

**WEST TRAVERSE TOWNSHIP  
SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MAY 27, 2020**

Chairperson Mooradian called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Meeting was conducted via telephone conferencing.

Roll Call: Wallin, Baiardi, Moore, Repasky, Uutinen, Varner, Mooradian.

Visitors: Troy Bosker, Dave White.

Approve Agenda: The agenda was approved by consensus.

Public Comments: None.

Special Meeting for Case 2020-1, Site Plan Review for Troy Bosker: Dave White reviewed the application from Troy Bosker for a Site Plan for construction of an eight-unit storage building at 7569 S. State Road at the corner of State Road and Franklin Street and his review reads as follows: “The proposed leased units will be heated with bathroom facilities. The storage units are a permitted use in the C-1 district. The existing building currently on the site will be removed. The property is next to the I-1 district with a building being owned by Gary Wright. The applicant is proposing a 5 ft. side yard setback which the Planning Commission may approve as long as there is a two-hour fire rated wall. The I-1 structure contains no windows or other openings on the abutting side of Bosker’s property. The parking spaces, as presented, do meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance which show two spaces per unit. Circulation on the site is very tight and scales out to be ten feet or less between the overhead doors and the proposed parking along the Franklin Road frontage. Parking is also being allowed in front of some of the doors. After discussion with the Emmet County Road Commission, the new driveway entrances will need to be permitted and upgraded to commercial standards. White said that he would ask that if the plan is approved, the Township receive a copy of the approval from the Emmet County Road Commission. Landscaping is shown on the Site Plan with four new trees planted along State Road and all existing trees are slated to be removed. Lighting will be installed above every garage door and next to the entry door as per the Building Code. The Site Plan, as proposed, does not impact the current flood zone area. White said that he has contacted both the County and State about the properties near the flood zone, which the State has a 707.8. Should fill be brought in, a permit would be needed if placed in a flood zone. In emails with the applicant, he feels that the site, when graded, will not in any way impact the flood zone. We will have to have documentation of that at the Township level. Should the Planning Commission wish to recommend approval of the proposed Site Plan, White would ask that a 5 ft. setback from the I-1 be approved and the Township receive a copy of the driveway permit from the Road Commission.”

Proposed: May 27, 2020

Approved: June 17, 2020 with one correction: Page 5, 5th line, add: *be* between *would* and *easier*.

West Traverse Township  
Special Planning Commission Meeting  
May 27, 2020

Mooradian questioned the actual distance from the overhead doors and the proposed parking along Franklin Street. He pointed out that this project is proposed to cover two lots, 7569 S. State Road and 110 Franklin Street.

Troy Bosker said that the units will be leased as a fully finished unit. They are being proposed as higher end storage. He stated that there is more than ten feet between the overhead doors and the parking along Franklin Street. There will be bathrooms in each of the units.

Mooradian pointed out that all of the existing trees will be removed. The existing building will be removed. There is a small driveway apron to the existing building and then there are two driveway aprons into the empty lot area. The existing building in I-1 is approximately about a foot off the property line, so that needs to be taken into consideration during the deliberations of the setback request. The setbacks along S. State Road and Franklin Street are correct.

