Corpe stated that originally the landscaping materials installed were smaller than the minimum size required. The Landscaping Committee (Smith, Krause, Carstens) and Corpe met with the landowners and their landscaper on site and determined what additional materials should be installed to make up for the undersized installations. To her knowledge, this work was completed as required. Some of the materials are in poor health after the winter, but the landowners have already acknowledged to her a responsibility to have them replaced.. Carstens about screening for the Dumpster, which has traditionally been full to a point visible beyond the installed fence. Corpe reported that the new plans call for the Dumpster to be totally enclosed within the new portion of the structure and therefore screened from view.

Motion by Hoxsie, support by Vermetten to set a Public Hearing regarding Application #2004-9P for the June 28 meeting. The Chair cast an unanimous ballot, there being no objection.

- b) **Preliminary Hearing on Application #2004-10P by Dennis Moody/Great Lakes RV & Storage for SUP/Site Plan approval to construct a boat and RV storage facility on vacant property located at 6220 S. Railway Commons and zoned B-4, Material Processing & Warehousing** (Attachment I included and incorporated by reference): Brad Kaye reviewed the plans for the Township. Mr. Moody was present to support his application. The parcel is currently vacant; a new storage facility with an office is proposed. Mr. Kaye has several concerns, the first being the proposed property use. The storage facility use is specifically permitted within 500' of the M-72 right-of-way, but this property is farther away. The B-4 zoning rules allow the township to permit uses that are no more intrusive than the others permitted, which he feels would be warranted in this case. No drainage plan has been submitted, and the landscaping plan may be a bit sub-par. The proposed parking area surface is gravel, which is permissible by the Commission instead of pavement on a discretionary basis. The proposed Wal-Pak lighting has been placed quite high on the wall, and perhaps could be lowered. No mechanical equipment is indicated on the plan; it may or may not be necessary due to the nature of the proposed use. A grading plan should be presented within two weeks; if these conditions are met the application could be ready for public hearing on June 28. Mr. Moody stated that the parking lot will be paved instead of gravel, and is willing to work with the other

concerns as required. No outdoor mechanical equipment will be necessary; the facility is for cold storage.

Hoxsie asked where the subject property lies in relation to the entrance to Railway Industrial Park. It is about a block to the east, and diagonal from the Hughes property. Hoxsie feels that some additional landscaping is warranted to help break up the vast expanse of the proposed 120' long building wall. The landscaping shown meets the bare minimums of the ordinance, the Commission would like some materials added to the north side.

Motion by Hoxsie, support by Sherberneau to set a Public Hearing regarding Application #2004-10P for the June 28 meeting. The Chair cast an unanimous ballot, there being no objection.

- c) **Preliminary Hearing on Application #2004-11P by The Village at Grand Traverse for Special Use Permit approval for a Mixed Use Planned Development on 182 acres of land commonly referred to as “The Rollert Property” located on the south side of M-72, to the east of the Williamsburg Conference Center (formerly the GKC theater) and to the west of Lautner Road, currently zoned R-3, Urban Residential** (Attachment J included and incorporated by reference): Russ Clark gave a PowerPoint presentation of his planner’s report. This application is brought pursuant to Section 8.22, Mixed Use Developments, of the Zoning Ordinance. This allows for a variety of uses. The applicant has requested a mix including civic, mixed, commercial, hotel, retail and residential uses. Mr. Clark noted that the total square footages of uses proposed (approximately 1.9 million sq. ft.) include upper stories and does not represent the footprint of the development. The presentation included the verbatim statement of intent from Section 8.22.1 of the Ordinance. He displayed a map that describes a geographical area mentioned in said paragraph, and stated that he has asked Christopherson to speak from a legal standpoint as to how that section might be interpreted.

Flexibility in land development and innovation of land use are the specific objectives of the Mixed Use Development (MUD) ordinance. The applicant has asked for a variance from our required parking ratios (they would like to develop fewer parking spaces than the ordinance currently requires in consideration of the ability of a mixture of uses to share spaces.) They are also seeking variance of the 35’ height limitation to permit 75’ tall hotel, multi-family housing and mixed use buildings. Mr. Clark noted ordinance requirements that the MUD not be used to avoid the normal requirements for a zoning district, nor does this section of the ordinance set forth requirements as to how much of a development must be a certain type of use. Compatibility with adjacent land uses, and preservation of unique open spaces and spaces for civic functions is also stressed.

Mr. Clark made several recommendations:

- Deferral of the application to a study session so the applicant can complete certain elements of the required application packet including agency letters (public works, soil erosion, Metro Fire, MDOT)
- Conceptual site plan at 1” = 100’ showing land contour lines and current tree lines in relation to the proposed development
- Phasing plan
- Wetland Delineation report
- Demonstration of 40% open space assertion

- Identification of how many housing units could be in the mixed use structures
- The distance of the proposed hotel from the M-27 right-of-way, not the travel lane as currently provided
- Removal of a civic building from a wetland area
- Verification of traffic flow statement on page 21 of narrative
- 350' setback from Acme Creek
- which buildings would be 75' tall
- terracing plan cross-section
- consider parcel at corner of M-72 and Lautner Road (Andres parcel) as part of this request if both landowners should come to agreement
- address any questions and concerns raised by the Planning Commission this evening
- All materials to be submitted at least 1 week prior to any scheduled study session.

