
Fwd: Just read all documents

Joe Mosher <joe.mosher@gmail.com>
To: moshercentervilletwp@gmail.com

Tue, Nov 14, 2023 at 8:09 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Nicole Coonradt** <nicole.coonradt@gmail.com>
Date: Mon, Nov 13, 2023 at 2:24 PM
Subject: Just read all documents
To: Joe Mosher <joe.mosher@gmail.com>

Hi, again, Joe~

It seems to me that the information in this attached screenshot re MCL 436.1605 (1) (b) and as it is glossed over in item 2. for the Clerk to sign off on near the end of the proposal document in the "Be it resolved . . ." section will be a key sticking point because of the commercial development aspect and further danger of a bad precedent. If the planning commission signs off on that, there is no telling what might happen re commercial development.

As well, in thinking back about summer business in the minutes, local farmers who wanted to use their non-farmed acreage for extra income by charging campers fees to use it, were denied that use, so I suspect there is already a precedent opposing all of this, regardless of this proposal.

Also, every one of the now proposed 75 (!) tents will have en suite bathrooms and stoves. Notably, 75 is a considerable increase from what both Emily & Matt had said previously would be 50, which already sounded like too many. Jim suggested the number may be high so that during the process if they are willing to "cut it back to 'only' 50" doing so would make them look better, as if they are willing to compromise. A clever strategy if that is the case.

Anyway, it will effectively be a huge subdivision and each tent will have en suite bathroom facility with water heated by gas burners. As well, each tent will have its own wood burning stove, that they claim will never be used by guests for any cooking. I can see this getting violated by people who want to make coffee and cocoa and roast hotdogs and toast marshmallows for s'mores as a start and they will justify it as not actually cooking and probably would think the rules don't apply to them. As well, how can camp staff keep track of 75 tents? Moreover, as is usually the case, that type of use snowballs to additional violations. It is usually a few who ruin it for others. Regardless, even with the suggested use, 75 gas water heaters and 75 woodburning stoves in tents sounds like there may be just a modicum of fire hazards in the woods.

In the event that one patron rents out the entire facility for a wedding, they can party until 11PM-- but then magically fall silent at 11:01 to comply with "quiet time"? (Unlikely.)

Another huge concern is road use for Amoritas, which is now dirt. They discuss it in terms of "per guest," which is rhetorically savvy since saying that there could be, on average, *200* cars per day on Amoritas Road necessarily sounds pretty horrifying to local residents used to maybe a dozen vehicles per day.

If you are able to advise me, Joe, what is the best way for local residents to help ensure that this glamping proposal is categorically denied?

Some of our neighbors are planning to gather tomorrow at our place for supper to discuss everything. My neighbors just north of us are both environmental scientists and conservationists with PhDs and global fieldwork, so they, too, are keen to do whatever we can to provided a united front opposing this special use permission (for myriad reasons).

Thank you,

Nicole



Screenshot_20231113_125505_Drive.jpg
727K



Joe Mosher <moshercentervilletwp@gmail.com>

Fwd: FW: Amoritis site plan

Joe Mosher <joe.mosher@gmail.com>
To: moshercentervilletwp@gmail.com

Thu, Nov 16, 2023 at 2:23 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: <timjohnson@centurytel.net>
Date: Wed, Nov 15, 2023 at 8:35 PM
Subject: FW: Amoritis site plan
To: Joe Mosher <joe.mosher@gmail.com>, Lindy Kellogg <lindykellogg@gmail.com>

Best of luck... 😊

-----Original Message-----

From: Cathy Sehnert <cathysehnert@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2023 8:13 AM
To: timjohnson@centurytel.net
Subject: Amoritis site plan

Hi Tim, a neighbor on Amore Rd shared the site plan with me. Once again, I'm disappointed in how some want to keep adding short term rentals to our community.

We are in such desperate need of affordable housing for those who work here, I can't imagine, more "camp sites". I appreciate what all of you do on the commission. I felt I should voice my concerns about this development.

