



**HELENA TOWNSHIP
ADVOCACY GROUP, NFP**
Email: HTAG@Groupmail.com
Website: www.HTAGroup.org

Helena Township Planning Commission
PUBLIC HEARING – BOATS & DOCKS ORDINANCE
June 19, 2025 @ 5:00 pm
(RECAP)

(The content contained herein was extracted directly from recordings of the above-referenced event and prepared as accurately as possible based on the room's conditions including number of people simultaneously conversing. At such times, statements are unrecognizable, it is so noted as such as being "(inaudible)".

Present:

Butch Peeples, Supervisor
Mike Robinson – Chair
Jim Gurr – Vice-Chair
Fay VandenBerg - Secretary
Gordy Schafer
Jim Schilling – Board Liaison
Darren Whipple
David Hunstad
Bob Logee, Zoning Administrator

Robinson called the meeting to order at 5:00 pm

Gurr: "Every time I see somebody wearing a hat, I wonder if it's a person who has to wear a hat or something. I thought that until I was about 60. And then I started to just care whether I wore a hat or not. I grew up in a household where it was normal to wear a hat indoors. We're about to begin."

Gurr: "Just one last time before the meeting actually begins. If you wish to make public comment, please fill out one of our forms ahead of time and then Darren will call your name on the slip, and you can have your chance to be heard. But it's 5 o'clock according to my clock. So, it's time to call the Thursday, June 19th special public hearing together and we'll begin with the Pledge of Allegiance."

Pledge of Allegiance:

ALL ATTENDEES: Cited the Pledge of Allegiance.

Gurr: "As a point of information, Mike Robinson, who was elected chairman at our last meeting, has resigned the Chairmanship - I'm Vice-Chair for the purpose of getting this meeting over, will handle it under my authority and then the Planning Commission can deal with changes in the officers later in a regular meeting if we want to."

Roll Call:

Gurr: "And we'll start the roll call tonight with Mike."

Robinson: "Mike Robinson"

Hunstad: "David Hunstad"

Whipple: "Darren Whipple"

Gurr: "Jim Gurr"

VandenBerg: "Fay VandenBerg"

Schilling: "Jim Schilling"

Schafer: "Gordy Schafer"

Gurr: "All in attendance. Ok."

Gurr: "Ok...Now I'm going to call for approval of the agenda. But I'm going to make a motion ahead of time that we need to amend it a little bit. For starters, under New Business...this meeting is solely for the purpose of definitions and ordinance language change for 5.02.02. The notice afterward about the meeting is closed for finding the facts, motions, and voting does not apply. And then the planning commission will, after the public hearing, will do a roll call vote for language change and definitions. And instead of saying the meeting is open, the meeting will be closed. So, I'm asking for someone to approve the agenda with those amendments."

VandenBerg: "I motion."

Schilling: "Second."

Gurr: "Any further discussion?"

Gurr: "all in favor, signify by aye."

Planning Commission: "Aye."

Gurr: "Any oppose the same?...very good. Thank you."

Conflict of Interest:

Gurr: "Okay. This is the point where we ask ourselves as a planning commission whether any of us might have a conflict of interest with the item on the agenda. Hearing none, we can move on."

Gurr: "Okay. Darren's going to do the honor of calling people to speak. I know it's a little disconcerting to some to have to fill out a document with your name and address, but we're required by law in a public hearing to know who the people are and what their role is in planning. So that's why you had to do that. And to simplify the process, Darren's going to call names and you'll have your three minutes to make your pitch."

Whipple: "All right. We'll start with Dusty Kiel."

Resident (Dusty Kiel): "How we doing? Dusty Kiel, 11283 Southeast Torch Lake Drive. In the initial draft, there's some discrepancies, in my opinion, on not only the townships that we butt up against, but the particular township

we're in. Our ordinance, there hasn't been one apparently since 2012, from what I have found out. And so starting with an agenda of eight boats per 200 feet of shoreline for a lakefront owner conflicts with all the neighboring townships as well. Forest Home Township doesn't have a limit on theirs. Clearwater Township does.

