

Milton Township  
Planning Commission  
Unapproved Special Meeting Minutes  
November 15, 2021

Members present: Chairman Hefferan, Peters, Renis, Ford, and Merillat.

Also present: Kopriva, Vermitten and many audience members in person and participating via Zoom.

Members absent: Cole and Lefebvre, excused.

Hefferan called the meeting to order at 6:00pm.

Public Comment from Zoom:

Brenda Hasso of Torch River Road was at the township board meeting and found it ironic that as part of the conversation it was brought up that a bill was trying to be passed in the Michigan Senate regarding seasonal rentals and the board was upset by that. Our county commissioner was upset by that saying we do not have the infrastructure. That is how I feel about the RV Park. In a small, congested area, we just do not have the infrastructure to support what is being proposed by that. Put yourself in our shoes. This RV park is not for the community. It is for the developer and the marina. The community will not get a lot of positivity out of this. You are here to ensure the health safety and welfare of the community. Keep in mind what the developer has done already on this site.

Keith Bay of Rex Terrace Road said he is a seasonal resident but his family has been at Rex Terrace for more than 100 years and I have a deep interest in what's going on here. This proposal has already been through one iteration and it is not a good idea. The entirety of people that will be put into this location is not appropriate for the area. There could be a much better location. There should also be a much better set of plans. We just finished a sewer system update after 70 years and we had to put in a larger system than this park has to put in. Just because you can do it doesn't mean you should. Not in this location. It is unfortunate that the developer has progressed as far as he has but he has done it without getting the community's support. I hope you decide not to do this.

Linda Spevaseck said she has been on a planning and zoning commission in a rural township. She commended the board members for their leadership. Please give this application a thorough review and make sure it meets all of your ordinances.

Kevin Malone of Antrim County said he is not familiar with the new application, but I would ask you to keep in mind the unique aspects of Milton Township. The original application runs contrary to the township's stated aspirations that the water preservation is important. I hope you will take the longer view.

Kelly Wells of Miller Road, neighbors to this proposed SUP. This proposed SUP does not meet the ordinances. This SUP lacks many areas. It must meet all ordinances. It does not currently

meet screening. This application should be denied. You are the architects and will determine how this area will be used. What will it become? There are growing pains in the township and it is your responsibility to look carefully at that. This has been a couple years of difficulty and it is disappointing to say the least. It is not that people are anti-development, but many people who live in the area love this area and we have confidence that you'll do the best thing for the safety and welfare of the people who live there.

Tim Smith of Chippewa Trail said he has not seen the application, but the difference between 80 and 70 units is a reduction of 12.5%. He discussed the number of cars and people that could be expected. It should be denied for all the same reasons as the first application. It is not that big of a difference. His other concern is the main access is designed for Miller Road and it is on a steep hill and a bad curve and if the people park on Miller Rd, you won't be able to see people coming into the park. If they put in no parking signs, the sheriff doesn't have the staff to patrol that. For all the same reasons it was denied previously, it should be denied again.

Ann Hubbard of Wabigama Drive said she wanted to emphasize comments made earlier that it is such a precious area. I have so many fond memories of the area. It is so sad to think this area being destroyed by having an inappropriate development like what is being proposed. Please think about the long term effects on the people who have been coming for years and years. I appreciate your hard work and commitment to the work. I hope you make the right decision.

Mac Whitehouse gave his three minutes to Rebecca Milliken.

Evan Craig of SW Torch Lake Drive said he is used to seeing developers level a site and then have the whole site erode just like this site. I visited this site after that happened because I wanted to see if they'd posted their storm water plan. I did not see it. While I was looking at the sign post, there was a stop work sign. I saw one of the developers leave the site and try to convince me that everything was fine. With all that experience, he should have known not to do work like this and then I reported it. You need to think not only about the permit, but also about the people you are empowering to execute a permit. A piece of paper is only as good as those that sign it. I do not think you have trustworthy people protecting the water and soil.

Public comment from those attending in person:

John Peal said he would like to talk about the numbers that are being exaggerated. I spent the summer keeping track of the 10 camp sites we have. We averaged 3 people per site on the weekend and only 2 people during the week. Extrapolating, that is about 240 cars for the weekend. No one is there during the week days. Keep in mind the 70 sites we have 10 at the campground that we may remove. If you count 240 cars on the weekend, we only had 70% occupancy. That drops us down to 170 cars on the weekend. The marina has many slips and racks and we have never seen that many people at one time. The park will be filled with people that already have boats in the marina and are driving here. Take that same math and apply it to the campers and golf carts as fact, which is not fact but exaggerations. You all know the reason that park picked that spot is because your ordinance says that is where it needs to go.

