

**KASSON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING & PUBLIC HEARING
Monday, June 17, 2024; 7:00 pm
Kasson Township Hall
10988 S. Newman Road, Maple City, MI 49664
MINUTES**

I. Call Meeting to Order/Pledge of Allegiance

Chairman Lanham called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm with the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. Roll Call of Commissioners and Staff

A. Present: Mike Lanham, Chairman; Jerry Roush, Vice Chairman; Tad Carter, Township Board Rep; Thrasos Eftaxiadis, Secretary; Dave Noonan, Commissioner

B. Absent: None

C. Staff: Tim Cypher, Zoning Administrator; Dana Boomer, Township Clerk (acting as Recording Secretary)

III. Consideration of Agenda

Lanham stated that one of the applicants for tonight is running late, so New Cass will have their public hearing first and Verizon second. Lanham asked for a motion to approve the agenda as amended. **Eftaxiadis moved to approve the agenda as amended; Noonan seconded. All in favor, motion carried.**

IV. Declaration of Conflicts of Interest – None

V. Approval of Minutes – May 20, 2024

Lanham asked for a motion to approve the minutes of May 20, 2024 as presented. **Noonan moved to approve the minutes of May 20, 2024 as presented, Eftaxiadis seconded. All in favor, motion carried.**

VI. Correspondence Received – Cypher stated that two pieces of correspondence were received related to the public hearings – those will be addressed at the appropriate time.

VII. Public Comment – Bob Sutherland – He is here regarding the zoning change for New Cass/Cherry Republic, and he thanked the PC for considering the change. They have so many workers that would like to live in the same community that they work in, and this is a wonderful opportunity to make this happen.

VIII. Area Reports

A. Chairperson - Chairman Lanham – No report

B. Secretary - Commissioner Eftaxiadis – No report

C. Township Board - Commissioner Carter – No report

D. Zoning Board of Appeals - Commissioner Noonan – No report

E. Zoning Administrator – ZA Cypher – Cypher’s May reports had been previously distributed. He has been working on various zoning concerns through the month, and summarized those.

IX. New Business – None

X. Old Business

A. New Cass, LLC Rezoning Public Hearing –

Roush moved to open the public hearing at 7:06 pm; Carter seconded. All in favor, motion carried.

Marc McKellar, attorney for the applicant, spoke regarding the application for rezoning by New Cass, LLC/Cherry Republic. The initial application was presented at the May PC meeting. This application is driven by the need to provide employee housing for the operations of Cherry Republic. Their expansion in Empire has been approved for an approximately 15,000 square feet of additional centralized space. This will result in numerous new employees based in Leelanau County, and these employees will need housing. They have identified the Maple City property as one that needs to be improved. There are currently several old mobile homes with old drain fields. The replacement of those homes needs to happen, and rather than replace them with new mobile homes, Cherry Republic would like to replace them with town homes or apartments, with centralized wells and septic systems on-site. The use is not the purpose of the rezoning, but it does speak to the need for the rezoning. They want to be transparent that they will be seeking approval for higher density housing if this rezoning is approved. They may also be requesting a zoning variance for the 0.03 acres that they are missing to have a two-acre property, due to the housing densities being based on a per-acre calculation. These higher density housing units would require additional site plan reviews beyond the rezoning.

McKellar stated that to avoid spot zoning, a re-zoned property should be adjacent to similar zoning, which this property is. Maple City is an old, platted town which was designed for the purpose of higher density housing than the surrounding township. These employees are in need of housing for themselves and their families, and this is the need behind this request. McKellar asked the Planning Commission to recommend the rezoning be approved.

The PC had no initial questions.

Tom Deering – He owns the south and east borders of the property in question. It was mentioned that there are house trailers on the property – two of those are currently unlivable. It was also mentioned that this piece of property adjoins additional Commercial Mixed Use Zoning – the difference being that the adjoining property fronts on Maple City Road, and this property fronts on Maple Street. He has previously spoken with Sutherland on the topic, and feels that putting 16 housing units on this property

would be way too many, with no area to place a swing set, fire pit, or other amenities on the property. Having 16-20 people living on less than two acres is too many. He is aware of the need for employee housing, and he is not sure how to fix it, but he would prefer it wasn't in his backyard.