And so I wonder how is that regulated from the water, from one house to the next? How are they to tell 124 feet to 200 feet? So the discrepancy there, in my opinion, is very vague. And the terminology alone, each additional 25 feet, additional one powercraft permitted, and powered watercrafts capped at eight would initially mean anyone with 200 feet is allowed up to eight boats?"

VandenBerg: "Eight watercrafts."

Kiel: "Eight watercrafts?"

VandenBerg: "Could be eight jet skis."

Kiel: "Correct. Yes."

VandenBerg: "Now, does Clearwater have...um...a maximum for their..."

Kiel: "I believe it's four."

VandenBerg: "Four or how many feet...for anything?"

Kiel: "Well, Clearwater Township is limited on space between Crystal Beach Road and Torch River, and so most of those are well under 100 feet. So, maxing out at eight boats for within 200 feet is very unlikely. Also, the way that this agenda was put together, I was unaware of this. As a resident, I had no way of knowing that this agenda was being put through...The website has been down..."

VandenBerg: "It's been up for a week, more than a week."

Kiel: "Well, a week, but the agenda was put into effect while the website was down, and there was a several board member change during that process, which there was no public awareness of it. And as I was informed of this meeting coming up, I know specifically from a board member that there was a conflict of interest with a board member that was on the panel, and in that process, between when I found that out and I came to the board meeting, there was a new board member on chair. And so I question, you know, how these agendas came into effect.

Gurr: "You know, I don't have an answer for questions about the notification... It certainly has been lots of public attention. I'm sorry that you've not been aware."

Schilling: "It's been going on for almost a year."

Gurr: "Yeah, but the whole discussion is actually two years old, so I'm surprised that you weren't more abreast of what's going on. I mean, that's not a criticism...it's easy working man, I'm sure you've got plenty to keep yourself occupied.

Kiel: "Absolutely."

Gurr: "As far as changes on the planning commission, you know, those are individual decisions that people make about, you know, length of time, how long they want to be on, whether they've got the appetite to continue. We don't tell people what and how. We're happy to have them."

Whipple: "We'll move on to the next one. Paul Colbert."

Resident (Paul Colbert): "Hi, my name's Paul Colbert, I live at 10016 North Lake Street. And I just wanted to say I kind of support what you guys are doing. To me, it kind of comes down to whether it's two, three, or four boats for 100 feet and then what it is additionally. I think we can all have different opinions on what exactly is best, but I put it in you guys' hands to make a reasonable decision, and I have faith that you will. You know, I think the number one thing we were trying to achieve as a township was to limit marinas and funneling. That was the number one reason we're here. Whether it's two, three, or four is really secondary. And we can all have our own opinions, but at the end of the day, what you guys are putting in place stops funneling, stops marinas and the fact of the matter is, if, in fact, everything's grandfathered in, everyone that's sitting here that's on the lake, nothing really changes as long as you continue to own your property. So, I'm in support of whatever you guys decide."

VandenBerg: "Thank you."

Whipple: "All right, next, Laura Wilcox."

Resident (L. Wilcox): "Laura Wilcox, 7197 Crystal Springs Road. I guess I'm going to just start by saying, you know, I really could care less about the number of boats. I've been saying something each month at this meeting, focus more on the process and how things have been decided upon and brought to the public's awareness. So there's many new faces here again today that maybe didn't know it had happened. But, you know, as you know, the Planning Commission held a public hearing on April 3rd after many months of in-depth discussions, deliberations, and public input regarding this ordinance, and it resulted in a reasonable middle-of-the-road boats and docks ordinance being passed. The Planning Commission then announced residents directly affected by this ordinance had not been culturally represented during the process. Therefore, a May 8th special meeting is scheduled to foster the opportunity to hear from more residents. During that May 8th special meeting, the Planning Commission thought it was appropriate to verbally announce and keep track of each person who stood up and opposed the ordinance language that was passed on April 3rd, which is part of what's now being drafted. The number of people who opposed the language that you passed on April 3rd was a total of five people.