Ray Deanne of Torch River Road has been a resident for more than 40 years. He has listened to

the exaggerations and lies that people are spewing of the eventualities of this park. Looking at the people who may be coming here, it won't be 800 on any given day. It will be a fraction of that. The number of automobiles are from people who already come here. There has been conversations about the septic and sewage that will dump straight into Torch River and that is a lie. The septic system is twice the size of regulations and he has a site for overflow. You get tired of people complaining about why not. Many of you are much older than I am and one of the easiest things you can do is complain about why you should not do something. The economic value far surpasses any possible detriments. I hope the board reconsiders and approves this park since all requirements have been met.

Neil Way of Eagle Way Lane said this park is allowed in your ordinance. As far as the erosion, that is a separate issue and that is being taken care of. The second entrance off Miller Road is required due to their being more than 25 parcels. As far as that road being on a curve and on a hill, people drive slower on hills and curves. I am in support of it.

Steve Quit of Torch River Road gave his time to Sharon Hill.

Irene Quit of Torch River Road said numbers are probably exaggerated on both ends. The septic is still a concern. We have not seen any guarantees about septic pollution of our wells. That is a big concern. If we cannot see guarantees that this will not happen, we are not for it.

Gary Dody of Fairmont Drive said he is discussing only facts. The developer was given a permit by Shafer for a site stabilization plan and it was given a temporary entrance off Miller Road. He did not need this. Instead he hauled equipment up and down from Torch River Road. The stabilization plan was permitted by Shafer which expires November 2022 a full year from this month. This site must be very unstable if it would take that long. In reviewing the plan, a road runs through the middle of the property and connects to the temporary road and it was ordered to be removed and it has not been done. This is the stabilization plan so while it may be possible for a road plan to be incorporate, there is nothing that says this phantom road is due to stabilization. There are five stubs coming off the unnamed road going to nowhere. Above the unnamed road, it shows an infiltration trench which connects to another trench, F21 which means it will completed fall of 2021. Since there are no inspections taking place by Milton, we do not know if this work is being done or not. The Miller Road stabilization plan were all designed by Carrie May and if you know how to read them, they are a mirror image of each other. If you take that plan and you lay it over the RV park plan, the roads are a match. The stubs turn into accesses to campsites. The road on the plans are identical and are the same length. The trenches were put there to support 14 campsites. If they were installed for F21, they were building prior to approval by the planning commission.

Terry Roote of Cherry Ave said his property was a disaster when he bought it. After his work it was nominated as a top 10 yard in the area. We have had people pay to walk our site. That is because of our work for several years. We have talked about remediation and erosion. I'm the guy who got affected by the erosion. I have two inches of clay. The only thing growing on my lawn moss. The retention pond is a detention pond. The fifth time, he has had spillage into his yard. This develop has created end point pollution and he has done nothing to clean it up.

Susan Roote of Cherry Ave said she has done a lot of the work at her property but her yard has been demolished five times, she is pissed. I thought the soil erosion was supposed to protect homeowners. Please do something. Heide cannot guarantee this won't happen again. I ask you to turn down this permit.

Mary Scarnulous of Torch Lake Drive wanted to remind everyone that prior to the last master plan being written, they did a survey and the residents did not want more business at the Torch Village. That was put into the master plan under item 8.2. And if you go forward with this you are going against the master plan. She said the township changed the master plan without approval. She talked about the curve on Miller and that people will go slow. No one will go slow there. People have to live there to see that. We are concerned about traffic because if the DNR puts in that boat ramp, it will get even busier.

Pat Scarnulous of Torch Lake Drive said he is concerned about the environment, water, sewer, congestion and traffic. I watched a motorcycle do a wheelie across the bridge. We have people on bikes, golf carts and they do not realize that road is narrow and no one goes the speed limit. We have an understaffed sheriff's department but it is all of our responsibilities. I am concerned that someone will get injured or killed at that intersection. The DNR is going to build their ramp on Torch Lake Drive. If that happens you will have so much more congestion. I filmed near accidents from people backing out of Mico's and nearly getting hit.