Thank you,
Cathy Sehnert

Sent from my iPhone

Sent from my iPhone=

Fwd: Just read all documents

Nicole Coonradt <nicole.coonradt@gmail.com>
To: Joe Mosher <moshercentervilletwp@gmail.com>

Tue, Nov 14, 2023 at 9:36 AM

Thanks, Joe.

Also of note I will highlight a couple of other important things:

Per EGLE, what is being proposed is *not* camping but a resort (even if they call it 'glamping'), due to the en suite bathrooms & running water-- toilet & shower-- in every unit. That is why they are having to go through local government for approval with the Centerville Township Planning Commission.

Also, all their original documents from Michael & Mary Goodell via the trust (from Grosse Pointe, see the third set of documents) indicate that the property in question is, by law, "Qualified Agricultural or Qualified Forest Shall Remain Qualified Agricultural Property." This would mean it is NOT to be redeveloped commercially or a resort, which this-- by legal definition-- would be. And in that vein, as I said yesterday, I think the entire thing may hinge on the MLCC, or MCL 436.1605(1)(b) and later the related Item 2 at "Be it resolved . . ." among the first set of documents because if the Centerville Township Planning Commission were to sign off on that it would be zoned as "commercial" for redevelopment. That would be far beyond Ag Tourism and disastrous. As well, it would clearly violate the above noted Affidavit from Jan. 21, 2013.

Best,

Nicole

On Tue, Nov 14, 2023, 9:23 AM Joe Mosher <moshercentervilletwp@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Nicole: if you can delete my personal email and use this one instead it will help me transition all township related matters to one place. Thanks!

I think it would be better for us to speak once I have had a chance to review the application in full plus your feedback. I will be in touch when that time comes. Also, please know that there are a series of meetings including a public hearing, for all site plan reviews and so there is time for input and analysis to come together well ahead of any decisions being made.

The next regular PC meeting is Monday, Dec 4. We are waiting to hear back from Northgate whether or not they wish to be on the agenda for continued deliberation or if they are exercising their right to resume the lawsuits against the township and PC. Once we have clarity on that front (expected this week) then we will be able to firm up the Dec agenda.

Thank you,
Joe

Joe Mosher
Planning Commission
Board of Trustees
Centerville Township | Leelanau County

On Tue, Nov 14, 2023 at 9:18 AM Joe Mosher <joe.mosher@gmail.com> wrote:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Nicole Coonradt** <nicole.coonradt@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Nov 14, 2023 at 9:10 AM
Subject: Re: Just read all documents
To: Joe Mosher <joe.mosher@gmail.com>

PS When is the meeting at which this proposal will be discussed? Jim thought the Thursday, 12/7.

On Tue, Nov 14, 2023, 8:17 AM Nicole Coonradt <nicole.coonradt@gmail.com> wrote:

Thanks, Joe.

Also, I would be happy to stop in to meet you in person to discuss this further, or speak on the phone. I am fairly available today.

Best,

Nicole

On Tue, Nov 14, 2023, 8:09 AM Joe Mosher <joe.mosher@gmail.com> wrote:
forwarding this to my township email and will take a look, thank you

On Mon, Nov 13, 2023 at 2:24 PM Nicole Coonradt <nicole.coonradt@gmail.com> wrote:
Hi, again, Joe~

It seems to me that the information in this attached screenshot re MCL 436.1605 (1) (b) and as it is glossed over in item 2. for the Clerk to sign off on near the end of the proposal document in the "Be it resolved . . ." section will be a key sticking point because of the commercial development aspect and further danger of a bad precedent. If the planning commission signs off on that, there is no telling what might happen re commercial development.

As well, in thinking back about summer business in the minutes, local farmers who wanted to use their non-farmed acreage for extra income by charging campers fees to use it, were denied that use, so I suspect there is already a precedent opposing all of this, regardless of this proposal.

Also, every one of the now proposed 75 (!) tents will have en suite bathrooms and stoves. Notably, 75 is a considerable increase from what both Emily & Matt had said previously would be 50, which already sounded like too many. Jim suggested the number may be high so that during the process if they are willing to 'cut it back to 'only' 50" doing so would make them look better, as if they are willing to compromise. A clever strategy if that is the case.