Wilcox: At the June 5th regular meeting, as the Planning Commission had hoped, more Lakefront property owners directly affected by this ordinance attended and voiced their ideas and concerns, most of whom supported the language passed on April 3rd. The Planning Commission did not verbally announce or keep track of each person who stood up and supported it, but the number of people who did support the language that was passed was 13. Also, at last month's meeting, our Township Supervisor emphasized how important it is for the Planning Commission to make decisions based not on what you want as individuals, but getting everybody together and doing what is needed to best serve this community in the future. Following our master plan is also imperative disregard. Taking into consideration the input the Planning Commission has now received from additional Lakefront property owners and your belief that the two troubled properties, which supposedly spurred the reintroduction of this ordinance, are grandfathered in any way, it would be appropriate for the ordinance

language passed on April 3rd to remain in place. Ordinance language can always be revisited should the community want or need something different later on. Wouldn't it be wise to recognize what the majority of residents want now and stand by the ordinance you worked so hard to pass? It's easy to see how things have changed in our community and our lakes. Keeping the April 3rd ordinance shows you have truly listened to the majority of residents affected by it and want to help prevent situations which could negatively impact our community in the future."

Gurr: "Thank you, Laura."

Whipple: "Next is Mark Moody."

Resident (Mark Moody): "Hi. Mark Mooey, 8772 Southeast Torch Lake Drive. I support what's written today for the last meeting and what you handed out here. I do agree with some people that the way we were all notified wasn't the best. I'm retired...I'm not reading the paper all the time, but I found out through a neighbor that's why I was here April 3rd, the first time, but I've been here every meeting since. So I don't agree with what was done before. I agree with what we have today since I've been here or what I've listened to."

Schilling: "Okay, thank you."

Whipple: "Next is Trish Narwold...Sorry if I mispronounced your name."

Resident (Trish Narwold): "Oh, no, you did well. Can I just ask before I make a statement? This was handed out today, and there's this Draft where it's talking about the funnel, the grandfathered funnels, but yet there's no, this was not at the meeting last time and written in the Draft..."

VandenBerg: "We just got that information."

Narwold: "Okay."

VandenBerg: "And you'll notice it's still in DRAFT - It's not the final language, but we wanted to let folks know, Instead of sending a separate letter to them...."

Narwold: "Yeah, thank you for that clarification, because I would just like to see maybe shorefront footage along with the number of boats, not just the items of where there are funnels."

VandenBerg: "Okay."

Narwold: "For my statement, I'd like to say I once again will voice an opposition to this proposed ordinance due to two reasons. Number one is the number of boats I find excessive, and number two, boats are not required to be registered to property owners so the friend and family can funnel in. One in two of the Helena Township shorelines on both Torch and Clam is 100 feet or less and could have four large pontoons. I know you want to dream that they're jet skis, but four large pontoons or even these new Florida boats with the giant canopies in front of each house. And over 10% of the township parcels are over 200 feet, and that would allow them to have eight of these large boats. And as there are no setbacks set up in the ordinance, the docks and canopy hoists can

run the whole length of the shoreline. A recent study of Clam Lake Southern Shore, because that's Helena Township, showed a density of 1.73 boats per 100 feet of shoreline. This ordinance would easily double the number of boats and canopy hoists on the Clam Lake shoreline. And in some cases, 200-foot properties could go from one boat up to (8) boats, which I think you'll hear more about. I just think this is too many boats. The shoreline will be congested with docks, boat hoists, and canopies. If this ordinance passes, gone will be the views of the waves along the shoreline as you will be looking out over your neighbor's boat canopies, and gone will be the wildlife living in critical area where the water and land meet. Dock space cannot be rented for the proposed ordinance. However, we know all too well the human pressure on our lakes. This will not discourage family and friends from funneling where I see the wink, wink, nod, nod. I will pay for your dock installment each year if I can leave my boat in one of your allotted hoists. And I think this is likely already happening. Like Dusty stated, in Milton and Lake townships, they do have a limit of three boats per 100 shoreline. And this is what I would prefer to see in Helena Township, in making a more uniform ordinance around our lakes. I've spent 30 years volunteering to protect these lakes with different organizations from people whose actions harm the lake, and often unknowingly. This ordinance, if passed, as written, will continue the sad saga of loving Torch and Clan Lakes to death. I urge you to reconsider your draft.

