
Fwd: Under Canvas Proposal

Lindy Kellogg <lkelloggcentervillepc@gmail.com>
To: Joe Mosher <moshercentervilletp@gmail.com>

Sun, Dec 3, 2023 at 8:13 AM

Good Morning,

Comment for the record - Amoritas.

LK

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

From: **Rebecca Carlson** <beccagcarlson@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Dec 1, 2023 at 10:49 PM
Subject: Under Canvas Proposal
To: <lkelloggcentervillepc@gmail.com>

December 1, 2023

To: Ms. Lindy Kellogg
From: Rebecca G Carlson
Re: Amoritas Winery/Under Canvas

Dear Ms. Kellogg,

I am joining the numerous voices of our peninsula in standing against the development proposal for the Under Canvas Resort on the Amoritas Vineyard property off Amore Rd.

I am a full-time resident living south of Suttons Bay; consequently, I would not be directly affected by road and construction noise, the disruption of daily life as utilities and other items are connected, and the end to the quietness of Amore Road once the resort is open to tourists. However, if the proposal is approved, all residents of the Leelanau Peninsula will be adversely affected by the continued chipping away of our beautiful, agrarian world in the Leelanau Peninsula if this reckless development is allowed. This does and will directly affect my family, neighbors, and myself. As owners of a small cherry orchard in the center of the peninsula, we and our farming neighbors work very hard to be devoted stewards of the land.

Tourism is important to many of our livelihoods in this area. I have worked in several service industry positions, winery and retail, and understand first-hand that tourism dollars are vital. Even so, tourism is not the sole source of income for the peninsula. Consideration needs to be given to homeowners and the potential devaluing of their properties with this type of commercial development. There are reasons that mega-corporations like McDonalds and Costco do not exist in Leelanau County. The Under Canvas corporation, even under the guise of Agricultural Tourism, is no different. Furthermore, once the charming character of the peninsula disappears through over-development, what is left? Will the area still attract tourists once our quaint world is gone?

Please give consideration to the voices in opposition to this commercial development proposal.

Thank you for your time,

Rebecca G Carlson
Suttons Bay MI 49682

Hello,

My name is Bill Uhaze, thank you for allowing us to record our concerns of this proposed commercial resort.

My wife Michele and I moved here to live deliberately and were excited to have a climax forest in our backyard even with 25% being very large ash trees that would crash down with each new storm. Now, there's beech bark disease, hemlock woolly adelgid, and coming soon for the maples, Asian longhorn beetles. These threats are real. The stress on Amore woods is real. These are threats that I have no control over, however, now there is a new threat that will affect our way of life. A proposed commercial resort in our backyards. What an unmitigated disaster this will be!

When we moved here 15 years ago in January, the adjoining property of 150 acres was for sale with us having an almost 1000' border. What a great property. Talk about aesthetic, very boreal with exciting topography, open fields, and lots of trees! As we know, trees do a lot of good, not only for the earth, but for our way of life. A couple of years later the property was sold.

Enter the new "land stewards", (as they are described in the document). The first thing was to clear cut a very large stand of mature evergreens where these yurts are planned. The vines came next in the open fields. More recently, the remaining mature hardwoods were forested, leaving thin stands of deciduous trees opening up the climax forest.

This latest habitat destruction killed me, as for several weeks before this cutting began, I was watching an eagle build a large nest of sticks high in a crotch of a large noble Beech that had a view of the lake. Suffice it to say, the nest was abandoned when the cutting began.

Now, with this proposed commercial development, there will be more habitat destruction on an already stressed Amore woods this time for others to see, with more mature evergreens lost to make way for the entrance, losing more Amore aesthetic.

Since the vineyard was installed, we can't use our yard on days they spray, because the smell and hazards of pesticide wafts across our backyard and down to our house making us close windows until it passes. Not to mention the incessant bird noise deterrent used all day in the fall. We are not able to enjoy our backyard during these times because of the noise from the constant mowing and spraying in the vineyard.