Robert Larson of Coral Lane said his main concern is sewage contamination of his well. He asked if he could study the previous drawing and he was denied seeing it. My intent was to measure the lot sizes and roads and using a drafting scale. I'd recommend the township do this study and measure the size of usable land for a 70 unit park. I'm concerned about the driveway on Miller Road. If you would go to Torch Grove, golf cart are used to allow children to drive around. Other parks have a manager on site 24/7. They control traffic and enforce the rules. I left information on park models. The previous lot spacing plans would require certain dimensions. Concerning boat storage, a sea of blue wrapped boats won't be pretty. Better screening will be necessary.

Sharon Hill of Torch River Road corrected a statement she made regarding a EGLE violation went to Torch River Road. The observed discharge went into the state wetland area. When we went to do an addition to our home, the health department rejected our plan and said we needed to downsize it since our lot is non-conforming. I wanted to know how I could correct it. It is about the ground water and I cannot change that. The wells in the area are about 35 feet deep or less. But 70 family units can be added to affect my ground water? There are two wells at 69 gallons per minute. By doing two it does not have to be registered by the DEQ. We have had a lot of rain this year, but it really was not a record year. July was a record month. What I know is that we have had standing water more than I've ever had. My neighbor has never had standing water like this until the hillside clearing happened. Now the hilltop is bare and the water is traveling downhill. The rain will not be able to reach the soil. Even worse than this is the sewage permit regarding what's allowed. What I know is crap runs downhill. If water runs down, so does sewage and it will go into our ground water. In the last two summers there have been two water events that has caused issues. Please be aware of the risks and concerns. I've had my well tested. I'm here with three generations. It's my happy place. I intend to leave it to the next generation.

Uphold the ordinances. Deny the SUP.

Bruce Ford of Torch Bridge Ct. said he's hired lawyers to take care of things such as the pollution of our septic and wells. The police and fire are understaffed now and then if we approve this, it will be far from satisfactory.

Rebecca Milliken on behalf of Torch/Skegemog Alliance and Torch Lake Protection Alliance. We are here on a SUP application. Your ordinance recognizes a special use has special impacts. The state law allows you to consider the impacts to the community and whether they are so great the permit cannot be supported. To the suggestion that this project checks boxes and meets the ordinances, it is not a use by right. I sent a letter over the weekend. It was to highlight the many items that were missing in the application. I want to make sure to note that these items were missing out of the plan. I do not want to suggest that if these items are provided it should be approved. We will acknowledge that there have been changes made to the plans since the last time, but these are mostly superficial in nature. The number of sites have been removed. The stability of the site and the ground and wastewater and the impacts from cutting trees is what is most concerning. This is a technically demanding undertaking and the community thought it was helpful to consult an engineer and bring Beckett and Raeder on. We would encourage you to seek expertise. I must rebut one point regarding where to put the RV Park. Mr. Peal came to this body and suggested where to put this site. It is not too late to change the site. I urge you to consider this carefully. This may not be the right spot for this project.

Public Comment is closed. Hefferan thanked everyone for their comments

Approval of Agenda:

**Motion** to approve the agenda by Ford. Seconded by Renis. **Motion carried.**

Purpose of the Special Meeting:

A. SUP 2021-01 Torch River RV Park: Introduction:

Andy Blodgett, attorney for the applicants introduced the applicants and their representatives.

Jim Brewer, the owner said he is a retired petroleum engineer and his wife Lori is a retired nurse. All of us in this project, none of the owners are developers. It is just a term. We are just local business people who are trying to make a buck in a difficult township. Who are we? In 2001 we purchased Torch River Marine from the Wickstroms. It was built in 1969. We have been in front of this board many times to fix things up at the marina. We are the largest employer and the largest tax payer in the Village. Until this year, we were the largest donor to the fireworks. We are the village's biggest seasonal RV park and have been for 20 years. Right now, you have a seasonal RV park in the village zone. We did not want it to be considered non-conforming. We wanted to ask for a special use to cover our campground, which would have been grandfathered in but we wanted it to be above board. Like John Peal said, in 2017 we spent our retirement funds and bought 17.81 acres from Bill Weiss and it is zoned Village. We are not asking for a variance. Since it is village, there is a special use listed for an RV park. Your ordinance says you can have a seasonal RV park. Right now we do and we have a lot of customers. All the people who will be at the RV park are already driving here. They come from all over to get there on a