Whipple: "next is Kathleen Volle."

Resident (Kathleen Volle): Kathleen Voll.

Volle: "Kathleen Volle, 6933 Crystal Springs Road. And I guess I spoke two weeks ago. I'm new on all of this. I've been coming to Torch Lake since I was born. But I'm, I guess, still a fudgy I don't know. Anyway, it will never be like it was. I think probably most people are against funneling and seeing boats all lined up. I was a little appalled. I am right now on Clan Lake with 200 feet. And I was thinking eight boats in front of this house with possible hoists. I am against that number. So, I guess that part of the ordinance I am certainly against. And I wondered if you ever considered, I was looking out at the lake this evening, and across the lake there are two boat owners, large boats, with black canopies over the top down to about 40 feet. I don't know what's the same owner. I don't know anything. I can understand they're protecting their boat. But it looks like there are two black buses. And one is a little cattywampus, so it really looks pretty bad. And I know Torch will never be the same. I worry that it's going to be lost, as probably we all do. But I am against that number of boats.

Whipple: "Thank you. Next is Laury Stone."

Resident (Laury Stone): "Laury Stone, I'm representing my husband as well, who couldn't be here today. I was at 9166 on the Road in Alden. First of all, I'd like to commend all the people that have worked on this for, apparently, years. I thought it was for about a year. But it takes a lot of hard work and frustration and a lot of back and forth. I and my husband agree that what is currently written was a good compromise to what was originally proposed. And I think we can all be very proud in what you've accomplished as far as prohibiting marinas and public outlets. I think that was the main focus here. As far as the number, I think this is, in the way it's written, will be very likely we won't see that. But in some instances, it might be possible that visiting boats and moorings and sea legs and that sort of thing. With that said, we are in support of this amendment. Thank you."

Whipple: "Thank you, Laury. Next is Gary Mayes."

Mayes: "Yes, I've got a couple of comments. Ok, so one thing I keep hearing, I do think, at least my understanding, is this ordinance does not address funneling, nor does it address marinas. It doesn't address funneling. That's going to be a later effort. So, I think that needs to be cleared that that still has not been completed or even started. So the other thing is, and it's more for process. Process, that's kind of what I, the amount of boats isn't a huge thing for me, but I do believe we should follow process - And I'm concerned that the meeting minutes, the draft meeting minutes from the last meeting are not available. I checked on the website and I checked on the board. It says in here, according to MTA, it says draft minutes must be available for the public inspection within eight business days after the meeting. And there's nothing. Nothing at all.

VandenBerg: "And some of that's out of our control. The website was down. We have sent that information to the person who adds to our website and manages it...and...um...this...is out there...I mean...it's

Mayes: "It's not on the board."

VandenBerg: "No, it's not on the board.

Mayes: "And that's where you typically would put it if the website's down. That's the way it was done for years and years. That's the place. The public hearing notice is on the board.

VandenBerg: "But it wasn't a public hearing last month."

Mayes: "No, it's minutes...it doesn't matter if it's a public meeting...it needs to have minutes, and it needs to be posted within eight days."

VandenBerg: "Okay. Well...

Gurr: "We'll work on it."

Mayes: "Well, yeah....That's all I have.

Schafer: "So in the future, the minutes will be in two places, posted on the board, and then when the website's working again."