We moved here knowing this land was zoned agricultural, so I have to live with this threat of being poisoned by runoff pesticides into our aquifer as well as the psychological effects of the daily fall screeching bird noise repellent. But now, our property values will be decreased, threatened by more pollution with this proposal to join in a lease agreement with an absent land steward. This will only degrade our land and way of life even more.

This land is sacred to us and these proposers do not live here, and do not have the vested interest about what happens in our backyard. We will be impacted by this in many ways especially by things we can't see or hear. Right now we can hear cows a mile away on Popp Road, music from French Valley vineyards in the season a few miles away. I'm pretty sure we'll hear hundreds of people echoing in this proposed "yurt valley" and the constant smell of when at full capacity there would be 75 wood burning stoves roaring away.

Why is our way of life constantly under attack by entities that keep poking and prodding to get a foot in the door, Timber Shores, Timberlee, Leelanau Pines, and now our slice of paradise?

This proposed commercial resort wants to change the zoning laws to fit their needs, despite the impact to our way of life.

What a dangerous precedent this will set!

Do we want glampers infringing upon our property? No!

Do we want this resort noise with gatherings, weddings and, whoever knows what else, to further degrade our way of life and the peaceful rural character of the township? Again no!

We live here, we work for a living, not to mention sleep. As homeowners, our taxes provide the majority of the county's funding – not tourism, not farming.

Do we want to hear the noise and pollution of hundreds of vehicles and service equipment daily? No!

This is not what our neighborhood nor the Leelanau Peninsula needs or wants. This is not what this already stressed environment needs, nor does it fit the Master Plan to preserve open spaces and the rural character of the county.

How will they staff 90 people, with 20-30 on site at any one time to run this resort? There is already a housing shortage for service industry workers.

Who will monitor this vast commercial area? And how long till any enforcement gives up on our complaints?

We have more questions than answers.

Michele and I, like many, are concerned by this Proposal being shoved down our throats by interests that have unlimited resources, being able to fund unending litigation to get this done.

We especially feel threatened by the pollution that could occur by laundry effluent and commercial septic issues that would impact our underground rivers and springs (since our land is downhill from this proposed resort), ending up in the aquifer that feeds our well and the watershed that feeds into Lake Leelanau. Not good!

These are but a few of the concerns we have (too many to list) here. But I can go on...

Can we just be left alone by these commercial entities so we can enjoy our peace and serenity that we live here deliberately for and that our property taxes support?

Thank you for your time, I trust our concerns will be of immediate importance.

Sincerely,

Bill Uhaze

To the members of our Centerville Township Planning Commission,

I am writing as a citizen of Centerville Township and I am very opposed to the proposed glamping operation on the Amoritas Vineyard off Amore Road. Under Canvas is proposing a tent city of 75 tent units under the guise of Agrotourism. What part of the definition of Agrotourism does this proposal reflect? This plan does not define how the visiting tourists will be participating in the agricultural aspects of a vineyard. Will they be harvesting the grapes, or stomping the grapes, or running the equipment to spray them and pick them?

What is the purpose and proposed need for a liquor license? Will they be selling wine or running a tasting room? This is clearly not Agrotourism. Do we also need to worry about drunks driving on this very rural road?

I have considerable frontage on Amore Road and have been beseeching the township for three years to pay their half to improve Amore Road which has been in terrible condition. The answer has always been no money to do this. The road commission had created a master plan with their engineers to include widening, ditching, installing culverts and repaving. Instead due to no township matching funding they had to take it down to gravel.

I lived on a gravel road for over thirty years downstate and know how quickly they can fall into disrepair with washouts, potholes, and how quickly they become dusty and filthy for homeowners living on the road. Amore Road as it exists today cannot possibly hold up to the kind of traffic this proposal is making of 100-200 cars a day. Just on this issue alone the proposal should be denied. I am dismayed by the Road Commission permitting a driveway into the property without involving EAGLE or getting any public input from adjacent property owners. The driveway will be crossing a creek and is near an identified wetland. Our master plan calls for none of this to be approved.