Anyway, it will effectively be a huge subdivision and each tent will have en suite bathroom facility with water heated by gas burners. As well, each tent will have its own wood burning stove, that they claim will never be used by guests for any cooking. I can see this getting violated by people who want to make coffee and cocoa and roast hotdogs and toast marshmallows for s'mores as a start and they will justify it as not actually cooking and probably would think the rules don't apply to them. As well, how can camp staff keep track of 75 tents? Moreover, as is usually the case, that type of use snowballs to additional violations. It is usually a few who ruin it for others. Regardless, even with the suggested use, 75 gas waterheaters and 75 woodburning stoves in tents sounds like there may be just a modicum of fire hazards in the woods.

In the event that one patron rents out the entire facility for a wedding, they can party until 11PM-- but then magically fall silent at 11:01 to comply with "quiet time"? (Unlikely.)

Another huge concern is road use for Amoritas, which is now dirt. They discuss it in terms of "per guest," which is rhetorically savvy since saying that there could be, on average, *200* cars per day on Amoritas Road necessarily sounds pretty horrifying to local residents used to maybe a dozen vehicles per day.

If you are able to advise me, Joe, what is the best way for local residents to help ensure that this glamping proposal is categorically denied?

Some of our neighbors are planning to gather tomorrow at our place for supper to discuss everything. My neighbors just north of us are both environmental scientists and conservationists with PhDs and global fieldwork, so they, too, are keen to do whatever we can to provided a united front opposing this special use permission (for myriad reasons).

Thank you,

Nicole

Fwd: FW: Centerville Township Master Plan & zoning question

Joe Mosher <joe.mosher@gmail.com>
To: moshercentervilletwp@gmail.com

Thu, Nov 16, 2023 at 2:23 PM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Joe Mosher <joe.mosher@gmail.com>
Date: Thu, Nov 16, 2023 at 2:22 PM
Subject: Re: FW: Centerville Township Master Plan & zoning question
To: <timjohnson@centurytel.net>
Cc: Lindy Kellogg <lindykellogg@gmail.com>

Thank you Tim.

Yes do not read, just forward along! I will ask Beth to remove your contact info from the twp website

On Wed, Nov 15, 2023 at 8:15 PM <timjohnson@centurytel.net> wrote:

[Didn't even read it per your recommendation....](#)

From: Steve Hamilton <hamiltonsteve811@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 15, 2023 5:11 PM
To: timjohnson@centurytel.net
Subject: Centerville Township Master Plan & zoning question

Hello,

First, thank you for your careful and thorough analysis of the proposed Leelanau Pines expansion, which was amply evident at the last PC meeting.

I am now looking ahead to the next Site Use Review for a commercial resort by Under Canvas to be located on leased land at Amoritas. I see that the most current Master Plan on the county website [here](#) dates from 2014. I am wondering whether the plan has been subject to the usual annual reviews and 5-year updates. Perhaps the version that is online is out of date?

Also, the Ag Tourism section of the overall 2023 Zoning Ordinance document that is posted [here](#) seems to have different numbering than the 2015 Ag Tourism Ordinance posted [here](#), and the latter is cited in the Site Plan. Should I assume that the 2023 text is the correct version to look at?

If the Master Plan is almost a decade old, and given the deficiencies in zoning as applicable to Leelanau Pines that became apparent at the last meeting, I further wonder whether approval of new Site Plans should be paused until the pertinent guiding documents are revised. Too late for Leelanau Pines, I imagine, but the next big project (Amoritas) and new ones surely to follow will prove challenging to navigate if the Master Plan and zoning guidelines are imprecise.

Finally, the request to designate the property as a "commercial redevelopment area" to facilitate a liquor license is confusing to me. The plan refers to attached legislation but I saw no such attachment. And I see nothing about commercial redevelopment in the township zoning ordinance. The closest I can find on the state's web pages is an act that involves tax credits and sounds to me like it would apply to a commercially zoned parcel. The legislation I found, called Act 255 of 1978, is described [here](#). So are they asking for rezoning to commercial, I wonder. It seems that the previous township supervisor kicked that can over to the planning commission, hence I am directing the question to you!