busy day. We have 68 rentable sites and 65 on a waiting list. This will be filled by people who are already there. They drive on the busy roads to get to our marina. We have operated this 10 unit RV park for more than 20 years and the sheriff or the fire department have never been there. While I hear the conjecture, it does not make it true. We have 20 years of operating data. It is not opinion. The next point to make is the number of people and the number of cars. The state has designed a few campgrounds in their history. They require 1.5 parking spaces per site. That is about right for the busy weekends. During the week, the people are not there. They are at work. On the weekdays, there will hardly be anyone in the park. You have to take everything with a grain of salt. When we purchased this property in the village zone, we had meetings with you. We told you what we were going to do. Milton requires a very detailed site plan and we are going to cut some trees so we can build a seasonal RV park. Your ordinance says you have to cram it into 10 acres. We needed a soil erosion permit and we got it. We asked the right people the right questions. We have been stuck with changing perspectives such as the fire chief. What you are expecting what all your opinions will be in the future and anticipate that and build an application that fits all of the changing opinions. It is unfair to the applicant. Regarding the August 10 storm, we did not get approval to stabilize until June of this year and we did not get the contractor until July. We were half way through it when that storm hit. We had the money and everything to stabilize it, but you would not let us. We look forward to proving that in court because we have the documentation. First you all have the rules. Have you read them? There will be no campfires allowed except for two pavilions. Your ordinance requires a 24/7 manager. So there will be someone on site the whole time. Brewer said quiet time is from 10 pm to 8 am. This is what the state does. Two autos per site even though we are required a minimum of one and a half. We are not allowing boats or trailers in the RV park ever because we do not want the traffic. These sites are seasonal. Regarding the Miller Road exit. Our original plan, when we went through subcommittee they asked us to take that off. Trying to work with the township, we removed it. That was something we got hammered on. We took it off because you asked us to. Now you see it is back on. This road is not a main entrance. It is only for emergency vehicles and park maintenance. We think this is a good compromise. Our customers will not use this and it will be gated.

Carrie May representing Gourdie Fraser in the design of the park. She is going to go through the details. Regarding the property, like everyone else, I appreciate the work you have done. She reviewed an overview aerial view and the rendered plan. The overall property is 16.07 acres. There are two parcels. There is a 1.18 acre parcel that will not be developed. It is zoned Ag. The rest of the property is 14.89 acres and that is what the park will be within. May referred to a line on the map regarding the outline of the park which is 10 acres. The zoning for the village has a 20K square feet minimum lot size. There could be 34 single family dwellings on that site. The other requirement is a max of 40% coverage. That could be 6 acres of roof. The seasonal RV park is a special use. There is not a rezone request. She referred to a map shows what is still wooded. The slopes vary from flat to 1.5 to 1. The soils are sand and clay. This is why there were erosion issues after it was disturbed. When Gourdie Fraser started with the design on this project, earth work had been done and I called Weinzapfel and asked if they had their permits and he said they did and they were good to go from there. I am not a ZA. If they are told they can proceed, they will. We did tell him you cannot build the RV park until you have your permits. That does not change the fact that there was exposed soil that needs to be stabilized. Once it is open, storm water has to be controlled.

May discussed the permitting for a campground. There are 8 separate permits in Michigan. She pointed to a diagram and explained the flow chart. Entry drive is across from a drive into the Marina. Both gates will be locked with a keypad entry. Again we coordinated with the road commission for the drive off Miller Road. We needed this entry to do a stabilization project. We understand they did work and did not have that originally. When you are building on a slope this is necessary. The goal is to disturb the least amount of land and that is what we did. The wells and septic all go through the NW Michigan Health department. The septic also would go to MI Waters at EGLE because it is a community system. All these entities work together and see each other's review. Those two wells are alternating for a failsafe operation. EGLE issues two permits, one to construct, but you need your land use permit from the township and the as-built from the engineer before a license to operate is issued. In this redesign, I have talked to all of these folks, I have gone over the changes and they do not want to see it again until you are done with your review.