Whipple: "Next is Lori Woodman-Mayes."

Resident (Lori Woodland-Mayes): I've been present at many meetings and listened a lot to what has been said. I have listened to a lot of comments, and I see what happens from out here being presented. The ordinance language never makes an adjustment. And I would like to know, before you finalize this language, I would like to know from each one of the commission members, where they stand, why they made the decision, and the backing behind that decision. What says this is the right language when we have townships on either side of us that have different language?

It'd be better to coordinate, since the lines of the township are invisible from the lake. And I would like to know that, and I would like to know, since you are a planning commission, that how this is going to look, doubling the number of boats, especially for CLAM, how this is going to look in 10 years, as we continue to grow, because we're growing, growing, growing, growing. And so I would like to know from each of you, before you make this decision, where you stand, why you chose that stance, and how you see this affecting our community. Thank you."

Gurr: "With respect to your request for some kind of defining statement from planning commission members, we can't compel people to do that. I will extend the opportunity to anybody who might want to do that at this point to address it that personally, if anybody wants to go down that road."

Schilling: "I can address it."

Gurr: "Sure."

Schilling: "I'm an outlaw married into the family up here. The cottage has been on Torch Lake since 1927, so this family's seen a lot of changes over the years. And I hate to say it, but we can't go back to drinking out of a garden hose. I mean, times have changed. We have one boat and two jet skis, and when I'm down there for a week or so, I put my fishing boat on the dock. So that's it. I'm maxed out. Can't do any more with 110 feet of lakefront and I think that the people who come on Torch, you know, with today's equipment, today's boats and everything, especially with grandkids and jet skis, I think our proposal's more than fair for everybody. We try to limit it, but yet we try to leave the people that God knows what you pay for a place on Torch Lake. If you say, hey, you can have a cottage on Torch Lake, but you can only have three or four boats, that's not going to work. So that's just my opinion."

Gurr: "Any other planning commission members? Thank you, Jim."

Whipple: "Next to speak is Lori Sak."

Resident (Lori Sak): "6461 Crystal Springs. I have a letter here that Ariane actually brought me this afternoon. It's from Al Cash. He asked me to read this to clarify what was said at a May 8th meeting.

"My name is Albert D. Cash, Jr. With the exception of two years during World War II, I have been coming to Torch Lake for 86 years. I remember when there were three gas stations in Alden and a Chevrolet dealership. When there were clams in Clam Lake. I remember when Torch Lake's water was clean and you could see the clear bottom and the dark plume from Clam River...stopped at the river and did not extend to Lone Tree Point. When there were about four Chris Crafts and we used a 2-5 horse motor or much later a 25-horse powered Johnson Outboard. Real estate was \$10 to \$15 per foot and the entire shoreline was green and full of trees.

Now with the population growth, you see what we have, tree clearing, waterfront development, boat, parking lot, and storage. Naturally, merchants want to sell more boats, more food, more drink, and more buyers go back. We advertise for people to come to the South Beach, which creates a Coney Island each summer break.

This results in many boats, more food and drink, more urination, it's his words, more diaper changes, and more waste. This results in required policing, post-beach clean-up, pollution, and questionable behaviors. Today we are concerned about the number of boats in front of each 100 foot of property. Each boat is about 10 foot wide and a dock alongside adds about 4 foot or at least 15 foot per boat or 60 foot, 15 by 4, per 100 foot of property. Then add hoists and canopies and the footprint only grows. You know what that would look like if each driveway had four or more cars, trucks, or SUVs in front of each home.

What about houseboats? Property is so expensive, I'm sure houseboats are already being considered. What about rental boats? What are docked on leased frontage? I am now 90 years old, and I pointed out a few of the lake changes in my lifetime. What will the future lake be like?

I'm afraid Torch Lake will look like a commercial warehouse without a green shoreline deprived of the past beauty. What will happen if 25-foot shorefronts are approved?

Whipple: "Your time is up!"