I have numerous other concerns about this proposal including the drain on our already overloaded utilities, our infrastructure, the lack of any sewage system in our township, and the over taxing of police, fire, and emergency services. When not a single business on this peninsula has enough help and all have help wanted signs out how on earth do they think they will have the staff to operate this plan. A full day and night shift of employees operating check in, the kitchen, the laundry, a house keeping staff, a full day time fire pits tender. Where will this staff come from?

The pipe dreams long down the road of having chickens, a gardens, foraging classes for mushroom, rose hips, ramps and tours are unrealistic and are nothing but a guise pretending to be Agrotourism Has anyone ever tried picking rose hips? They are among the meanest plant growing and this invasive species was introduced by farmers to keep cattle in. These do not represent Agrotourism in the current plan. In fact currently there will be nothing that does.

Nothing in this proposal explains how or where the removal of trees will take place nor explains how the land leveling that will have to be done. It is obvious that the whole topography of this gorgeous land will be plundered and destroyed. They pretend this company will be minimalists and will be fostering environmental consciousness. Nothing about this plan will do that. I am very concerned about the environmental impact this plan will have our this area. And what else will come along after it?

Developments like this always demand more development.

Just how will our current noise ordinance be enforced? Nearby neighbors are bound to be impacted by noise, light, traffic and especially if special events are allowed.

So I urge you again to deny this proposal in its entirety and move on to more important.

Thank you for listening. Darlene Doorlag

To: Centerville Township Planning Commission
From: David LeFevre, 2197 S Popp Road, Lake Leelanau, MI 49653
RE: Amoritas Vineyard/Under Canvas Application for Site Use Review

Dear Commissioners,

I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed development at Amoritas Vineyard.

Let me start by saying that what attracted us to Leelanau County was not just the rural nature, farmlands, open spaces and quiet roads, but the support for local entrepreneurship and not large corporations. I believe in the fact that local investment is the key to a locally sustainable and thriving economy.

Based on my statement above, here are my concerns for this and other major corporate backed projects:

- The sheer size of these projects are beyond the current definition of the Centerville Master Plan, Agricultural Tourism definition and the current rural infrastructure of the township. More residents need to be able to express their desires to what the Master Plan and Agricultural Tourism definition looks like.
- The number of increased traffic down these small rural roads. The plan shows an increase of a minimum 200 cars a day on any of the 3 roads that would lead to the proposed site, but I think this is a very conservative estimate, since guests to the site would come and go throughout the day. There is also the fact that the restaurant would also account for increased traffic that is not being considered in the proposal. Therefore, if we use the estimate in the proposal, we are looking at an increase of at least 400% in traffic on these small rural roads.
- The lack of definition of Agricultural Tourism for Centerville township. Thus allowing for any and all projects to proceed without clear boundaries and no definitions makes it difficult to defend the current Master Plan and leaves the township exposed to litigation that would be hard to defend without this definition.
- A majority of the money that is produced by these corporations will not remain in the area. Thus producing a greater gap for local people to be able to build sustainable livelihoods and futures in this county.

My recommendation as a minimum next step is to place a moratorium on any Agricultural Tourism developments until the Master Plan is reviewed/revised and more definition is developed to define goals and boundaries of Agricultural Tourism. Without this review/development the township and county are at risk of the deep pockets of large corporations to push their agendas onto our rural community.

Thank you for taking my concerns into consideration,
-David LeFevre
Popp Valley Farm

To: Centerville Township Planning Commission
From: Derenda LeFevre, 2197 S Popp Road, Lake Leelanau, MI 49653
RE: Amoritas Vineyard/Under Canvas Application for Site Use Review

I am writing to express my concerns with the proposed development at Amoritas Vineyard.

We moved to this area because of the rural nature, farmlands, open spaces, quiet roads, and strength of local entrepreneurship. Shaub Pond on S Popp Road is a peaceful bird sanctuary and migratory pathway for many species. We are thankful for the walks and bike rides on our quiet road. We enjoy hearing nature around us, not the sound of traffic.