The layout of the park is 70 sites, down from 80. These will be seasonal May to October. The minimum is 2600 ft<sup>2</sup>. The state allows 1200ft<sup>2</sup>. We laid this out according to NFPA 1194 guidelines for campgrounds. It is not specifically listed in your ordinances. But the fire chief said he wanted to see these items. Part of the NFPA is to shorten the dead ends and provide turn arounds. The grades are all still fine. The guidelines for 1194 requires 20 feet between trailers. May reviewed the map and showed what is gravel and what is grass for parking. We are trying to limit the hard surfaces. There is plenty of room on the site for parking. There is also a gravel pad 40'x10' and a 12' x 12' permeable patio on each site. We have 105 parking places and 17 overflow spaces. There is 4.5 at bathhouses and some spaces at the pavilions. 126.5 spaces total. The park rules limit the lessee to two vehicles at any given time. May said she is not counting grass parking sites. The longest distance away from a bathroom is about 840 feet and all of the campers have their own hookups. When we talk about walkability, a quarter mile is walkable.

Regarding the bathrooms and pavilions, May discussed what will be on site. Sewage demand for a project is based on the use, not on the number of fixtures derived from data from existing RV parks. If we install another 50 toilets, it will not increase the waste, it is just more convenient. May discussed the two pavilions on the drawings. They have a grill, sink and walk up bar, and a fire ring with chimney. Only propane grills are allowed at each camping site. It is better for fire safety.

Regarding open space, 20% is required to be open. We are providing 39%. If you look at the overall development parcel it is 59.2% that will be open or wooded.

Regarding the dumpster enclosure and park sign. The original plan was to use a green hedge. Jim is happy to put a fence around it to shield it. May gave an extra plan that shows a drawing of the privacy fence and sign. The size is that it will be as small as possible and it will be illuminated from a downlight perspective.

Regarding water and sewer. The water is a type 2 community well. The regulations are more stringent than they would be for an individual well. They have to do a four hour draw down test to make sure it is not drawing down the aquifer. The pumps will be alternating variable

frequency drives. All equipment is certified and it's spelled out in the permits and it will be monitored and sampled. Gourdie Fraser is a licensed operator for drinking and wastewater.

Erick Arbit of Gourdie Fraser talked about the wastewater operation. They did tests looking for the depth to the ground water table. Based on that review, we got the minimum size of the drain field and then the number of sites. Of the sites 16 are proposed to be park models and the remaining are standard RVs. The park model site would generate 150 gallons per day. The smaller unit is 75 gallons per day per site. These numbers have come from the state data. That is how we got those numbers. The additional buildings are calculated within those numbers. Based on those flow numbers and the number of sites, that is where we came up with the drain field of 8,600ft<sup>2</sup> requirement. We are above what the state requires at 13,000ft<sup>2</sup>. The 10,050 gallon septic tanks are providing extra capacity for surge loading. Due to the fact that the park flows are high enough, we need a ground water discharge permit from EGLE. We are required annually to submit a report to check the flow meters which will generate daily flows. If we find that we are above our limit of 6,000 gallons, we have to report that and it is a violation. That is a built in protection. We are doing time dosing of the drain field. It is different from a home system. It will dose the drain field throughout the whole day. Being a pump system, it is considered low pressure. We are also using distribution zones to dose a different part of the field. The drain field areas have a bit of slope across the top so the water will sheet off. We have designed in berms or rocks to prevent people from parking on it.

May discussed roads and safety. Gourdie Fraser did an assessment on traffic and consulted with MDOT and according to them it would not trigger a traffic study. Progressive AE did a traffic two part stud. We did not see part two, but part one summarized in the worst case, there would be 40 trips total during peak hour which does not meet any agency requirement for a traffic study. Parking spaces do not generate traffic. Uses generate traffic. If we provide more parking spaces it does not mean more traffic. Kopriva asked about handicapped and ADA. ADA does not regulate how many spaces. This is done by zoning and by use. However, the spaces we have would qualify.

May reviewed a more detailed engineering drawing. May reviewed the drives which are meant to be gravel. We did not want to pave everything because we are trying to be friendly to the environment and save ourselves on additional storm water runoff. It is not that the water will sink in, but if you pave a drive it accelerates the runoff. We are using a geo-web cellular confinement system on the 10% grades. You have profiles that show you the grades. The reason we use that is it is a fabric that expands. There are diamond shapes. It is compacted into a confinement grid. It minimizes the possibility of aggregate transportation. It is also being used in storm water applications. I went through the plan with the fire chief. May discussed the load rating on the road. It has been tested for 50 years and they have no issues with it.

