

Milton Township
Planning Commission
Unapproved Meeting Minutes
June 16, 2022

Members present: Chairman Hefferan, Renis, Warner, Cole, Ford, and Merillat.

Also present: Sara Kopriva, Jackie Peterson, Chris Grobbel and 8 audience members.

Members absent: Peters.

Hefferan called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

Public Comment:

Ann Hubbard of Chippewa Trail commented regarding funneling and there should be some language in the ordinance that would protect people in the township from funneling.

Mac Whitehouse of Chippewa Trail suggested, regarding the vacation rental ordinance, using a checklist such as fireworks, quiet hour definition, overnight visitors, 24/7 on site manager, dark skies and lighting requirements.

John Spevasek asked regarding a letter written by his wife Linda which was given to the commission. You will have some kind of density calculation in the zoning. This approach says you do not include space you could not build on such as steep slopes or other unusable space.

Tim Smith of Chippewa Trail said a design of any development should include the calculations to provide enough parking spaces for the development. In looking at an RV park they should provide enough parking spaces so people are not parking on the street. This should also account for visitors to the park. He spoke additionally about benchmarking.

Sharon Hill of Torch River Road provided an update on TESA's lawsuit. Resolution has been reached. There is a plan to proceed. Regarding the ordinance discussions, the township has had an interest in steep slopes, in thinking about preserving those and minimizing changes on an existing site, maintaining the site is critical. Also regarding park models, those are very heavy units and they must be pulled by a larger vehicles on steep slopes.

Dan Sijokowski of NW Torch Lake Drive said he submitted an email and he discussed it regarding density. He appreciates the way the commission is conducting this review of the ordinance.

Gary Doty of Fairmont Drive asked the commission to consider having no off season storage of trailers on site. No boat trailer storage in the summer and no boat storage in the off season.

Approval of Agenda:

Add under old business - Item B: Master Plan Survey; Item C: Coastal Management Resilience;

Item D. Host Compliance.

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

Approval of Minutes dated May 18, 2022:

Page 1: add "in regard to any legal proceedings"

Motion by Ford to approve the minutes as amended. Seconded by Warner. **Motion carried.**

Old Business:

A. ZO 2022-02 Zoning Ordinance Amendment on RV Parks:

Kopriva has provided an updated draft. Kopriva reviewed these changes with commission members. Item Q was to clarify screening. No questions.

Kopriva discussed the additions. Hefferan asked if the 18% slopes would conflict with anything else in the ordinance. Kopriva looked through the ordinance and said this is too big of an item to put in just one place. The immediate action is to put it here and then figure out how it fits into the ordinance. Hefferan asked regarding referencing the grade anywhere else. Kopriva agreed. All outside agency permits are needed or a letter of no concern if they will not issue a permit and this will apply to anyone applying for a SUP or site plan review. Regarding storm water, it must be retained on site and use a 100 year storm.

Warner reached out to others in community development regarding what can be done to modernize housing. Working with the other townships, it would be good to coordinate this.

Merillat said there was discussion from the public regarding the number of people on the site at one time. Should we put a limit on total number of people? Just a thought because we had a lot of push back on the number of people who can be in one place. Cole suggested doing it on a per site basis which we have now. The public thought that was too large. Renis said he would like to see how it is a problem before we struggle to correct it. Hefferan concurred with Renis. He heard the public's concerns as well, but statically speaking, what are the odds of having all of the people on site. Merillat said he does not think it is a problem either, but he is bringing it up because of the public concerns. Ford agreed with Renis.

Merillat said regarding internal roads, should we reference our chapter on private roads and require them to conform? Commission members agreed but look at the issue of pavement and what should be paved or gravel.

Merillat mentioned putting a stipulation that generators cannot be used in a park except in the event of a power outage. Hefferan said he struggles with this because he feels we are getting into what should be on the parks rules. But, the majority agrees so we will add this.

Ford asked the basis for putting the RV Park in Village rather than another zone? Hefferan discussed the history of this. The consensus was to put it in the village because putting it in the AG would conflict with all of our references to farmland preservation. We also wanted to infill our village zones, not expand but infill. Cole said he recalls the question of density and if you put it in AG you do have a business and you are putting a commercial operation in AG when we are

trying to preserve AG. Merillat said the big thing was density.

Cole asked about a clause that did not allow the selling of individual sites rather than dealing with one owner of the RV park. Hefferan said the definition of RV Park covers this concern. Cole said regarding the lot and the usage of it, he provided a sketch showing dimensions. He suggested 4 units per acre as he believes the current site size is too small. Hefferan said we are getting into what is best for the business owner. We have a minimum. They can always go larger. Cole is suggested a minimum of 3,000 sq ft and a minimum width of 45 feet. Renis agreed with the concept of number of units per acre. Kopriva is indifferent to the lot width. Merillat said leave it as is. Ford asked regarding boats and trailers. Are they not allowed on the lots? There is nothing in our ordinance that says this. Hefferan, leave it as is. Renis, leave it as is. Warner agrees that the 45ft width looks better, but we have worked with narrower lots. Leave as is.

Merillat said the 20 foot clear space between each RV is for fire safety.