Attendee (O. Lefew): "You're time's up!"

Whipple: "Maam...I'm gonna given you a chance."

Gurr: "She's close."

L. Sak: Let's go to two boats for a 100-foot for the lakefront property owners with no rental use codes on the backlot properties."

Gurr: "Thank you, thank Albert when you get the chance."

Whipple: "Next to speak is Mike McCracken. Mike McCracken, please speak, please."

Resident (Mike McCracken): "I'm Mike McCracken, 1133....Where do I live? Sometimes I get a little upset in between. I live in Alden. I have a business in Alden. I believe in this community. I moved up to this community because I love it. I love Torch Lake. This proposal, the way it was written, you guys did a lot of work on it. You tried to compromise. I think it's appropriate. To the board, people don't like to change. You have to look into the future, but traditionally they don't like to change. My group of employees sometimes fight that change and we have to work our way through it. We have to accept that good things are going to continue to happen here. I've invested heavily in this community and continue to want to invest heavily in this community. So I thank the board for putting this together. In the one section in particular, we beat that dead horse to death. And you know, it's a compromise. It's fair. I rode around this lake many times. I'm going to continue. It's a beautiful lake. It won't get abused a lot. There'll be an habitual offender because there isn't everything we do. And there'll be some complainers because that's the way it is. So anyway, again, I thank the board for doing a job that is very thankless. That's it. Thank you.

Whipple: "Next to speak is Dan from Pure Marquette. I'm not going to try to do the last name. I apologize."

Resident (Dan Roketenetz): "I just want to clarify. I'm hearing about funnel parcels. We actually live next door to a real funnel parcel as defined in Michigan law. And it's a 150-foot wide parcel on the lake. It was first deeded out

in... What year was it...60s, 70s? 1963...1963. Okay. It was first deeded out in 1963. And currently there are 20 properties that feed into 150 feet on the lake. There's 17 property owners. I'm one of the property owners. I rarely use it, but we live next door to it. Believe me, I don't want to impede anybody's ability to use the lake and have fun and go boating. But with this type of arrangement, there is... Your ordinance is going to do very little to control the use of that property. I don't understand how this property is grandfathered in for the purpose of the ordinance. As I point out, I wrote a letter to the board. I hope you got it. I don't know if you did or not. Let's see. The ordinance has eight boats, and it contemplates at 200 feet, but they've given an exemption to this one, an oral exemption of eight boats on 150 feet. So already it's more crowded than the ordinance provides because it's grant filed again. Well, the boats are only there three or four months a year. The rest of the year, it's conforming. No boats are there. The police are gone, the docks are gone. It's non-conforming for (8) months out of the (12) a year at least. So, I don't know how you came to grandfather them. It seems to me two things. You ought to have a time limit when something becomes non-conforming. When it ceases to be conforming, there ought to be a time limit so the ordinance doesn't apply. Zoning ordinances are to make things uniform through the township. That's what they're for. And the ultimate goal of zoning is to bring everything into compliance eventually. And if you have to do that by using time limits for non-conforming, so when the non-conforming use ceases to exist for, say, six months, the ordinance will apply. I can live with (6) boats next door on 150 feet. People that come down and use them are very responsible and respectful. And I don't have a problem. But there are some people that are abusive. There are some people who abuse that privilege and cause a lot of issues for other property owners on that piece. And adding two more boats is just going to exacerbate the problem. The other thing is, I don't see anything in this ordinance about enforcement. How are you going to enforce it if someone has 10 boats on that property?"

Whipple: "I do apologize for time's up. I'm trying to keep everybody on track. Thank you."

Whipple: "Next, Diane Roketenetz."