Regarding the second exit, May went through it with the fire chief and discussed the grades. The gates at the top will have a lock with a code.

Regarding storm water, May reviewed another map of the watershed. Regarding the Roote property. Unfortunately, the ditch on the east side of Miller goes into his yard. The ditch on the west side goes into a low area. There is no way to take that storm water past there. May does not



know what the solution is, but we are aware that is a sensitive situation. We have attempted to mitigate this. May brought up individual watersheds within the design. She explained the color coding. As a result of the stabilization work done, which marries with the new proposed plan is designed to fit what is there now. We took 1.3 acres draining west and now it is going east. We have also designed these two basins in coordination with the road commission. We are trying to mitigate what is heading in that direction. Five areas flow in different directions. The strategy is to handle infiltration where we have sandy areas. Where we have clay areas, we are taking it to basins. We have got two basins that are integrated into the new design. May showed how it all connects. We are using the geo-grade product here. It will be filled with a drain stone but it allows the storm water to drop in the trench basin below. Milton does not have storm water regulations. It is punted to Antrim County. The state told counties they do not have jurisdiction to enforce storm water. Right now, it is only regulated by Antrim. They do have a set of guidelines and we have designed to that and above. We have to have it designed to a 25 year storm. We have designed to the 100 year storm. May discussed possible outflows and storm water control. It is designed that sediment basins are dual basins. If you get a smaller rain storm, it would be retained in the upper basin. If you get a larger storm, it would flow to the larger basin. They are designed with staged outputs.

Regarding soil erosion. An exposed site is a big hazard for erosion especially if you have clay. We had some issues and some big rain storms. Part of this was because the site was open and the review was protracted. Their temporary storm water controls were breached. We were first given permission to stabilize the west site of the site, but were not able to stabilize the whole site. In August we had a big storm. EGLI said they wanted us to stabilize the whole site. They said they wanted us to make it like it would be because they did not want to come back out. There has been a lot of people trying to compare an eroding site to an engineered site. Try not to do that. When it is finally designed, it will be different. May showed a picture of Miller Road and discussed the green retaining wall. There is already some trees planted here. Soil erosion wise, the plans restrict that there will be no slopes in excess of 2:1. Retaining walls are shown on the plan. If it's 4ft or greater, it is engineered.

Regarding landscaping and greenbelts. May discussed a map and said it follows the ordinance. May showed where abutting agriculture or residential uses are. We are very open to what you want here. Early on, if we put the greenbelt on the right of way, you will see the RV park. Would you rather have it at the top of the hill? We are open to figuring that out in a way that everyone is happy with. We can do this to make the most of the screening. May showed a photo of the highest point on the project which are intended to be the owner's site.

Regarding lighting, on the general notes page, it requires lights to be down lit and shielded. We will try to minimize lights. There is lights on the well house, bathrooms, pavilions and sign.

The engineering on this is extensive. Apart from all of the regulating agencies, the township's consultant prior to the plans being reduced in density stated that the project was not rejected due to engineering. He stated it was designed to the ordinance. The NFPA code has information on park models. I know someone had questions about storm water volumes and how we are going to deal with events being bigger and more severe. I will say on this project, we have tried to maximize everything we could. May discussed rain events through history. It looks like we are

going through a period of more intense storms. All we can do is maximize the resources.

Don Passenger is an attorney from Helena Township and an attorney for the Brewers. They have made adjustments to this plan. There are 70 units but 68 are for rentals so there are two for on-site monitoring. The number of visitors is based on research. The traffic has not been deemed enough to do a traffic study. He discussed the traffic counts and he does not think they are big issues. Everything in this place will be on wheels and they can come and go. In the report you have, this will bring \$550K into the community. In addition it increases your tax base. I understand the concerns raised by people. It is fear of the unknown. The reality is that this is a thoughtful plan that will bring dollars into the community. We are happy to take questions. Set a public hearing soon and the sooner we can build it out and stabilize it, we can get everything the way it needs to be. You have heard from many residents in this township today but many other voices are very loud by not being here to object.

This concludes the applicant's presentation.

Hefferan appreciates the dialogue with everyone. This is our opportunity to ask questions to the applicant and their representatives.