Linda Kuhn – She and her husband own the property across the street. She submitted a letter to Cypher, which he received late in the day. They also own the parcel adjoining which is Commercial Mixed Use Core, which fronts on Maple City Road. This whole area is single family homes, and feels quite rural. It is inappropriate to have very high density housing in this area. Maple Street is a quiet street, and there has to be better places for a big development like this than in a single family residential area.

John Kuhn – Since Cherry Republic has bought the Murphy house, there have been numerous intrusions on their property from residents of that property as they travel to the downtown area. Bringing in this many units will bring in a traffic problem that Maple Street was not designed to handle, especially given the number of pedestrians using that street.

There was no further public comment. The floor was opened to McKellar for response. McKellar stated that the applicant doesn't need to max out the property density. There is an acknowledged need for housing. No one wants more housing in their backyards, but it has to go somewhere. He understands the concerns, but potential impacts from proposed uses are more appropriate during a site plan review. The village is an appropriate place for density – it is why villages exist. If not in the village, where else in Kasson Township would be appropriate? He is not aware of whether Cherry Republic is aware of the trespassing issues. Deering and Kuhn said they had not made Cherry Republic aware of this, they have tried talking directly to the employees. McKellar stated that Cherry Republic will make it clear to their workers that the ongoing trespassing issues must stop.

McKellar stated that they want to improve the property and make it more appropriate for their employees. However, in order for this to be viable, they need additional density than what is allowed with the Medium/Small Lot Residential zoning. They are open to green buffers and other conditions that can be discussed during a site plan review. What Cherry Republic is looking at is similar in concept but more dense than the Habitat for Humanity development to the south. All of this can be discussed during a site plan review, but the rezoning is the first step.

Lanham asked Cypher for a statement. Cypher stated that the draft Findings of Fact had been developed. Cypher asked McKellar whether any preliminary contact had been made with the Health Department to determine what intensity would be allowed. McKellar stated that a soil study has been done and it is appropriate for a community system. That system has not yet been designed as it is determined by the design of the proposed housing, which has not been finalized yet. The earliest estimates from the

health department seem to show the ability for more housing capacity than would be permitted by the township. Cypher stated that these soil studies are not required for the rezoning request, but the information may be useful.

Lanham asked how many housing units could be on the property currently. It was determined that there are only two dwelling units allowed on the property currently. The rezoning would allow up to four dwelling units of single family residential or 16 dwelling units of multi-family residential, given the current size of 1.97 acres. A variance for the 0.03 acres would allow for doubling of those allowances, with all multi-family residential units required to go through site plan review.

The PC and staff began a review of the draft Findings of Fact. The PC reviewed the Master Plan references to rezoning. Cypher asked whether a traffic study had been completed. McKellar stated no, they need a proposed density before an engineer can complete a traffic study. The PC reviewed the zoning changes that would come from a potential rezoning, which would be the allowance for townhouse dwellings and apartment dwellings. The PC reviewed residential density allowances and the changes that would come from a potential rezoning.

McKellar stated that they are willing to self-condition to no more than 12 dwelling units on the property. He doesn't want the fear that there will be 32 units on the property. This could be memorialized as a development agreement between the applicant and the township. Eftaxiadis asked for more elaboration on the traffic study. McKellar stated that there is no current design or finalized dwelling units, which makes it impossible to determine what level of traffic can be anticipated from the property. They do not have a preliminary site plan, a determination on apartments vs townhouses, unit size, etc. Without these items in place, there are too many potential scenarios to study. They would be prepared to present traffic impact statements during a site plan review.