Resident (Diane Roketenetz): "I'll pick up where my dear husband left off. Because I'm looking at your agenda and the thing that you're concerned about are the marinas are not allowed in residential R1 zones. Is that correct? So that's what we are. And how many boats does it take to make a marina? We have more boats in that piece of property than we have down in downtown Albany. And so if we're going to look at, like Milton Township has got a very good ordinance on their books and we could live with that. And that was two boats worth 100 feet. So for 150, you would have figured that in. So, my concern is that when I look out there, especially if you come down in July, it's not eight boats. It's like 13 boats. And it just adds and adds and adds to it. So, I'd be pleased if people came down and actually took their boat out and went out on the water. But they're right there and they're right in front of our property. And so, I know you've done a lot of hard work on it. I don't envy that because it takes a lot of diplomacy to deal with different opinions. But I would like, and I have asked some of you to come down and take a look and see what we're dealing with. And you're talking about compromise where you're asking us to compromise and give it all up. Like I want to compromise and make it workable for us. And I go back to the Milton Township. I really like their ordinance. And so that was for two boats. And up until 2012, that was the ordinance here. And I was told, well, it just couldn't be enforced. So, if that can't be enforced, how are you going to enforce (8) boats out there when there are (13) out there? How are you going to enforce that? So, it's an issue for us. And I appreciate your willingness to hear us because I know there are people on both sides. And I appreciate

when people want to come down and just get out on their boat and enjoy the lake. Hallelujah. I'd like to be able to do that, too, on my property. All right.

Whipple: "Our next speaker is Paul Sak."

Resident (Paul Sak): "Paul Sack. Michigan Zoning Enabling Act, Act 110 of 2006, Section 125.3103.

"If a local unit of government conducts a public hearing required under this act, the local unit of government shall publish notice of the hearing in a newspaper of general circulation in the local unit of government not less than 15 days before the date of the hearing."

Resident (Paul Sak): "This public notice went on our website. It's got a date of June 11th. That's like eight days ago. The actual publication in a newspaper, the Antrim Review, was June 12th. That's about 7 1/2 days short of the 15th. This meeting is in violation of the Zoning Enabling Act. At the June 5th meeting, I spent some time pointing out how the process over the last six months has been totally...There's probable violations of the Zoning Enabling Act and the Open Meetings Act. And I've been following a gentleman, Brian Graham. Jim Gerd knows him, a retired lawyer out of Bellaire - He's been a lawyer for a lot of townships around here. In fact, was a lawyer here until, for some reason, he got asked to leave but whatever, he follows the law and what he has said, and what I picked up at the County Planning Commission members, is you have to follow the law. If you don't, any ordinance, I don't care what you come up with, any numbers, any good lawyer will tear it apart. And these agreements with Moran, with Cedar Shores, in the June 5th document, there was reference to agreements with an organization that doesn't even exist yet and the reference to Cedar Shores, I've never seen an agreement - I've never seen a document. There's nothing backing up what's being done here. **Now the numbers, we can argue, and we can go back and forth - I feel strongly about what was presented on April 3rd and voted on by the Township Planning Commission – that was two boats, less than 100, each additional 50 feet, one more boat. It kept the density. We've got reasonable, not this eight boats and 200 feet. Milton Township, for instance, 200 feet, they only allow guide boats maximum, as an example.** So, if the township wants to take on a good lawyer who's gonna represent one of these organizations here, or somebody who's not even grandfathered, just wants to come in here and build a marina, good luck, Helena Township....You're in violation.

Whipple: "Thank you for your time."

Gurr: "Is that it?"

Whipple: "That's the last one."

Gurr: "There was an announcement made at the beginning of the meeting that if you wanted to use your three minutes to speak, you had to fill out a form. If there's anybody that hasn't filled out a form, send that opportunity. Otherwise, we'll be closing the public comment period."

Gurr: "Planning Commission...Language in question is in your hands and available to the public for quite some time. There's no proposed alterations or changes coming out of this Public Hearing that I'm aware of, but this is the Planning Commission's prerogative, it's time for us to discuss it and tackle the burden. So, however you guys

might like to proceed, we can do that if there's no extensive commentary or questions that beg to be answered, we can move expeditiously."