If it is not appropriate for me to be asking you some or all of these questions, or if they must be raised in the eventual public hearing, please let me know that. I need to understand all this to properly evaluate the plan and develop an informed opinion.

Thank you for your attention,

Stephen Hamilton

[5685 E Amore Rd](#)

[Lake Leelanau, MI 49653](#)

TO: Centerville Township Planning Commission
FROM: Nicole Coonradt
ADDRESS: 5680 E Amore Rd., Lake Leelanau, MI 49653
RE: Amoritas Vineyards / Under Canvas Application for Site Use Review
MEETING DATE: December 4, 2023

As a resident of Centerville Township on property immediately adjacent to Amoritas Vineyards, I offer these points of concern and questions about the Amoritas Vineyards/Under Canvas Commercial Resort Proposal currently posted at the Centerville Township website.

First, most broadly, this proposal for a **commercial resort** (according to EGLE as documented in the proposal) to be operated by a 100-million-dollar private equity firm based outside the state of Michigan is beyond the purview of what is imagined in the *Zoning Ordinance* for “Agricultural Tourism,” which contemplates options like a seasonal farm stand to sell produce or honey, an autumn corn maze for children, or winter sleigh rides—all of which are rural and quaint and “preserve open space and farmland” and “maintain the township’s agricultural and rural heritage” consistent with the overall Master Plan of development for Centerville Township and, further, Leelanau County.

Amoritas Vineyards and Under Canvas have submitted a proposal to receive a “Special Use Permit by Section 4.24 Agricultural Tourism.” First of all, their information seems to have been taken from an outdated document from February 11, 2015, rather than the most recent *Zoning Ordinance for Centerville Township, Leelanau County, MI* dated April 27, 2023, in which “Agricultural Tourism” actually begins with Section 3.20.1. Nevertheless, the information is essentially the same even if the section number designations differ regarding “Intent, Goals, and Limits” of the provisions that concern us here—“Provisions” being those things that would allow “Agricultural Tourism” in the first place.

That said, I draw your attention to Section C. “Limits of These Provisions” (p. 61), item 4. of the April 2023 *Zoning Ordinance*, which reads:

“Agricultural operations whose gross revenues are solely or primarily derived from alcoholic products are not included under these provisions.”

Therefore, since Amoritas Vineyard is a business whose primary revenue is from the sale of wine, ergo alcoholic products, I hereby question how the rest of this proposal is relevant, despite the pages and pages of materials trying to justify it.

Quite simply, do any of the *Zoning Ordinance*’s “Agricultural Tourism” specifications apply to Amoritas Vineyards when their primary revenue is from the sale of alcoholic products?

Furthermore, the *Zoning Ordinance* defines “Winery” as “A state-licensed facility where fruit production is maintained; juice is processed into wine; and sold at wholesale or retail to the public with or without the use of a wine tasting facility.” At the Amoritas Vineyards website—listed as a “Winery”—the lead page reads: “From the Heart of Lake Leelanau, Amoritas Vineyards’ wines are made from grapes planted, nurtured, and harvested by hand on Michigan’s Leelanau Peninsula” and goes on to give extensive information about the tasting room, their wine clubs, all the wines they sell, etc.

Following the above cited term “Winery” and its definition in the *Zoning Ordinance* is the term “Working Farm,” which the Amoritas/Under Canvas proposal goes to great lengths to quote and then attempts to establish, even providing sales information for grapes (I believe that timber does not count as an agricultural product). The proposal lacks detail or documentation for the sale of alcoholic products, which would likely demonstrate that the primary revenue of the business is from selling wine.

All of this appears irrelevant, however, because the provisions for “Agricultural Tourism,” according to the *Zoning Ordinance*, do not apply to Amoritas Vineyards because their primary revenue is likely from the sale of alcoholic products. Amoritas Holdings LLC, which oversees and operates Amoritas Vineyards, should be requested to submit all relevant tax documents as evidence vital for the Planning Commission.