I am opposed to this plan *as proposed* for the following reasons:

- Our Masterplan ensures that the “design and scale of (agri-tourism) developments do not harm the environment or detract from the peaceful rural character of our township.” This Under Canvas project *exceeds the scale* of agri-tourism compatible with our rural community and would be disruptive to our neighborhood.

The addition of at least 200 car trips per day, which I feel is an underestimate, will greatly increase traffic on our roads and the excessive scale of the project (75 units) will not ensure that our peaceful rural character is preserved.

I am not opposed to expanding economic opportunities for farmers and would gladly support *locally owned and locally run farm stays or glamping experiences on privately owned agricultural property on a scale that reflects the rural nature of our township.*

- Approving this plan *now and as is*, sets a *dangerous precedent* for other agricultural land use and agri-tourism in our community, allows for big business to secure a foothold here, and threatens the character of our community.

Under Canvas is a for-profit, investment-run company and will operate as such. They are not investing in our community, but in their company.

The next best step for our township is to review and update our current Masterplan to strengthen goals and reasonable restrictions for agri-tourism and to establish healthy and sustainable financial pathways for farmers to build upon.

We also need to invite the appropriate voices to weigh in on decisions like this that will impact our neighborhood as well as the entire county. Those voices include the Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa and Chippewa Indians, The Leelanau Land Conservancy, and the Disability Network of Northern Michigan as well as Centerville Township residents and the greater Leelanau County community. Decisions like this impact all of us.

I would rather see, and could fully support, local initiatives that assisted farmers like Matt and Emily Goodell to establish locally-owned and locally run agri-tourism that promotes the artisanal and cottage industries that uniquely defines our community.

- Considering the housing instability that our area is currently experiencing, due to lack of affordable housing and uncontrolled rental rates, this project puts undo pressure on a system that is already over-stressed.

The financial gains from this project will not be an investment in our community workforce and will likely require bringing in employees from outside of the area that will need housing. If we can't house our community members, how can we support these additional housing needs?

- The project as proposed does not adequately address access needs for the disabled community.

Legislation mandates compliance with the American with Disabilities Act. But the *ADA does not equal inclusion and should be thought of as a minimum standard.*

The proposed design restricts access because it does not allow for choice of location, address ease of use and anticipate fatigue, and access needs of the deaf, blind, and neurodiverse communities.

Our services, built environment and collective mindsets have yet to make inclusion a priority for the nearly 44% of our population that need to feel they are welcomed. *Access is essential.*

The extent of disability experienced by an individual is a direct result of the barriers we build into our environments.

Thank you.

Fwd: Amoritas - Under Canvas

Lindy Kellogg <lkelloggcentervillepc@gmail.com>

Mon, Dec 4, 2023 at 1:42 PM

To: Joe Mosher <moshercentervilletp@gmail.com>, Mary Beeker <mlbeeker@gmail.com>, Noel Bielaczyc <noel.bielaczyc@gmail.com>, Chris Grobbel <grobbelenvironmental@gmail.com>

Amoritas Application Comment for record.

LK

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

From: **barclay welch** <welchbarclay@gmail.com>

Date: Mon, Dec 4, 2023 at 11:52 AM

Subject: Amoritas - Under Canvas

To: <lkelloggcentervillepc@gmail.com>

Centerville Township Planning Commission

Dear Commissioners,

The Amoritas/Undercanvas Application For Site Plan Review should NOT be considered. The Amoritas proposal contains know falsehoods. This body has been given false information upon which it is being asked to base its decision.

Proposals are, according to the Master Plan, evaluated in part based on their impact. How can this body render an appropriate decision or action if it is based on misleading and inaccurate statements made by the Applicant. The Applicant states "Buffers and Screening -

Due to the site's rolling topography and extensive mature vegetation, **none of the proposed improvements are visible from outside of the property boundary."** **This is false and not true.**

Not only are the proposed luxury campground sites visible from our house and property but our property is also directly exposed to the noise, air and light pollution caused by French Valley Vineyards. The community has charged this body with making decisions consistent with the views the community has expressed in the Master Plan. The Master Plan specifically charges this body with making decisions that don't harm the community. Exposing multiple rural agriculturally zoned properties to the negative impacts of not ONE but TWO special use entertainment/luxury lodging zones is to disproportionately and negatively impact those properties. Is this body's purpose to convey special advantage to some parcels and to actively strip value, enjoyment and love of the land from others?