Section 309 references the uses that are allowed in the C-1 district. The side yard setbacks of twenty feet, where C-1 abuts I-1, are able to be reduced to five feet if a fire rated wall was built on that side. In this case, the adjacent building is already one foot off the lot line, so if a five-foot variance was given, there would only be about six feet between the buildings. This would not meet the Building Code. Mooradian said that the Planning Commission could only allow a nine-foot setback because of the Building Code. Bosker said that he has a preliminary set of drawings with a two-hour fire rated wall all the way through per code. Mooradian stated that there has to be ten feet between the two buildings. Repasky said that he does not want to send the wrong message to the County by saying that West Traverse Township is okay with relaxing any fire protection requirements according to their Building Code. Repasky wanted to review the proposed parking and said that he doesn't agree with the parking proposed in front of the man doors. He wondered how safe that would be if there was an emergency and someone had to quickly exit, especially if there was a handicap person. He doesn't see any handicap parking provided. He doesn't see any areas for snow storage. He wants to know if there is just one water service that will provide water to all the units or is there a water line that will require an easement. He pointed out that the door openings are relatively large suggesting that trailers would probably be used to offload things into the units. He wanted to see more information about loading and unloading areas on the plan. He does not think that a car-trailer combination could back up and safely to unload anything in that area. He doesn't see any soil erosion plans on the Site Plan. He stated that there is an 18-foot-wide throughway and wants to know if there is a designation of one way or two-way traffic. Repasky asked if the neighbor, Gary Dwight had been asked if he was okay with the relaxation of the side yard setback. It had been noted that the Emmet County Road Commission is going to require that the driveways be upgraded to commercial standards. He asked if this was going to be revised on the Site Plan. He thinks that the Road Commission would require 30-foot radius standards associated with the driveways and

Proposed: May 27, 2020

2

Approved: June 17, 2020 with one correction: Page 5, 5th line, add: *be* between *would* and *easier*.

West Traverse Township  
Special Planning Commission Meeting  
May 27, 2020

require a setback to the spring points on the radius. These are the questions that he had. Mooradian reviewed the questions Repasky had to make sure everybody understood the questions. Mooradian thought that the handicap parking would be a Building Code issue with the County. Bosker wants to know if the Site Plan has met the parking requirements based on the use of the building. He said that he did not have to be handicap compliant because it is a private building. It will not be retail or anything where the public would be invited. There will not be any commercial use in the buildings. He feels that there is plenty of room for someone to be able to back in whatever they want in the storage units. He doesn't think there is a rule or a law against what he is proposing that he knows of. Bosker pointed out that the snow storage is noted on the Site Plan in the retention area. Mooradian told Bosker that it is very important that with his snow storage being on the corner of S. State Road and Franklin Street, he does not stack the snow very high which would block the visual line of site. Repasky wanted to know if the water line is a recognized service line servicing eight lines. Bosker said that the water in Franklin Park is a separate water system. The water line that will service the storage units will be from a separate water system that all owners in Franklin Park pay for the use. Tom Graham is the owner of the system. Repasky stated that in the process of backing up a smaller boat, someone would have to use all of Franklin Street just to do that for a small boat, let alone backing in a much larger vehicle into one of the large units. Bosker said that that is what is done on a daily business in Franklin Park. Repasky asked if once the plans are revised to show the Emmet County Road Commission commercial driveway standards it will make much of a difference. Bosker said that Repasky had a good question about the radius and that they don't want to cut corners there. He said that they will obviously do what the County wants them to do, but they want it as accessible as possible. Repasky questioned Bosker about the offsets from the existing pavement edge required by the Road Commission. Bosker said that it does, but he doesn't have the exact dimensions. Bosker said that all the calculations for storm water go to the west side of the property along State Road. Mooradian said that there are storm drains along the parallel parking area. It does not look like it sheds into the northern retention along Franklin Street. Bosker said that the calculation meets the requirements. Repasky stated that in reference to Bosker's statement regarding a law about parking requirements, the Township Zoning Ordinance calls for a safe vehicle and pedestrian movement. So, the Ordinance requires the Planning Commissioners to decide whether this site is safe for vehicle and pedestrian movement. This is noted in Section 506: B in the Zoning Ordinance. Mooradian said that it seems that his proposed parking is a little congested. Regardless of how many semis back up from Franklin Street, that has not been approved and it is not acceptable in a Site Plan approval. The plans need to be designed to manage the traffic, not clog up the road. Wallin thinks that there would be some congestion problems with this Site Plan. It is pretty congested as it is. The far west

Proposed: May 27, 2020

Approved: June 17, 2020 with one correction: Page 5, 5th line, add: *be* between *would* and *easier*.

West Traverse Township  
Special Planning Commission Meeting  
May 27, 2020

entrance to Bosker's property is right near the entrance to State Road and he thinks it would be a problem. Wallin said that the Planning Commission has the responsibility of maintaining the safety of the public. He brought up the possibility of someone putting in an office in one of these units and then who is going to require handicap parking. That needs to be looked at. He also wonders if Mr. Dwight would be okay with the side yard setback.