Other issues to note:

The proposal includes the *Affidavit Attesting that Qualified Agricultural Property Shall Remain Qualified Agricultural Property* (January 21, 2013) that states in item 7. “Percentage of This Property Which Is Currently and Will Remain Qualified Agricultural Property” is “100%.” This apparently being a fact, how would it be possible for the agricultural land in question to become “certified,” to use the language in the plan, as a “commercial re-development area”? It appears the Affidavit complicates this possibility. Moreover, I wonder how land that has not, to my knowledge, been developed previously be “RE-developed”? Among the goals of the proposed declaration would be to obtain a liquor license for the sale of alcoholic beverages at the proposed resort, which again brings us back to the question of alcoholic products and the revenue of the business.

Further, as regards liquor use/sales, the MLCC and MCL 436.1605 (1)(b) portion that seeks to have the land “certified for commercial use” on page 25 of the proposal is of particular concern because of implications for the long-term use of this land. I am concerned that it seems like an afterthought because it is not mentioned until so late among the initial documents. Of further concern is the handy form titled “RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING COMMERCIAL REDEVELOPMENT AREA” for the township to sign off on—a document which I assume would be legally binding. One wonders what further commercial developments Amoritas Vineyards and Under Canvas might undertake were the resolution certified by the Planning Commission. I am uncertain of the ramifications of such certifications, but it reads to me like effectively rezoning qualified agricultural land for commercial activity. I would be concerned about the precedent such decisions could have for our township and the rest of the Leelanau Peninsula.

It bears repeating that our Master Plan and *Zoning Ordinances* (which are the law) strive to “preserve open space and farmland” and “maintain our township’s agricultural heritage and rural character.” I am concerned that our zoning be appropriately applied and not set a precedent that a landowner can seek to get a variance to these efforts solely to seek a new source of revenue, such as is proposed for this commercial resort.

December 1, 2023

To: Centerville Township Planning Commission

From: Emma Rosi, 5685 E. Amore Road, Lake Leelanau

I am writing to express my concerns about the recently proposed Application for Site Use Review submitted by Amoritas for Under Canvas to lease Amoritas's land for the development of 75 luxury camping units. After reviewing the submitted plan, it is clear that this is a commercial resort disguised as a campground. Indeed, EGLE indicates that this would not be a campground, so it is best to discuss this as it is—a 75 “room” resort, run by a very large, out-of-town corporation. Here are some things I have learned about the recent rapid growth of glamping resorts in the US:

- An article in [Modern Campground](#) states: “According to [Kampgrounds of America Inc.'s](#) (KOA) 2023 North American Camping & Outdoor Hospitality Report, the number of households choosing to glamp skyrocketed from 7.7 million in 2020 to an estimated 10.5 million in 2022”. The article goes on to state “As glamping continues to redefine the traditional camping experience, operators who adapt could find themselves at the forefront of a rapidly expanding and profitable sector.”
- Callan Riddles at the vacation rental management company IGMS states: “Running a glamping business is rising in popularity among investors and entrepreneurs. As a matter of fact, according to Tents Xpert, the [glamping market in the United States](#) is expected to reach a revenue of about \$1 billion by 2024. And, there's no sign of slowing down.” <https://www.igms.com/glamping-business/>
- Under Canvas has 12 facilities around the U.S. Near Acadia National Park where Under Canvas built a site in Surrey, Maine, many more proposals for these types of resorts are apparently pending. According to the [Maine News Center](#), Mainers are concerned about these developments and municipalities are working to revise zoning ordinances for this new type of development. In a [news](#) article dated May 23, 2023, a proposed glamping facility in Maine was described as “90 domed units, along with a restaurant, spa, employee housing, and ‘activity domes’,” and that “guest domes would be the size of a comfortable New York City apartment, with between 425 and 845 square feet of floor space, and come complete with electricity, air conditioning, fireplaces, and private bathrooms.”

Make no mistake— glamping resorts, like the one proposed by Amoritas and Under Canvas, reflect big business setting their sights on Leelanau County. These types of resorts are popping up near national parks all over the U.S. Under Canvas was started by a couple in Montana and was sold to a private equity firm for [\\$100 Million dollars](#) in 2022. So what is being proposed by Amoritas and Under Canvas is not a local Leelanau family business, but rather a large corporation proposing to start a new resort embedded within the agricultural landscape in Centerville Township.