Applications containing false statements should not be considered. Applications that contain false statements and other misleading data should get us to examine what else is untrue? Asking this body to render a decision based on false information sets a precedent that we must avoid as a community.

Barclay Welch
5541 Hohnke Road
Cedar, Michigan

To: Centerville Township Planning Committee
From: James A. Holleman, 5680 E Amore Rd, Lake Leelanau, MI 49653
RE: Amoritas Vineyards/Under Canvas Application for Site Use Review
December 4, 2023

Dear Planning Commissioners:

I write to express my serious concerns regarding the Amoritas Vineyard/Under Canvas proposal for a resort of 75 individual units, each with bathroom facilities (septic system), heating units, and wood burning stoves; a dining hall; parking for up to 122 cars (additional parking spaces to the proposal will come for employee parking); housing for an undetermined number of employees; and future expansion that could go unchecked if the project is given the commercial zoning designation that would be required to skirt around the current agriculture zoning status of the property. As the neighbor directly bordering their property to the northwest, this could greatly affect my property value, greatly increase car traffic on what is now a dirt road, possible contamination of my well water, and an overall upsetting of the rural nature of the neighborhood, environment, and the peace and quiet for which I purchased my home in November of 2020. I have spent time during every summer of my life vacationing with my family in Leelanau County and fell in love with her beauty, outdoor activities, vineyards, and rural nature of the area. I was very fortunate to be able to afford purchasing a home in the county and plan to remain here as an active resident for the rest of my life upon my upcoming retirement.

Having attended the November 6, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting in Leland, regarding the Pines Campground Proposal, I have good confidence in the sincerity and diligence of our township planning committee and your dedication to preserving the rural/agricultural nature of our area and future of our township, county, and peninsula; all with a good understanding of controlled tourism growth and dedication to the master plan of the township. Zoning is the law!

I plan on speaking at tonight's planning commission meeting, Monday, Dec. 4, and will touch on as many of the follow points as time allows. I will also attend future meetings and continue to articulate my concerns and objections to this proposal. Please place this letter in your records so that what time does not allow me to verbally articulate tonight becomes part of the official records in opposition of this proposal.

- My understanding is that homeowners pay a much larger percentage of township/county taxes, which is the majority of revenue for the township, than do agricultural properties. This should give us a stronger collective voice in the planning process as we stand in opposition to a large corporation with unlimited funds to press and litigate the issue.
- The estimated car travel on E Amore road, as proposed by Under Canvas, seems suspiciously low (200 trips per day) as they are comparing to one of their glamping/resort properties near the Grand Canyon in Arizona. My understanding is that their Grand Canyon Resort is basically 30-50 miles away from most anything, including the overlook of the canyon. So, I assume that

once their guests arrive they tend to not travel multiple times in a single day. For comparisons from Amoritas Vineyard; Front Street in Traverse City - 23-miles away; Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lake Shore – 25 miles away; Good Harbor Bay Beach – 6 miles away; Van’s Beach – 8 miles away; Shopping/Restaurants in Leland – 8 miles away; Shopping Restaurants in Suttons Bay – 10 miles away; all in different directions. Then add all of the tasting rooms, restaurants, hiking trails, grocery stores, etc., in the area and the number of daily trips will most certainly be considerably higher than the proposal suggests.