Smith asked Christopherson whether or not the applicants may apply under section 8.22. Christopherson referred the Commission to Appendix B in the narrative for their argument. He feels that there is room for interpretation of 8.22.1, but such interpretation would be the responsibility of the ZBA if requested. One way or another, litigation is an expected outcome. It is not a question the Planning Commission can answer, although it can request that the question be settled as part of any overall recommendation. Smith feels that this interpretation should be nailed down before the Commission deliberates further. Christopherson stated that he is not giving a formal opinion as to whether the application fits the section or not. He has reviewed minutes from the PC and board from the adoption of the section. There is some support for the proposition that a geographic limitation may exist, which he chose not to submit to the Planning Commission because it is not for them to decide. He finds no case law that would allow the Commission to submit the question directly to the ZBA; that only the applicant or Township Board may do so. Smith is uncertain what to do at this juncture; the planning consultant has recommended that a study session take place, but he isn't sure the effort should be expended until the interpretation question is settled.

Carstens stated that the MUD ordinance was written in 1989-1990, and the Master Plan was written in 1999. He feels that this application represents a basically commercial development. He cited a master plan statement that any application approval should be based on the community values as assessed by a community survey. He agrees that the outcome will eventually be subject to litigation, and feels it would be a poor use of time to hold extensive hearings and study sessions before the outcome is known. Smith noted that an applicant does have a right to public hearing, but this remains a question. Vermetten feels that working in parallel with any other proceedings so as to be prepared for any outcome would be advisable. Smith stated that it would then follow that the Planning Commission should ask the Board to direct the ZBA to take up the question as well as setting a study session. Carstens does not feel that any study session on this issue should occur at the same meeting as master plan review is conducted. Krause asked Mr. Clark to explain the purpose of a study session. Mr. Clark responded that it relates to obtaining a complete application that would enable a public hearing date to be set, to facilitate a transfer of information between applicant and Planning Commission. Krause feels that the plan before the Commission at the current time "has gone the other way" from the plan previously submitted. The buffer from M-72 has been decreased, and outlots have been created. Smith and Mr. Clark stated that discussion of these issues is one purpose of the proposed study sessions.

Steve Hayward, Planner for the applicant asked to speak to this issue. He questioned some of the language being used, and asserted that the applicant sought an interpretation from the Zoning Administrator, but because he was out-of-country, they asked the Board to forward the question to the Planning Commission in his absence, and that the Board made a determination to give the application to the Planning Commission. Corpe and Christopherson both stated that the application was delivered to township staff as is customary, but that the Board has taken no action in regards to it. Mr. Hayward stated that he was therefore operating under an erroneous assumption, and that they would seek an interpretation from the Zoning Administrator and, if the outcome were unfavorable, would request an appeal from that determination from the ZBA. Christopherson stated that the Commission can still also ask the Board for a decision.

Motion by Vermetten, support by Sherberneau to ask the Board of Trustees to pursue a determination as to whether Application #2004-11P may be brought pursuant to Section 8.22 of the Zoning Ordinance. Motion carried by a vote of 5 in favor (Hoxsie, Krause, Sherberneau, Smith, Vermetten) and 1 opposed (Carstens).

Ken Petterson, attorney for The Village at Grand Traverse LLC asked if the applicant could make their presentation as planned this evening, prior to a vote as to whether or not to hold a study session. Vermetten was unsure as to whether the application should be seen; Hoxsie felt it absolutely should be. Mr. Clark also recommended viewing the application, as it may contain additional information requested but not previously submitted.

Mr. Petterson stated that at a citizens group meeting, he heard their attorney say that the plan was being brought back through a “loophole” or a “back door.” They disagree – they believe they are bringing their application under a perfectly open and legal format that has been used by other applicants before them. They seek an open and constructive dialogue. This is a new application seeking approval of a new plan after appropriate review. He introduced Steve Hayward to give a more detailed presentation.

Mr. Hayward began by pointing out that the tag-line for the development has not changed, and that it is designed to be indicative of the elements of a mixed use project. He discussed the similarities, differences and legal basis for the MUD and former Town Center (TC) ordinances. They feel a sense of urgency because under the MUD ordinance they have one year, not two as under the TC ordinance to achieve final design, marketing and permitting. He also noted that the MUD ordinance is must less strict than the former TC ordinance. It has been used in the past. They are attempting to appeal the ruling that set aside the TC ordinance, particularly in light of state and local language regarding separability, which they feel should have allowed only one sentence, not the whole ordinance, to be stricken.