The proposal by Amoritas and Under Canvas is likely to not be the last of these types of developments, and we need thoughtful zoning in place to guide this type of development in a sensible fashion that aligns with our Master Plan to maintain the rural character and quality of life for residents. Thank you for your work on the Planning Commission on our behalf to retain the rural character of our township and for considering my concerns.

To: Centerville Township Planning Commission

From: Stephen Hamilton, 5685 E Amore Rd., Lake Leelanau, MI 49653

Re: Amoritas Vineyards / Under Canvas Application for Site Use Review

1 December, 2023

Dear Commissioners,

I wish to express my concerns regarding the above mentioned “glamping” development, which would be a commercial resort on land zoned as agricultural.

I do not believe the original intent of the Agricultural Tourism section of the township’s Zoning Ordinance was to allow a resort of this scale on our agricultural lands. This kind of development on agricultural lands would not be consistent with the goals of the Centerville Township Comprehensive Master Plan, which directs the Township to “retain the township's rural and scenic character (page 7-2).”

Approval of this development on agriculturally zoned land would set a *precedent* that would make it difficult to turn down future requests for similar developments. Our township has a lot of agriculturally zoned land, and numerous parcels include woodlots and fallow fields that could be targeted for developments like this. If this one is approved, how could the Planning Commission say no to the next proposal, or the one after that? Approval of one resort could lead to the proliferation of these kinds of developments because the demand by tourists outstrips the availability of accommodations in Leelanau County, and this attracts outside companies and investors looking for business opportunities.

Therefore, I think that the Planning Commission must be very careful about this issue of precedent leading to future developments. I also believe that it is time to revise the Agricultural Tourism part of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as the Master Plan for that matter, in light of the intense controversy that has been generated by recent development proposals in the township and the broader county. Those issues were not on the table back in 2014 and 2015 when these documents were drafted, and there was certainly not the expectation that large resorts would be proposed on agricultural properties.

All of us have witnessed the consequences of over-development of tourism in the vicinity of national parks, and we are extremely fortunate that this has largely not occurred here. But I am sure that undesirable development has only been prevented through the vigilance of citizens and planning authorities who have worked hard over the years to retain the rural and scenic character of our local landscapes. Thank you.

I am Michele L. Uhaze a resident of Amore Road with property adjacent to Amoritas Vineyard.

After reviewing the plan submitted to the Centerville Township planning commission for a Glamping Resort to be built on Vineyard property by Under Canvas, I am alarmed on many points and would like to highlight those here:

- Amoritas has entered into a lease agreement with Under Canvas. We do not know the terms nor the length of that lease agreement and what profound changes Under Canvas could continue to make to the property in the future.
- Under Canvas is a developer funded by a multi-billion-dollar equity firm. If this plan is approved we will forever see the landscape of Leelanau County changed. Approval of their proposed plan would open the door for other developers to degrade and develop Leelanau County rural spaces.
- Through out the proposal, Under Canvas refers to the importance of the RURAL nature of the space is: On Page 6 – “utilizing the RURAL character of the Farm” “maintain open space”, On page 7 – “limiting the impacts of DEVELOPMENT” Page 10 – “peaceful rural character of the township On Page 14 – “To Preserve open space and farmland”

HOWEVER, on page 24, Under Canvas’ proposal would require a special use permit since MLCC (Michigan Liquor Control Commission) prevents any entity in another regulated tier – in this case UNDER Canvas as a retailer from entering into a lease agreement. Under Canvas is therefore asking for an exception and asks the county to certify the property as URBAN, COMMERCIAL or for Redevelopment. NOW that is a major red flag, since multiple times throughout the proposal Under Canvas refers to it as rural, and to protect the land with minimal development impact and yet they need to it be certified for Commercial Redevelopment to fit their plan. Such commercial use would be against the vision of the Township Master plan. “Preserving Open Space and Farmland” does not agree with “Urban, Commercial and Re-development” It’s a contradiction and this alone should be reason to deny this proposal.