- Zoning ordinances are the law of the township and in my opinion the Amoritas/Under Canvas proposal does not meet the requirements of Agri-Tourism or Resort Development as stated in our township zoning ordinances or the Township Long Range plan. I use Resort as this is the designation according to EGLE as well as standard use of the term for a vacation destination as opposed to simple lodging.
- If given a special “Commercial” zoning exemption, I fear that this could open the door to future expansions of the property that could go unchecked by the township and neighbors of the property.
- Precedent: Are we “first come, first served” in these types of developments? If approved, how does the Township say no to the next proposal from possibly French Valley Vineyards, Chateau Fontaine, Laurentide, Bel Lago and the many orchards in our township? Should the owners of Amoritas be the only ones to profit from this type of development/commercial endeavor? If approved, I fear they will not be the only ones.
- The proposal for wood burning stoves in each of the 75-units is concerning for our air quality and do we not all remember the drought we experienced last summer (2023)? I fear this could cause a possible fire hazard if the fires, contained under canvas, are not properly monitored.
- From my on-line research of Under Canvas, they have many complaints from residents in the areas that they build their glamping resorts, including registered complaints to the Better Business Bureau. My understanding is that Under Canvas is a multi-million-dollar company under the umbrella of a multi-billion-dollar corporation. I think we need to be very cautious of letting them get a foothold in our township, county, and peninsula. This could be the catalyst of very unwanted changes to us, our neighbors, the township, the county, the attraction for a volume of tourism in our area that is already under too much pressure and reduced business to the already established rental properties, campgrounds, and resorts that already exist. I don’t believe that opposition to this proposal equates to opposition to tourism for our economy. I do believe it will equate to uncontrolled levels and types of tourism that we experience in the future.
- I suspect that the timing of their proposal is purposeful as to try to slip it through while many homeowners in our area are not currently here during the winter months. Whether or not a homeowner/property owner is currently in the area or not does not disqualify their right to be part of the conversation.

- If the Planning Commission suggests a reduction in the size/scope of the project and allows for a smaller footprint, I believe it will still set bad precedent and open the door to this type of unwanted developments in our area.

Inclosing, as the direct neighbor (shared property lines) to the northwest of Amoritas Vineyard I am deeply concerned about this proposal as it will directly affect my property and enjoyment of my home. Moreso, if this were being proposed anywhere else in Centerville Township or Leelanau County I would involve myself in the opposition of the proposal as it will affect all of our neighbors and the rural/agricultural beauty of our peninsula. I also think it will negatively affect the nature of tourism in Leelanau County and why people choose to visit here and patronize the area businesses. I for one do not want Leelanau to become another Mackinac City or Pigeon Forge.

Again, I have confidence in the commitment and integrity of our Centerville Township Planning Committee to be our voice in this matter and stand against unwanted, uncontrolled, development.

Sincerely,

James A. Holleman
5680 E Amore Rd.
Lake Leelanau, MI 49653
Email: hollemanjames@icloud.com

To: Centerville Township Planning Commission

From: Kristen Underhill Welch, 5541 E. Hohnke Rd, Cedar, Michigan 49621

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

Dear Commissioners:

My name is Kristen Underhill Welch and I live at 5541 E. Hohnke Rd. I am writing to you today to express my objections to the proposed development by Under Canvas at Amoritas Vineyard on Amore Rd. I have objections that relate to the development plans for the township and county as a whole and also relate to how the development plans will impact my home and me personally. Before I elaborate on each of these, I would like to comment on the general proposal and some of the claims that are either misleading or outright false.

When one strips away the glossy photos and the homey narrative about who Under Canvas is what we have is a luxury resort that is owned and run by a venture capital company - KSL Capital Partners - that owns and runs luxury resorts around the world. This is a company that is beholden to its investors and whose primary goal is to extract as much value from its properties as feasible. They do not have a history of or expressed interest in promoting rural and agricultural communities. So I think it is accurate and appropriate to refer to them as a luxury resort developer plain and simple and not pretend that this is an agri-tourism venture even if they seemingly can squeeze their proposal into a very loose and broad definition of agri-tourism.