Wallin thinks that there will have to be curbs in the entrances. He said that the building that is going to be removed just sucked off water from Franklin Street. Where will all that water go to now? Will the retention area stop it and if so, how quickly? He pointed out that the flood plain runs right down Franklin. Uutinen said that some of his concerns have already been addressed, so they don't need to be re-iterated. He looks at this from an emergency point of view. He wants to know if these are to be sold or are they leased units. Bosker said that as of now they will be leased. Uutinen said that he wasn't looking at it with a large concern of a life safety issue. He said that there is no overnight sleeping. From a fire suppression point of view, he questions the ingress and egress of fire suppression equipment based on the distance of the parking spaces that are in front of units 3, 4, 5 and 6, as well as the parallel parking across the drive. Uutinen said that he understands the two-hour fire wall very well. He pointed out that in a fire, it is the contents that burn. Depending on what is stored inside these units, the fire suppression could be difficult. Uutinen would like to hear from the Fire Chief that he can get his equipment in and maneuver it as needed. He also would like to know more about the water supply to see if it is adequate. He also thinks that Mr. Dwight should be heard from. Bosker stated that there is a three-hour fire separation wall at 7,200 sq. ft. between units 4 and 5. This is in addition to the two-hour fire separation on the east wall. Moore asked if these are signed drawings and do the plans show every structure within 100 feet of the property, in particular he wondered if MacGregor's property should have been shown on the plan. He noted that Repasky stated that loading and unloading areas should be shown on the plan. He said that it has been shown that Franklin Street has not been included in that. Is the current sign going to be removed and are there any new signs being proposed in the Site Plan? Moore has some issues with the parking. It appears that there will be assigned parking and wonders how that will be adhered to and he thinks it could cause congestion issues. He would like to see the man doors included on the plan view. They are on the elevation, but you can't tell if there will be man doors on unit 1 and unit 2 and likewise for units 7 and 8. Moore pointed out that there are not supposed to be any openings in the adjacent building on the west side. There are no windows and it is mostly a block wall, but there are one if not two types of vents coming directly out of the wall. He wants to know if that would be considered an opening. The building height on the application does not match the height on the plans. Moore wants to know if Benchmark is using the same

Proposed: May 27, 2020

4

Approved: June 17, 2020 with one correction: Page 5, 5th line, add: *be* between *would* and *easier*.

calculations that the Planning Commission has seen on previous applications and did the Planning Commission ever determine whether that was sufficient. He has a question as to why there are bathrooms being proposed if the use is for storage in these units, also why are there man doors. Possibly the doors are a requirement for units of this size, but he would like to know. He thinks that because of the size of the units, the size of the roll up doors, the heated inside and the bathrooms, he sees a lot of potential for uses that are not approved. Bosker says that he wants it to be strictly storage and not commercial. Moore feels that someone could possibly just do what they want in these units. He wondered if the person who leases these units, especially the larger ones, would be storing personal items or could it be management companies doing work on other people's property in there. He also wanted to know if contractors or any manufacturing would end up in there, which are not allowed in C-1 at all. Moore thought that possibly the Planning Commission should look at Section 411 – Unclassified Uses and are some of the things possibly hobby shops that don't fall in the category of storage. He is questioning what high end storage even means. He thinks it could be like residential accessory use trying to be proposed in the Commercial district. Moore said that he went by the property tonight and saw a food truck in use on the property and would like to know if that was an approved use.

Mooradian referred to Section 202 Storage. The definition for Storage is: "To leave or deposit in a place for preservation or disposal in one or more of the following ways:

Storage Building: A building in which storage is the principal activity."