Cypher stated that the Master Plan does specifically reference traffic impacts. However, the MP does not specify a traffic study must be completed. The MP specifies that the PC shall also consider increased demands on public facilities and effects upon the native terrain. The various other agencies will also have the ability to opine on a site plan. Noonan states that 12 units with two cars per unit is a lot of parking and a lot of traffic on that small road, and so he would like to see some sort of traffic impact statement. Cypher stated that there are other options besides a full-blown traffic study. Cypher reminded the PC that the request tonight is for the rezoning, and while the applicant has given the PC a look into what they are planning, the rezoning is the only request currently before the PC.

The PC continued the discussion of the rezoning. Noonan feels there should be no more than 8 units on the property, if a rezoning is granted. This parcel was zoned as Medium/Small Lot Residential for a reason, and that is because that area is a rural residential area. Carter does not think the rezoning should be granted.

Noonan moved to deny, based on the Findings of Fact, for New Cass, LLC on June 17, 2024, rezoning from Medium & Small Lot Zoning to Mixed Use Commercial Core Zoning at 8419 S. Maple Street, Maple City. Carter seconded.

McKellar requested to withdraw the application without a vote. No vote was taken.

The PC accepted the withdrawal of the application.

Roush moved to close the public hearing at 7:51 pm. Noonan seconded. All in favor, motion carried.

The PC paused the meeting from 7:51 pm to 7:54 pm.

B. Verizon Wireless/TAG Towers Special Use Permit Public Hearing –

Roush moved to open the public hearing at 7:54 pm; Carter seconded. All in favor, motion carried.

Eftaxiadis asked for clarification of the Findings of Fact – there is a typo in the draft findings; the height of the proposed tower is 255’.

The applicant’s attorney presented the application. He summarized the application, including the proposed location of the tower in an active gravel mine, a near-industrial use. He summarized the procedure for finding a site, which starts with finding a coverage gap that needs to be closed. Propagation maps have been developed and distributed. They have identified this area as a coverage gap, based on customer complaints, in-field measurements of signal strength, and reports of lost signal. This tower will also be enhancing the capacity of existing towers in the area, as those towers are getting to a point of being oversaturated with signal requests, which results in lost signals even in high-coverage areas due to the tower being unable to receive additional signals. A new tower will both increase coverage in this specific area and increase efficiency of surrounding towers. The site must be located to not substantially overlap with other towers, as this would create interference zones. There is a small area where this tower can be located – approximately ¼ mile in every direction. They try to look for non-residential properties that provide coverage for residential properties – they believe they have found this in the gravel pit, which is a near-industrial use.

The applicant’s radio frequency engineer has stated that a 250’ tower will cover approximately 3,500 wireless users, while a decrease to 200’ would result in coverage to approximately 2,400 wireless users. TAG Tower would be building the tower, Verizon would be the first service on the tower and have the highest placement, with co-location of other providers allowed lower on the tower. The PC had previously asked about

illumination – the tower will be illuminated as required by the FAA with red lights at two levels, one at approximately 175’ and one at 255’.

Noonan stated that no matter how bright or dim the tower lights are, you can still see them, no matter where you’re at. The applicant stated that once they go over 199’, which they feel they need to get the needed coverage, they must have it lighted. The applicant stated that there are significant differences between old towers (which did not have upward pointed lights) and new towers. They do not want to put lights on the towers either, but they are required to. They would prefer to keep the tower lower, but to reach the additional 1,100 customers, which they are required to do with their license, they need to go higher. If they can’t go higher, they will need to install a second tower.

Eftaxiadis appreciates the statement of network need from the radio frequency engineer from Verizon Wireless – it included a lot of information. In the document it refers to “candela” – the applicant stated this is a measurement of luminosity. Eftaxiadis noted that one of the stated goals is the coverage of areas along M-72 from the tower west to CR-675, and that sometimes there is a lack of capacity currently. Is this due to too many people? The applicant stated yes, it is due to too many signals being received by existing towers. Eftaxiadis stated that the statement of network need stated that a 250’ tower would cover 3,500 people, while the 200’ tower would cover 1,100 people fewer. There are only about 1,600 people in the township. There are not that many people in the township for coverage. He does not see a substantially measurable coverage difference in Kasson Township based on the difference in height. Is the higher tower’s purpose to cover areas outside of the township or within the township? The applicant stated that the people covered are not just the residents, it is everyone in the service area, including the traffic on M-72. The applicant stated that it is very difficult to see with the naked eye the coverage difference between the two propagation maps between the two tower heights, but there is actually a substantial difference. In addition, Verizon will be the highest place on the tower, and so lowering the height will make other co-located services also lower with smaller coverage areas. The applicant stated that there may be up to three co-located services.