Their proposal gives the impression of an ecologically sensitive development in which guests have no electricity except in the main buildings and therefore the grounds are quiet and dark after sunset. However, they provide their guests with battery packs and there is nothing to prevent guests from bringing their own battery packs to run electrical devices and lights. While they say they will respect the quiet hours per zoning and shut down by 10:00pm, there is no way that they will be able to or have the will to police up to 150 guests paying very large amounts to stay at the facility to be quiet after 10:00. If you have ever stayed at a densely populated campground where people have been eating and drinking, quiet is not what one finds. Instead there is a cacophony of voices as people stay up talking and laughing. In the proposal they even mention having "hives" of tents if friends and families wish to travel together encouraging socializing. In addition, there will be the sound of carts ferrying guests to their accommodations on steep gravel paths. While the carts might be electric the paths will be noisy as the tires crunch over gravel up and down steep grades.

With no electricity to the tents, they are relying on wood burning stoves to heat the accommodations. When the resort is full especially during the shoulder months there will be 75 wood burning stoves going all at once. This is hardly ecologically sensitive or healthy for those in the vicinity. Remember what it felt like during the wildfires of this past summer. This is what the air quality will be for people in this area during March through October when the resort is in operation. I don't think that this is what the Township wishes to support.

In the proposal, the tents are sited all down a steep slope that has a stream in the valley. Each tent has its own toilet and shower. That means 75 toilets and showers along that slope. The refuse and water is proposed to be pumped up to septic fields and while I understand in theory that this is technologically feasible, what happens when it doesn't work. Are we okay with refuse running into a stream that empties into Lake Leelanau?

The proposal **falsely** states that this resort development is not visible from any of the properties in the area. We share the property line on their southern border and have a clear view from our home of their southern vineyard and the steep sloping hill on which this development is proposed. We will be able to see the tents, smell the smoke, and hear the voices and carts as sound travels down the valley that leads from their property up to ours.

As it happens, our property shares its western property line with French Valley Vineyards which has a special use permit to hold parties, weddings, and musical acts. During the summer months we clearly hear the parties, people and music from this venue. On days and nights when the sound travels particularly well, it feels like the people are right in our garden. We all love a good wedding, but weekend after weekend it is tiresome. As a result of this special use permit during the summer we no longer sit in our garden in the evening. Instead we spend our time on our back porch that is shielded from the noise by our house. This deck looks out down our valley to the site in question in this development proposal. If this special use permit is granted there will no longer be a place at our home during summer months that is not exposed to the noise of entertainment enterprises. I do not think that the Planning Commission wishes to harm other members of the community through the granting of special use permits, however by having two venues on the border of our property that are noisy, and in the case of the Amoritas/Under Canvas proposal also adds smokey, particulate matter to the air, our peace of mind will be harmed, our health will be harmed, and our property value will be harmed.

I also have concerns for the precedent that approving this special use permit might have for the township and county as a whole. The township has a Master Plan in order to thoughtfully steer development with an eye to what the community wants and needs and how the community sees itself. In reading the Master Plan, I did not see mention of the development of luxury resorts. Instead the Master Plan speaks to wanting to preserve the rural and agricultural nature of the township and invest in things that will enhance that quality. If the Planning Commission accepts this proposal as agri-tourism and does not see it for what it is, what stops the next developer and the next from developing resorts that are on farm land, but don't promote agricultural enterprises? We have seen what overdevelopment of resorts looks like in other parts of Michigan. I think the Master Plan speaks clearly to the desire to avoid that type of overdevelopment in our township.

Furthermore, this special use permit is for the development of a resort that will only be leasing land. Apart from the rent paid to the owners of Amoritas the profits will not be staying in the township or county, but instead going to the investors of KSL Capital Partners, the venture capital firm that owns Under Canvas. Who will be accountable to the neighbors, township and county when guidelines are not followed, or when ecological problems develop? What recourse would the township have? Please see the wolves beneath the sheep's clothing. Venture Capital firms by their very nature do not make good community partners. The industries and communities that have been picked dry by Venture Capital firms are too numerous to list in this document. I know that this is not something that any of us wish for our community.

In conclusion, I ask that the Planning Commission refuse to grant a special use permit to Under Canvas for the development of a luxury resort at Amoritas Vineyard.

Thank you for reading and considering my objections and concerns.

Respectfully,
Kristen Underhill Welch
kuwmd@sbcglobal.net
(773) 294-8314