- On page 9, the proposal states that the Camp may be used for group events such as weddings retreats etc. and site quiet hours in their proposal. How do you police that? You don’t.
 - Quote from a TripAdvisor review of Under Canvas Grand Canyon – Glamping does not mean comfort “My single biggest complaint is that 10pm is supposed to be the start of quiet hour, but there are too many people staying here that make a ton of noise. I finally complained but nothing changed. It’s not fair or acceptable...for this rule not to be enforced.”
 - And yet in this proposal, Under Canvas presents an 11pm quiet hour – this will destroy the quiet residential life of those living next to the property and disrupt lives.
 - Quote from The Times Independent – Serving Moab and Southeast Utah –“Horrified for Looking Glass”
 - “don’t be fooled, this is no modest campground..... this will be a sprawling hotel-like establishment with low upfront costs and high corporate payouts.....”
 - The article goes on to say:
 - “My horror of the proposed development comes from experience: I have worked at Moab Under Canvas. A recent wedding with 150 guests attempted

a...upscale wedding in the middle of the desert.... the results were predictable, guests trespassing and trampling fragile ecosystems....blasting music in to the wee hours of the morning, flashing bright lights into the night sky and littering everywhere....”

- 75 campsites – with the potential of 200- 300 people? Tents with their own individual toilets and showers, a laundry facility, kitchen, staff structures. Underground springs and small streams run through all the Amore Rd properties. Our well water is crisp and clear CURRENTLY. These underground springs and small streams eventually run into Lake Leelanau. HOW will this development impact our already fragile ecosystem??
 - Quoted in the Salt Lake Tribune, “according to the Division of water Quality, the septic system at the resort failed....” causing a large amount of septic water to surface and flow downhill” “one worker went on to say “that water and sewer pipes....routinely break in the winter”
 - Under Canvas, How is this being “Good Stewards of Sensitive environments” as you propose it to be.
- The proposal goes on to say on page 11 that 75 tents will generate 195 daily traffic use and compare it to 74 homes which would generate 590 -740 trips. Well, that is not an accurate assessment of what will ACTUALLY happen and not an accurate comparison of the number of homes on Amore road – there are only 11. Your comparison of 74 homes makes no logical sense. Amore Roads 11 Residential homes generate less than 80 trips/day. These types of hotel like developments typically have an average LOS (length of stay) of 3-5 nights, not long term occupancy. This would double the traffic use they are claiming, especially on days when the campground turns over the site with departures and new arrivals. Add to that the addition of deliveries needed for services etc. to this glamp ground, you’ll add hundreds of trips to their proposed number. This proposed development will destroy the peaceful, quiet nature of our rural road.
- On page 12 – the proposal says that “none of the proposed improvements are visible from outside the property boundary” . That is simply not true. My entire back yard borders Amoritas vineyards property and will have full view from the eastern and southern boundaries.
 - We have created plantings and gardens, added nesting boxes for birds in our backyard that borders this proposed site. How will the potential campers know borders and not trespass. They won’t!
 - The proposal mentions putting up wooden privacy fencing and signage – that’s a disgrace to the current peaceful beauty of this place.
- Amore Rd is home to mature evergreens and beautiful hardwoods. Under Canvas is proposing a new entrance with signage on Amore Rd. This will entail cutting down hundreds of cedars and other trees to make way for this new road – Under Canvas – how is this and any of the above-mentioned points “being good stewards of sensitive environments and maintaining the rural and agricultural character of the area”

I implore the planning commission to not approve this proposal by Under Canvas – we cannot allow this special place we call home to be lost to commercial interests. We, as many of you do, live in Centerville Township in Leelanau County for the Quiet, the Solace the Peace of the area. Our landscape is precious and has inherent value that is much greater than Under Canvas’ financial interest and their goal as quoted by their Chief Development Officer – “for an aggressive system wide growth to develop...new

locations across the U.S” Is Centerville Twp to become another stop on Under Canvases Aggressive growth goal? I sincerely hope not.