

Chairman Van Berlo asked Architect Dan Gorman and Fred Hackl if they had anything to add to the presentation. Both indicated that the memo and explanation from Mr. Frykberg pretty much covered the outline. They, along with the owner, Mr. Bonsteel are here to answer questions during public discussions.

Mr. Gorman explained that the entrance drive had been expanded to include increased turn lanes, and that it has been approved by MDOT.

Chairman Van Berlo asked if there were any comments or questions from the public.

Public Comments:

- Mr. Dan Sampson asked about extending the center turn lane, requiring a 20' side yard setback because of a Conditional Use, and requested the well be up front on the property. Mr. Gorman explained that the center turn lane was adequate to handle 1 1/2 cars turning left from the north. Mr. Dohm would like to continue working with MDOT to extend it all the way to W. Conway Rd., but could not promise anything due to complexities working on MDOT projects.

Mr. Frykberg explained that the setback standards could only be applied to the district as provided for by the ordinance.

Moving the well to the front of the property was not committed to, but a memo from Benchmark Engineering indicated that Luttrell Well drilling was familiar with the wells in the area, and opined that there was sufficient water supply.

- Mr. Gene Kaminski asked if there will be further expansion, why the berm does not extend the entire length of the property or at least along the side of the building, how many employees they will need parking spaces for, and an explanation on the size and location of a proposed storage building.

Mr. Dean Bonsteel responded that 40 units was probably the limit, but could not guarantee there would never be an expansion, or other uses for the front of the property.

Mr. Dan Gorman explained that the berm was intended to shield automobile lights from shining off site to the north.

Mr. Bonsteel advised it is planned for up to 15 employees per shift. Mr. Frykberg commented that the parking requirements based on those numbers were exceeded from ordinance requirements.

It was explained that the storage building was proposed to be 30' x 40' and detached as indicated on the site plan. Mr. Dohm explained that any footprint changes from the site plan would need to be brought back to the PC for approval.

- Mr. Sandy Frye asked if the property is built out when this is completed, and will the property be fenced.

Responses were that there is no guarantee that there won't be more added to the property in the future, but any additions would need further PC approval. There will be no fence, just a berm and tree plantings as indicated on the site plan.

- Mr. Dohm asked about affordability.

Mr. Bonesteel advised that the intent was to make it comparable to other facilities on the same type.

Chairman Van Berlo asked if there were any more comments or concerns from those in attendance. There were none.

Chairman Van Berlo commented that having seen the material presented, and heard comments from both the December 7, 2015 public hearing and those given tonight, he believes that the proposed use is a good use of the property, that the conditions required under Section 1304 and 1508 have been met, and that if conditions are provided in a motion covering those discussed, he would entertain a motion to approve the use and site plan with conditions.

Following discussion by the Board, a **motion was made** by Mr. Chattaway to approve the Assisted Living Facility Site Plan, including the 30' x 40' detached storage garage, subject to the following conditions:

- A minimum of 5' tall Evergreen trees to be planted on the berm which will be on the north side of the parking areas and the trees are to be planted in an offset manner to maximize the screening effect.
- All signage proposals shall come back to the Township for administrative review.
- Landscaping shall be added by the road. The proposed landscaping proposal shall come back to the Township for Administrative review.

The motion was then supported by Mr. Fairbairn and unanimously passed by voice vote.

Other Open Discussion for issues not on the agenda:

a. **Correspondence:** None

b. **Planning Commission Members:** Chairman Van Berlo asked if there were any comments from Planning Commission Members.
There were none.

c. **Township Board Members:** Chairman Van Berlo asked if there were any comments from Township Board members.
Mr. Dohm advised that Roger Beckley called to advise that Jean was in the hospital.

d. **Public Comment:** Chairman Van Berlo asked if there were any comments from the public.
There were none.

Adjourn: There being no further business to be brought before the commission, Chairman Van Berlo adjourned the meeting at 8:25 P.M.

Date approved 11-21-16
Secretary Tom Fairbairn
Tom Fairbairn

Respectfully Submitted,
William P. Dohm,
Supervisor

~~6-16-16~~ 7-11-16

Name

Address

GEORGE KAMINSKI

894 WOODVIEW H.S. 49740

FRED HACKL

891 W. CONWAY RD. " "

Dean Bonesteel

8121 Gordon Ridge East H.S.

Sandy Frye

742 Woodview Dr H.S.

DAN GORMAN

340 STATE ST. #1

Dan+Sandy Sampson

806 Woodview Dr.

D. Simon

676 Woodview

LITTLE TRAVERSE TOWNSHIP
EMMET COUNTY, MICH.

Regular Meeting of the Township Planning Commission
July 11, 2016
7:30 P.M.
at
The Township Hall

AGENDA

1. Call to Order.
2. Roll Call: Martin Van Berlo, Joseph Chattaway, Jean Beckley, Chip Radle,
Tom Fairbairn
3. Approve the agenda.
4. Approve the Minutes of June 6, 2016.
5. Public Comment.
6. Case #B-10-2015
Site Plan Review and further consideration of a request by FAH ARCHITECTURE,
PLL, representing "The Cottage of Harbor Springs", for an assisted living facility at
3498 Harbor-Petoskey Rd.
7. Open Discussion for issues not on the agenda.
 - a. Correspondence:
 - b. Planning Commission Members
 - c. Township Board Members
8. Adjourn.