Gurr: "No comments? Anybody else? Comments, questions, suggestions?"

Gurr: "Well, then I'm looking for someone to make the motion that we approve the definitions and changes in 5.02.02 that's been in front of us now for some months."

VandenBerg: "I'll motion."

Gurr: "Motion's been made. Is there a second?"

Schilling: "Second."

Gurr: "Seconded...Any further discussion from the Commission? Hearing none, I'll call the question."

Gurr: "All in favor signify with aye."

Planning Commission: "Aye."

Gurr: "Any oppose the same?"

Gurr: "We will send our approved at this meeting's alterations of the existing ordinance on to the COUNTY Planning Commission for their advice and on the receipt of that advice, I propose that we send it off to the Township Board for their approval with the advice that will become available to them."

Gurr: "There needs to be a motion as well."

VandenBerg: "I'll motion."

Whipple: "I'll second it."

Gurr: "It's been moved and seconded that we submit our document, definitions and changes to 5.02.02 off to the County Advisory Planning Commission and with their suggestions in mind, send it off to the Township Board for their approval at their next meeting."

Schilling: "Need a motion for that?"

Gurr: "Um...yeah, that is a motion."

Whipple: "Oh."

Gurr: "That's an accomplished fact. We've just done it."

Whipple: "Okay."

VandenBerg: "I'll second that."

Gurr: "It doesn't need to be seconded...I just paraphrased what was just accomplished."

Gurr: "It is true. The addition was we're sending it off to the Board. So, we need to see that in the motion. For those that are interested, that's Brian Graham's concern about the process that many townships, not just ours, Brian is of the opinion that things that come to the County for their advice need to come from the Township Board. Planning commissions in Antrim County have typically sent their recommendations off to the County Board - some of them come from the Township Board, most of them come from the Planning Commissions. That's an issue that we'll take up at the county level. Brian has signaled to me, I'm on the County Planning Commission as well, he's signaled to me that he will always vote that the county not approve because it's not coming from the Township Board. It's not following the model that he wants. But he's just, he is one vote among five on an advisory planning commission."

Resident (T. Narwold): Jim, can I just ask you a question? This was handed out today, the draft with the funnels, is there a whole separate funnel ordinance?

Gurr: "Yes."

Narwold: "Okay, I didn't understand. I saw the same numbers on here...so that's going to be 5.02.01...?"

Gurr: "Back at our regular, when we get back to our regular meetings, we'll tackle funneling in further detail."

Narwold: "Okay, so that's a different..."

Attendee: "It's the previous ordinance."

Gurr: "I'm sure you've heard that, you know, the issue of funneling kind of..."

Narwold: "Right, they go hand-in-hand, I just was curious why you handed it out today then...just giving us forewarning."

Gurr: "Very often the question is asked, you know, what constitutes grandfathering? How does it happen? It happens because of dates, like you'll find on those documents with respect to those parcels."

Narwold: "Okay, thank you. I just was confused."

Gurr: "So, in other words, the meeting...unless there's a reason on the part of the commission to remain, David, you're new...thank you for being on board....is there....I understand you've got some experience in planning issues, historically and family-wise?"

Hunstad: "Yeah, sure. Yeah, well, I'm new on the planning commission. Hopefully, I'll look forward to serving and involved in all the volunteers. My wife is involved in the community. We're very, very involved, too. We've lived here 18 years now. I hope that we continue to do great things and improve the area for all the people that come to visit."

Gurr: "Thank you. I'm sorry if I appear to have put you on the spot. We've all had the chance to make that statement. Sure. Unless someone feels the need for us to stay on, I'm going to look for someone to adjourn our meeting."

Schilling: "I'll make the motion."

Gurr: "All in favor, signify by saying aye. Aye."

Planning Commission: "Aye."

Meeting adjourned @ 5:47 pm.

Provided by,
Helena Township Advocacy Group (HTAG)

HTAG@Groupmail.com

www.HTAGroup.org