Hefferan asked regarding the Miller Road access. This was requested by the fire department. This is a brand new application. The ten sites at the marina, there is an existing SUP for those 10 sites? Brewer said no. The sites were there when we bought the marina in 2001. Hefferan asked if those sites would be removed. It is indicated those sites will remain where they are. Yes, we reserve the right to keep those as they are. '

Peters asked about the septic pumps. Do you have redundant pumps? Yes.

Peters asked regarding the park boundary as it pertains to 117.605. How many acres are within the red boundary? 10 acres per your ordinance.

Hefferan asked if there are two parking places per site or 1.5. There is 1.5 graveled but 2 spaces per site. Half of each second parking space is grass. You can fit two cars on your own lot. Hefferan asked in regards to guest parking, there are 17 sites for guest parking? Yes. In addition to the 2 per site. Kopriva said only parking spaces of gravel or pavement count as a space per the ordinance.

Merillat asked about the difference between detention and retention. May explained the way a detention basin works is essentially like a bucket with a hole. It slowly drains out. A retention basin there will be no outlet. The water is retained indefinitely until it sinks in. May discussed the county requirements regarding volume. Merillat asked why there are two parcels on the application when you are only using one. We wanted to make sure you knew we are including that triangle in this project and we are not planning another use for that parcel. There is wording about preserving this. How will that be done? The control is to you. Because the SUP would have to be modified to change that parcel's use.

Renis said looking at this for the first time as he is, is it a requirement for people to use boats in

their marina or Lhurs Landing? They will have their boats there. They will not be using the public ramp. I do not see an office. If I come to the campground, do I know how to get in? Do I park somewhere and check in? You would be leasing it for the season and people who have had RVs at the marina, when they lease it, we would give them the code. They would come to the marina parking lot in November or October and lease it for next year and they will know everything and so they will just drive in. What will happen to sites not leased? We already have a waiting list. What if people violate the rules? It is easy to tell someone to go because they can be replaced the next day. How is power coming to the sites? Underground. There is a whole electrical plan. What about abandoned or neglected RVs? Could someone do that? The reality is in our lease agreement we can take out any unused camper. They have to be 15 years or newer and inspected by management. Is there any chance that you are opening in phases or stages? No, we will open all at the same time. They have an option to store? You can park your RV at your house. 80% leave them there outside over the year. These could stay in place, but utilities will be disconnected. No boats or boat trailers will be allowed in the park. Will ground water be able to get to the septic system? No. It is a closed system. Is 6400 gallons for septic based on 80 sites? Sites have been changed to 70, but park models are 16. The park model sites are designed for 150 gallons per day. Standard site is 75 gallons per day. That is where the load difference came in.

Hefferan asked regarding outdoor storage. In chapter 6, charts, pg 6-7, outside storage: This is permitted as a special use in AG, AR. It is not permitted in the village zone. Brewer said it is an annual lease with a seasonal use. If those campers are moving in and out every year, the times they are doing it are not busy at all. Moving in or out creates more traffic. Blodgett said that outdoor storage in this table is a use on the land. That is not what is happening in this case. They are not advertising for storing RVs.

Merillat asked where the common area is in 1605K? They are where the pavilions and bathrooms are. There are some wooded areas and some grassy areas. Those are all included in the definition of recreation and common areas. How much is usable for the uses mentioned in that section? There is no playground. There will be open areas on the drain fields if people are wanting to hike to the wooded areas. Merillat would like to see it delineated where you consider that to be and how much acreage it is and how much could you physically put those things on because a bunch of it is steep slopes. Merillat said K needs to be satisfied.

Merillat asked Kopriva how many standard land divisions are available? Not sure. How many residential buildings are in Torch River Village? She will get this.

Ford asked if there are showers? Yes. Six total showers.

Merillat asked if there is a restoration plan to restore the trees removed on the interior. Brewer said yes there will be landscaping, if this is approved. Merillat said there is no documented plan. May said we do not want to plan trees that pose a danger to campers. There is no specific plan.

Hefferan asked regarding greenbelts. You have indicated the Miller Road section requires 50% screening pursuant to the ordinance. The ordinance talks about an access road being 50% screened. May said the way she read it the boundaries should have a greenbelt, the greenbelts

section of the ordinance says it has to be where commercial abuts residential. We would like to know what you would like to see here. We would much rather spend money where we know you want the screening. We are looking for your input on this. In the pink area along the slope I would think you would want something along the top of the ridge. May said Brewer is willing to plant evergreens and shrubs that will grow in at that location, which would create 100% screen at that area of the park.