Eftaxiadis asked how co-location would be guaranteed. The applicant stated that on the site plan, the tower is shown to be designed for four total carriers – Verizon and three others. The Federal Communications Act also requires co-location, in addition to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Eftaxiadis asked where the lights would be – the applicant stated that the lights would be at approximately 175’ and 255’, and would be white during the day and red at night, per FAA requirements. The applicant stated that the lights would be the equivalent of a 30 watt lightbulb, a very dull light. It would not be a bright light. Eftaxiadis summarized that the increase in height requires the addition of the lights, which is substantial in a dark-sky environment, but has the benefit of the increase in service coverage. He sees a burden on the residents of the township with the increase in height. The applicant states that co-location is also a benefit, as it provides

other carriers with the ability to provide service. The lowering of those carriers by placing them on a 50'+ shorter tower has the potential to make them unable to fulfill their service licenses, resulting in requests for additional towers. Eftaxiadis asked about existing towers – the applicant has provided a map of existing towers, and Verizon is already located on all of them. The proposed tower location is located in an existing coverage gap – increasing the height of current towers would result in overlaps that actually decrease service.

The applicant stated that the important portion of the increase in height is the large increase in wireless users covered. Their license requires them to cover coverage gaps, regardless of municipal boundaries. Other towers have coverage that comes into Kasson Township, even if they are located in other townships. This taller tower will also make it so that other providers have less ability to argue for new towers. They are using the latest technology for lights to make this tower as minimally intrusive as possible, and locating it in an active mine is part of that. Cypher stated that it is a requirement of the FAA that these lights on the taller towers not be shielded. Noonan agrees that they shouldn't be shielded, or aircraft couldn't see them – however, he thinks the taller, lighted tower is too much.

T. Carter asked for clarification regarding other carriers being able to ask for additional towers. The applicant read the provision of the law, and stated that there is case law that states that if a carrier can prove they cannot provide effective service on existing towers, a township can be required to allow additional 199' towers. The applicant feels that dropping from 250' to 199' would both reduce their ability to cover their customers and reduce the ability of other providers to cover their customers.

Public Comment – Jim Selby – He lives in Kasson Township. He is in opposition to building the tower. The detraction from the natural area and dark skies is huge as compared to an inconsequential increase in coverage. The applicant is speculating on co-location on the tower, while the current application only benefits the current applicant. More small towers are the future of cellular communication, not larger towers. The area needs lots of small towers to take care of capacity issues, not larger towers. The township should be encouraging small towers with no lighting, not these larger towers. The strobe lights are obnoxious and bright. He hopes that the Planning Commission can support the community against the short-sighted zoning request.

Linda Shimek – She is opposed to the tower. Kasson Township already has a landfill, gravel pits, three miles of berms on both sides of the road from her house, and now the township is considering putting a tower there because it's already a gravel pit. She is opposed to one more thing in Kasson Township that she's not sure is needed. The 1,100 people that could be serviced better – are those Verizon customers or people on other carriers? Is this tower 5G? There are medical and health concerns regarding electromagnetic fields from electronic devices, and it is being taken to another level with 5G, which is designed for larger uses like Munson Healthcare – it's not something

individuals need. On the health side, there are countless articles that ask people to think about the health considerations of all of the radio frequencies passing through the air. Shimek summarized an article regarding potential health considerations of these towers, and the impacts on local residents and employees of Elmers.

Bill Hendershot – The applicant gave a great presentation. He asked whether the tower had been approved and something was going up no matter what? If he searches the internet, he cannot find a long-term study that says 5G is safe – he doesn't want to be a guinea pig. We used to function fine without cell phones. This tower is unnecessary, it's ugly, and it's not what we need in our township.