The applicants assert that they meet 22 of 23 criteria used by New Designs for Growth to evaluate a project. They have included a mixture of uses within a 1,500’ radius – a 15-minute walk or a short bicycle ride for a child to buy an ice cream cone. The residential neighborhoods contain “whole-life housing,” options that meet the full range from starter housing to senior group living options that are new to this application.

Mr. Hayward expressed support for John Norquist, who was invited to speak in Traverse City last week by Concerned Citizens for Acme Township (CCAT.) He discussed the concept of a “transect,” a spectrum of land use from low to high density. The basic model is nature, and as applied to the built environment goes from rural countryside through rural housing through neighborhood grids to urban centers and cores. He gave a list of various principles of Smart Growth and the 23 criteria from New Designs for Growth.

Mr. Hayward gave an overview of a slide of the entire project. A letter was presented to the Commission in conjunction with the application addressing the requested accesses from M-72. He stated that traffic and market studies would be provided prior to the public hearing. He stressed the use of the proposed large hotel structure as a visual stopping point when looking across the development. He touted the “esplanade” as a public space where civic events such as book fairs might be held, and provided a 3-D rendering of a fountain feature for the north end of it.

Mr. Hayward provided a north-south cross-section of the site with a red line demonstrating the current topography of the property and a black line demonstrating the after-development proposed grade, showing the two being nearly identical. A similar east-west cross-section was also provided. He provided a parking study that was unattributed but that he stated came from a national source in support of the request for 6 parking spaces per 1,000 sq. ft. of space.

Mr. Hayward introduced Scott Nowakowski, representing Meijer Stores, stating that a letter of intent has been signed between Meijer and The Village at Grand Traverse, LLC. Mr. Nowakowski stated that this is “one of the finest developments they’ve ever seen.” They are in negotiations to possibly locate within the proposed development. Denny Rohn asked if negotiations are appropriate at this stage; Smith clarified that any negotiations referenced are taking place between the developer and his prospective clients and do not involve the township in any way.

Smith stated that the next order of business would be to set a study session. Mr. Petterson stated that the applicant is willing to pay for special meetings and expedited meetings. Mr. Clark stated that he is willing to prepare for a study session as long as he is given at least 7 days to review any materials. Mr. Hayward stated that the applicant would prefer the 7th or 9th.

Motion by Sherberneau, support by Hoxsie to set a special study session regarding Application #2004-11P for Monday, June 7.

Vermetten noted that the Commission seems to be expediting this matter. He understands a desire for this to occur from the developers point of view, but if the Commission is to have the information it needs by the 7th, the timing seems rather tight. Smith stated that if the information isn’t received in a timely fashion, the study session will be continued. The Commission will not be rushed, and he anticipates that more than one study session will be held.

Motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Smith declared the meeting recessed between 9:22 p.m. and 9:30 p.m.

- d) Preliminary Hearing regarding proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment #127: M-72 Corridor Overlay District (provided with the April 26 meeting packet):**

Smith asked Brad Kaye to update the Commission as consulting planner for this matter. Mr. Kaye noted that a sample buffer landscaping plan has been prepared by R. Clark Associates that is ready for review. Rather than proceed with the text amendment and hold a separate process for the buffer landscaping plan portion, he recommends that the subcommittee review the new material first and bring the full document to the Commission for the hearing process.

Motion by Hoxsie, support by Vermetten, to continue the Preliminary Hearing regarding Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment #127 to the June 28 meeting. The Chair cast an unanimous ballot, there being no objection.

5. Old Business:

- a) **Status Update regarding proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment #126** (Attachment K included and incorporated by reference): Smith noted that the Commission has a recommendation to set a public hearing for the June 28 meeting. Vermetten noted one typographic error (lack of a space between the words “or” and “for” in the redline version of the proposed language for the outdoor storage.) The Commission chose to permit up to two recreational vehicles but not to include more than one motor home. “Recreational unit” is the currently-defined term for any sort of mobile living or travel use vehicle.

Maitland said the ordinance was originally meant to address unlicensed, immobile items. Mr. Kaye suggested that up to two recreational items be allowed, not more than one of which can be a recreational unit. The Commission also wished language that treats a trailer containing multiple units as a single recreational vehicle. Amon asked if we have checked the language of other townships’ ordinances to see how they are constructed.

Motion by Hoxsie, support by Vermetten to continue the discussion regarding Proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment #126 to the June 28 meeting. The Chair cast an unanimous ballot, there being no objection.

6. Any other business that may come before the Commission:

- a) Corpe placed two additional articles on the table for the Commission’s information regarding William McDonough’s visit to Traverse City, along with two additional pieces of information related to Application #2004-11P

Motion by Hoxsie, support by Sherberneau to receive the letter regarding possible inclusion of the Andres property in the land subject to Application #2004-11P. The Chair cast an unanimous ballot, there being no objection.

Motion by Sherberneau, support by Hoxsie to receive the letter from the County Drain Commissioner regarding Application #2004-11P. The Chair cast an unanimous ballot, there being no objection.

Meeting adjourned at 9:58 p.m.