(Note - If a Board member is not able to attend this meeting, please call the office, 526-0351.)

MEMORANDUM

TO: Little Traverse Township Planning Commission
FROM: Randy Frykberg, PhD
DATE: 6-28-16
SUBJECT: Case #B-10-16 Site Plan Review for Assisted Living Facility at 3498 M-119 (Parcel # 24-08-16-22-200-001).

For 7-11-16 PC Meeting

REQUEST

Dean and Hilde Bonesteel have requested permission to build a 40 unit assisted living and memory care facility at 3498 M-119. The parcel is immediately north of the Sheriff's Office and is zoned R-2 in the front and R-1 in the rear. The proposed building would be located in the R-1 portion of the property.

On 12-7-15, the Planning Commission approved a Conditional Use Authorized by Special Permit for the use as an assisted living/memory care facility, with the condition that final approval is subject to a site plan review that satisfies the Conditional Use Approval Standards of Section 1304 of the Zoning Ordinance (standards listed below). A Site Plan Review is also required.

GENERAL FACTS

1. The 7.5 acre parcel is zoned R-2 in the front and R-1 in the rear.
2. Minimum setback requirements in the R-1 District are 30' front, 10' sides, and 25' rear. In the R-2 District the minimums are 30' front, 20' sides and 35' rear.
3. The plans show all setbacks to be met or exceeded.
4. The proposed structure and parking lot will be constructed in the R-1 portion of the property.
5. The property will be served by one on-site well and septic system.
6. A utility pole in the proposed turn lane will be relocated.
7. A 12' wide 110' tapered deceleration lane and a 13.7' wide 60' tapered acceleration lane on M-119 will be added at the entrance to the site.
8. The 24,200 square foot structure will have 40 beds.
9. 7% of the parcel will be the building, leaving 93% of the parcel as open space.
10. 28 parking spaces are planned. The requirement for elderly housing is 1 per 2 units; therefore 20 spaces are required. Probably few Alzheimer's patients will have vehicles. However, staff and visitors will also need parking spaces. The estimate is 15 employees for the largest shift.
11. A screened dumpster will be located on the south side of the property, approximately 50' behind the front of the building.
12. Stormwater will be handled on site by 5 retention and percolation areas.

13. Alternative uses, that are allowed by right on this property and thus wouldn't need Conditional Use Review by the PC, include:
 - a. For the front R-2 zoned portion of the property, the acreage would allow multiple family dwelling for up to 7 families or up to 11 two-bedroom apartments, or any of the uses allowed in R-1 (listed below)
 - b. For the remainder of the property, about 5.5 acres zoned R-1, the acreage would allow farms, churches, public, parochial, and private schools not operated for profit, or up to 5 single family detached homes.

FINDINGS:

1. The proposed project requires a Site Plan Review.
2. The graphic requirements for site plans are met, the checklist is complete, and the impact statement meets the requirements of Section 1508 (Site Plan Review).
3. **Standards for Site Plan Review** (Section 1508 sub 4.):
 - a) *The location and design of driveways and entrance feature with respect to vehicular and pedestrian traffic. MDOT has approved the entrance including the acceleration and deceleration lanes.*
 - b) *The traffic circulation plan and off-street parking lots with respect to public safety, on site uses, and adjacent properties. Parking spaces and walkways appear to be safely designed.*
 - c) *Buffer Techniques, fences, wall, greenbelts, and landscaping may be required by the Planning Commission in pursuance of the objectives of this section and/or as a condition of the establishment of the proposed use. A berm with evergreens is proposed to help screen the parking lot from the residential area to the north. Vegetation exists on much of the south side of the property. However, no landscaping is indicated for the entrance area at the front of the parcel.*
4. **Conditional Use Approval Review Standards** (Section 1304):
 - a. **Non-detrimental Impact upon the surrounding uses** – The proposed use of a 24,200 square foot 40-unit assisted living facility on 7.5 acres with buffering from the residential use to the north should not have a detrimental impact upon the surrounding uses.
 - b. **Site Size to accommodate use, future expansion, customary accessory uses, and on-site services (sewage disposal and water supply)** – Subject to approval of District Health Department #4. Compared to other uses allowed by right on the property, water usage and sewage volume should be comparable or even less.
 - c. **Impact of the proposed use on the quality and quantity of water resources, domestic water supplies; and capacity to absorb the anticipated sewage disposal demand** – Residential type use for 40 unit assisted living should certainly have an acceptable impact on

B-10-15 Cottage Assisted Living, 7-11-16

water resources and sewage disposal compared to alternative uses allowed by right on this property. It is anticipated that the well will be in the range of 180 to 200' deep, as are the wells for Griffith Arena, Sheriff Substation, and the Emmet County Building.

- d. **Entrance drives no less than 25 feet from a street intersection or boundary of different zoning district – Meets.**
- e. **Fencing around pools – N/A**
- f. **Suitability of access to the use – MDOT has approved the entrance with the new acceleration and deceleration lanes.**
- g. **Allowance is made for the safety of vehicles – O.K.**
- h. **Screening around all open storage areas – Dumpster will be screened.**

SUMMARY

This proposed project appears to meet all the Township requirements. Unless information to the contrary is presented at the meeting, approval seems appropriate.

Randy\My Documents\LTT PC\Case #B-10-15 Cottage Assisted Living 7-11-16.doc