Merillat said you should consider the green belt by the triangle. May said it is all heavily wooded. Merillat said he begs to differ. You need to have the green belt on the inside of the park boundary. It is there where it is abutting agriculture or residential. The ordinance says all park boundaries must be screened. May said she was going to the other section. Let us study this issue. We may need to consider this. If we are required to screen it, we will. The ordinance builds in relief but the Planning Commission must give that relief.

Hefferan asked Erick asked about approvals of this plan by the state and the requirement for monitoring. Yes. Gourdie Fraser is available 24 hours per day. You have a contract with the property owner? Yes. The state requires it? Yes. If they have their own person, they must be licensed.

Merillat asked if the observation decks are considered part of the common open space. The decks are so the manager and owner can see almost all the park. It can be a common space for other users. If it is common it is not an accessory structure.

Renis asked about the distance between the drain field and the water table. Many people have 30ft wells. How will they be protected? May said the health department said you have to have 4ft separation. This will be 16 feet above ground water.

Merillat said the observation decks are on sites and they are considered accessory structures. May said we can adjust the size of the site to put the decks off the sites.

Hefferan said signage and lighting will comply with the ordinance. Was the watershed changed by the property owners? The watershed was reduced due to the stabilization projects. Was the original watershed changed? May said you are talking about grade. May pointed to the map and showed the different grades. It was not changed until stabilization.

Hefferan said he saw a letter from the Fire Department, but he did not see a letter from the sheriff's department. They have a problem with people parking on Torch River Road and that was the extent of their input. Hefferan said he would like to have something in writing from them on this project.

Ford asked about the main entrance and why it was moved. May said it was motivated by the grade on the main road and showed the area on the map.

Hefferan asked where we are at with permits. Soil erosion will not give theirs until you give yours. Road commission is granted and in hand. Health department and MI Waters and campground are all waiting for you to approve and then they will take a new look at it. They will

revise their permits based on revisions we send them. Other than road commission, everyone is waiting for us.

Merillat said in the park rules there is a limit of two autos per site? How are golf carts considered? What is the difference between vehicles and autos? May said I feel like they are separate because a golf cart can park where ever. There are park rules pertaining to golf carts.

May showed on the map where there is a pull off spot at the entrance before the gate. They will have already registered. They can get off the road before stopping.

Ford asked about when they can get in? It is required by the ordinance, you cannot come in earlier than the first day of season.

Attorney Vermitten discussed the purpose of the meeting. The purpose here tonight is we are looking at this is a new application. The planning commission's job tonight was to take a look to see if the application has been substantially completed. There is no public hearing tonight. If substantially all of the questions have been answered, the chair can call for a public hearing. You do still have an opportunity to ask questions at the public hearing during the deliberations process.

Hefferan asked to for Kopriva to provide a copy of the A&E traffic study. It is referenced in the packet. The applicant said they have never seen phase 2. The one in your packet was done by Gourdie Fraser.

Hefferan said he is going to go through Kopriva's report showing what is not provided such as lighting, signs, screening for the trash. Max height for the pavilions of the rest rooms. May will get that information. On page 12, under additional comments, May has spoken to 1 and 2. Three is lighting which is minimal. Kopriva, can you comment on park models? This is something the planning commission will need to decide if they meet the definition of a RV under the ordinance. There should be some consideration of this. They are saying they are movable. Look at 117.218. I do not have an answer for you. It is something you would need to determine. Hefferan said there are 16 allowed and I would appreciate some feedback on if they comply with our definition of RV.

Hefferan said today was an introduction to the application. He appreciates the information and the comments from the public. Should we schedule this for a public hearing?

Merillat asked what is outstanding.

- Heights for structures.
- Greenbelts.
- Letter from sheriff.
- Decks in the common area.
- Outdoor storage.
- Park models.
- Traffic study from A&E.
- Common area delineated and how much is usable.

**Motion** by Peters to move SUP 2021-01 to a public hearing dated January 3, 2022 at 6:00pm.  
Seconded by Ford.

Roll call:

Merillat; No.

Peters; Yes.

Ford; Yes.

Renis; Yes.

Hefferan; Yes.

**Motion carried 4-1.**

Meeting adjourned by order of the chair at 9:52pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Merillat