Evan Hendershot – He opposes this tower. Like Mrs. Shimek said, there are unspeakable health problems due to the radiation and signals from cell towers. The lights are bright enough for planes to see, so they will be bright enough for people to see. He doesn't want to live half a mile from this tower and its effects.

There was no further public comment.

The applicant responded – regarding co-locations, Verizon has the largest network, and so if they have a hole, other carriers have holes. TAG Towers will own the tower, with Verizon and other providers locating on the tower. When Verizon locates a tower, it is the general practice of other carriers to locate on those towers. TAG Towers already has other carriers interested in this tower. Regarding the violation of the aesthetics of the area, he understands that a gravel pit is not necessarily what the people want, but it is there, and it is a use that is the most consistent with the location of a tower. It constitutes an effective prohibition to say no towers at all, or no visible towers, and effective prohibitions are not allowed. The applicant summarized other case law regarding towers and the fact that negative votes must be supported by substantial evidence. The applicant is doing everything in their power to project the light upward and to give co-location the best options.

Regarding the option of a large number of small towers, they must be widely spread out. With towers at 50', it would do nothing to fix the coverage gap, even if there were 30 of them in the township. Many ordinances prefer to limit the number of towers. The applicant is trying to do their best to make a tower that is effective for everyone.

The federal law states that no state or local government may regulate towers based on environmental effects if they otherwise meet FCC guidelines. The proposed towers meet FCC guidelines by a wide margin. 5g or otherwise, all that is projected is radio waves, not x-rays or ionizing radiation which is harmful to human tissue. Radios are not harmful to human tissue. The American Cancer Society states that while there are concerns about cell phones themselves, there is little or no concern regarding cancer emissions from towers, because the radio waves as they reach ground level are thousands of times less

intense than other emissions such as car radios or tvs. The FCC prohibits local municipalities from considering health effects as a reason to deny.

Eftaxiadis asked if a 200' tower can be lattice or monopole, a 250' tower has to be lattice style? The applicant stated yes, either lattice or guyed.

Cypher stated that a draft findings of fact had been distributed. The PC moved into a review and discussion of the draft findings of fact. No project schedule has been provided. The applicant stated that, if the project is approved, building permits would be requested within 30 days, and within 30-60 days of receiving the building permit, construction would commence. Construction is expected to take about 90 days, with weather and materials as the largest variables. There is also some variability in this schedule based on the length of time to get permits. They would need to get 23 other agency approvals for the tower, which they are working on. Cypher also reminded the PC that the approval is not final until the minutes are approved, and so no other permits can be granted until that is done.

The PC discussed the Findings of Section 7.7, Basis for Determination. The PC discussed whether the tower would be harmonious and appropriate in appearance with the existing or intended character of the general vicinity. Noonan does not feel the tower is harmonious and appropriate because it will rise above the gravel pit. Eftaxiadis would like to return to the discussion on this point. The PC will return to part A. The lower buildings and bottom of the tower will be buffered/screened, but the upper part of the tower will be visible. The PC had quorum consensus that parts B, C, and D have been met for standards, with Noonan disagreeing on part B. The PC discussed part E, including the potential for glare and noise. The lower lights will be dark sky friendly, shielded, and used only when technicians are present. Eftaxiadis feels that the proposed tower does not meet part E, due to the glare from the upper and lower lights.

The applicant stated that if they are not able to get approval for this tower at 255', they are willing to reduce the tower height to 199' to be able to remove the upper lights. However, they warned that this may increase the number of towers needed in the area by co-locators. The PC had consensus that if the tower is 199' and does not need lights, part E is met. The PC then returned to the discussion of parts A and B and whether those are met if the tower is 199'. Noonan feels that the tower itself is not harmonious to the area, and the height doesn't matter. Lanham stated that Elmers currently has a 90' tower in the pit. The PC had quorum consensus with Noonan disagreeing that parts A and B are met with the tower at 199'. The PC had quorum consensus that parts F, G, and H were met, and that part I was met with the provision of a project schedule and the administrative approval of co-locations by Cypher. The PC had quorum consensus that part J was met as long as other agencies give approval. Noonan stated that he disagreed with all of the findings, as he does not believe the tower should be there at all.