Mooradian stated that he looked up Storage online and the following is the definition he found: "The action or method of storing something for future use. The act of keeping something somewhere so that it can be used later. If things are in storage, they are being kept somewhere until they are needed. The putting and keeping of things in a special place for use in the future." Mooradian said that the definition of storage is not only in the Zoning Code, but in general. He said that there may already be some of this in the Township and they should be viewed as hobby units because they have different maneuverability requirements, different parking requirements, there are more people in and out. Storage is in and out on occasion, not daily use. Are these personal business uses or are they storage? This is something that the Planning Commission is tasked with looking into.

Bosker said that they are not proposing for use one way and then turn around and run it another way. He said that people will not be running a business in a unit, they will not be hanging out in there. They will have verbiage in their lease agreements regarding these actions. He said that it is a nice convenience for someone to be able to use their bathroom, wash their hands and not have to go across the street to the gas station. Mooradian asked if Bosker had considered just one common bathroom. Bosker said that he liked the idea of a personal bathroom. Baiardi said that she knows most of the questions have been addressed. She said that she does have an issue

with the parking being proposed in front of the doors. She pointed out that parking in front of doors was not allowed in a recently reviewed project. She asked if there was a way to decrease the size of the buildings and put the parking somewhere else. Bosker asked if the retention area on the Franklin Street side could possibly be reduced in order to help with the parking issue. There was discussion regarding how to calculate how many parking spaces are needed overall. Baiardi stated that she doesn't think that the Zoning Ordinance defines parking for storage buildings. Varner thought that everybody covered most everything. He said that if the Road Commission has to approve some of this plan, what does that do if changes are made. The Road Commission stated that the property owner will be required to get a driveway permit before any construction. The driveway will have to be upgraded to the Emmet County Road Commission commercial standards that will include, but not limited to HMH pavement and concrete curbs that will have to be shown on the Site Plan. Dave White had received this information in an email and it was forwarded to Troy Bosker. Varner wanted to know if the setback was a County issue or a Township issue. Mooradian pointed out that it was in the Township Zoning rules. The Planning Commission can relax the side yard setback, in this district, with fire protection. However, they don't want to cause a problem with Bosker being able to get a building permit. Varner said that he agrees with Moore by thinking that these units would make a nice place to have more than just storage.

Mooradian addressed the drainage calculations which are on the Site Plan. He said that he did not think that the storm water calculations were correct because once the existing building is removed and the rest of the property is cleared, it will be starting from scratch as far as there will be no hard surface to begin with. The Site Plan is reducing the proposed hard surface area by what is there currently. He would like someone to answer that question. Mooradian said that it is his understanding that in reference to the septic system, an alternative location has to be provided for failure of the system. This is in the County Code and since this is in the Commercial district, he also has to follow the State Code. Bosker has not applied for any septic permits or road permits at this time. Repasky thinks that the whole site needs to be re-thought due to the questions regarding fire protection, parking, storm water retention and septic. Mooradian thinks that this Site Plan is too dense for the parcel. Mooradian asked Bosker what he would like to do at this point. Bosker said that he would like to follow up on the questions that have been discussed at this meeting and post-pone further action until the June 10, 2020 regular Planning Commission meeting. There was discussion as to how many parking spaces should be required and it was agreed that parking should not be allowed in front of any of the doors. Mooradian reviewed the items that need to be updated on the Site Plan for Bosker so that it can be brought back to the next meeting.

West Traverse Township  
Special Planning Commission Meeting  
May 27, 2020

**Mooradian made a motion that the Planning Commission post-pone Case 2020-1, 7569 S. State Road and 110 Franklin Street, for Troy Bosker for further review and revisions, based on the conversation tonight and the list of items from Dave White which he will discuss with Mr. Bosker. The postponement will be until the June 10, 2020 meeting at 7:00 p.m. Baiardi seconded the motion.**

**Vote: All yes.**

Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at 9:34 p.m.

The next regularly scheduled meeting will be June 10, 2020 at 7:00 p.m.

Submitted by:  
Dawson Moore, Secretary

Transcribed by:  
Susan Matsko  
Township Secretary

Proposed: May 27, 2020  
Approved: June 17, 2020 with one correction: Page 5, 5th line, add: *be* between *would* and *easier*.