Hefferan said Dr. Grobbel came to us and presented us with language. We have reviewed and turned it over to our ZA and that is why we have not had as much dialogue. Dr. Grobbel thanked the commission for their work. The 25% coverage of usable recreational space is an improvement but think about what is required of a typical PUD is 50%. I appreciate wetlands were added. Add utility easements under K. Under Q and R, thanks for improving the screening and buffering, but the township does not have a noise ordinance. Vegetation does not screen noise. The 24 hour onsite manager will solve a lot of things. Not sure how those things are enforced. Consider a prohibition of events at RV parks. Under Q, no development or grading within RV parks shall occur on slopes greater than 18%. Regarding density, look at what is out there. You have a range of RV parks from 13 to 245 acres in our vicinity. The average is 87 acres. Only two of nine allow these things and they are in AG because of density. 2.9 units per acre is our density at regional RV parks. If you remove Honcho Rest, its 2.3 units per acre. That gives some perspective. You should establish a density of 2.5/acre. Minimum lot size is a sliding scale right now. If you look at the parcels, in the Torch River Village, you have a limited number of large sites. If you went with a 10 acre minim that would qualify. If you look at Kewadin, you have 20 and most are flat with wetlands. If you had 15 acres, there would be over a dozen. If you had a 20 acre min, there would be 7. Minimum lot size is something to wrestle with. Milton is more than 80% AG. Very small areas are village. If this will work, we must be careful of neighbors. We should talk about benchmarking. There are a number of things the public discussed should also be included also. The vacation rental language is well done.

Cole said regarding not allowing year round occupancy. This is considered outdoor storage. This is not allowed. Kopriva said it does not hurt to include it. Commission members agreed. Cole said regarding funneling. We do not have anything that would stop me from putting in an RV park next to a road end access. This is currently not allowed in the ordinance. Kopriva said this is in the ordinance but it refers to residential units. We may want to make a note to talk about this.

Renis discussed park models. Looking at places that have them, they could be added on with decks or stairs. He does not see a park model in the category of an RV. It has wheels but it is more of a permanent structure. Kopriva said in the state rules it does. We could exclude that specifically. Commission members agreed. Kopriva will make this changes.

Hefferan discussed parking. Kopriva said there is no standard for the number of parking spaces. She does not want a big parking lot, but I see the benefit of not having them on site. What do you want it to look like and if they have to be paved or not paved? Merillat said it should be specified better. 1.5 does not cut it. I do not like the fact we got hung up on that it had to be paved or gravel when it makes more sense to have a grass covered spot. Perhaps two sites, grass. Cole suggested gravel. Ford said he does not like pavement, but likes 2 spaces. Renis said 2 spots. Warner said a minimum of two and gravel. Merillat asked about visitor parking. Kopriva said you could require an additional .5 space for visitors. Kopriva said you need two spaces per site, but you are not required to put them on your site. So you could put one space on their lot and one elsewhere in a parking lot. This would allow for flexibility.

Warner said it comes down to what Dr. Grobel said. We cannot do it in the Village zone in a way that will be functional that will work. It needs to go to Ag where it can be separated on a larger scale in order to be viable.

Hefferan asked Grobel. What the math on Honcho Rest is. It is an outlier. They have 110 sites. 97 full hookups. 8.6 units per acre because they have a 12 acre parcel but they have municipal water and sewer.

Kopriva will revise with the feedback.

B. Master Plan Survey

Kopriva emailed this out last week. It's laid out and she wanted the board to review before it's sent out. She can't write any more of the master plan without results from the survey. Cole gave some typo comments. Ford gave a change on the introduction. Who is eligible to take the survey? Kopriva thinks anyone can take this. Board members agree. Ford asked regarding #1 and if he could fill out multiple spots. Kopriva said you can give multiple answers. Give the top three and have them ranked. Or rank them all. Ford said on #6, it talks about density, does the average person understand density? Kopriva will clarify with a beginning sentence. Renis said regarding the pie chart, can you break out the colors but they all look the same? Ford asked about #26 in regards to lake levels. Kopriva will consider this.

C. Coastal Community Resilience Matching Grants

The township has dedicated \$25K to building the master plan. The Village of Elk Rapids is just starting the process of working on their master plan. It would be nice if, on this issue, we work with the village. Why can't our chapter on shoreline read the same as theirs? Hefferan is proposing we work together in this financing plan to create the same structure to save time, money and have consensus. ER Village and ER Township are working on these things, but they have been unable to work together. Kopriva discussed some possible areas of collaboration and areas where we would need to be different. Kopriva explained how their contract for the master plan works. This chapter will be in the master plan regardless. It is just who will do the work. Planning should not be done in isolation. It would be good to collaborate with them. I do not know that there will be cost savings. Kopriva said this would delay us about 3-4 months since the village is just starting. Cole asked regarding their splitting the cost of just this chapter. Is it worth the potential hassle? We have inland lakes also. It will delay us. Hefferan said we are too far

ahead. Kopriva suggested having a joint PC meeting and talk about it, but maybe not just this chapter.

D. Host Compliance

Kopriva gave the background on this. They help to monitor short term rentals. We have had a subscription for this service. They have a letter writing service that is additional. The renewal has come up and we are discussing the benefit of having the service. Peterson has had difficulty with the letter writing component and she is writing her own letters now. Peterson said they can identify residences that are advertising for short term rental, then she would take it from there. Hefferan said his thought is we are paying a company and they are not doing the job. Peterson said there are other companies that do this. Let's see who else is available and what they charge. Kopriva asked how much enforcement you want. Hefferan said if Host Compliance says we have 60 rentals and we have 40 permits, we need to enforce this. Hefferan will discuss this at the Township Board level.

New Business:

None.

Reports:

ZA Report:

Kopriva provided a report for members to review.

Township Board Report:

Update on the property south of Ringler Rd provided by Peterson. Cole gave an update on the sewer and road ends.

ZBA Report:

Hefferan said ZBA did not meet this month.

Planning Commission Updates:

None.

Future Meeting Considerations:

Next meeting, July 21, 2022.

Steep Slopes Discussion.

Meeting adjourned by order of the chair at 9:20pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joseph Merillat