Cypher stated that engineering has been completed for the construction of the tower. No soil borings have been provided. The applicant agreed to a condition that soil certificates be provided before the final approval of the project. There were no changes to page 7 and 8 of the draft findings. The PC briefly discussed proposed screening and buffering, part of which is the existing berm. If Elmers were to ever sell the property or close the gravel pit, the berm could be removed. The applicant asked for a condition that if the berm is ever removed, they replace it with landscaping screening on their own property per the Zoning Ordinance requirements. There is already a 6' chain link fence proposed around the property. This relates to points 18 and 20 on page 9, and will be repeated as a condition for the findings of Section 5.17 part A and B on pages 10 and 11. Eftaxiadis asked what the life expectancy of the tower is – the applicant replied, practically forever. In the attorney's knowledge of 40 years, no tower has been removed due to falling into disrepair. They are only removed if they are no longer needed.

The PC discussed the need for an escrow deposit. There is a requirement in the ordinance that a tower be removed if it is no longer in use. There were attorney expenses with regards to the tower on the part of the township. Cypher believes it would be appropriate to ask for escrow fees for those already-incurred costs. He will work with the clerk to determine what those costs are. No performance guarantee will be required. The applicant is willing to pay reasonable attorney costs. If there is a dispute regarding what is reasonable between Cypher and the applicant, it will be brought back to the PC for discussion.

Carter stated that he can clearly see the tower on Tower Road from his house. However, from his house on Shimek Road, over the years, the tower just becomes some part of the landscape, not something that he sees as intrusive. The PC determined that the discussion of the findings was finalized.

Conditions:

- **The tower will be limited to 199 feet**
- **A written project schedule will be included as part of the findings of fact**
- **All other applicable agency approvals up to the county level will be received by the township, in addition to FCC and FAA approval**
- **Information regarding appropriate soil conditions will be submitted by the applicant**
- **If the Elmers berm is ever removed, the applicant will replace it with landscaping screening on their own property per the Zoning Ordinance requirements.**
- **The applicant will pay reasonable attorney costs for the project based on invoicing.**

Eftaxiadis moved to approve with conditions listed, based on the Findings of Fact, the Verizon Wireless/TAG Tower application for a Special Use application at 2488 W. Empire Hwy, for a

199' tower, on June 17, 2024. Carter seconded. Roll call vote: Carter (yes), Eftaxiadis (yes), Roush (yes), Noonan (no), Lanham (yes). Motion carried.

Carter moved to close the public hearing at 9:30 pm. Eftaxiadis seconded. All in favor, motion carried.

- C. Zoning Ordinance Amendments for PC Review – Tabled
- D. Bylaws Review - Tabled

XI. Public Comment – None

XII. Comments from the Commissioners – None

XIII. Next Meeting - Monday, July 15, 2024 at 7:00 p.m.

IX. Adjournment

Chairman Roush asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. **Noonan moved to adjourn the meeting, Carter seconded. All in favor, motion carried.** The meeting was adjourned at 9:34 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Dana Boomer
Township Clerk

Thomas Deering
8445 S. Maple Street
Maple City, MI 49664
231-620-9668
June 13, 2024

Dear Kasson Township Planning Commission:

Per the rezoning application for tax parcel number 45-007-002-013-01 to be rezoned from Residential to "Mixed Use Commercial Core", I would like to go on record, after careful consideration, as objecting to this change. My property borders this parcel on both South and the East property lines.

I have lived in Maple city for many decades and have raised my family here. I have also served on the Kasson Township Zoning Commission and understand what a difficult job it is, protecting the character and beauty of our area, while allowing for growth.

I have spoken to Mr. Sutherland, the owner of the parcel, who told me that he wanted to put 2 modular homes on the property, then showed me plans to put 5 or 6 modular homes there, for employee housing. He was wanting to purchase 1,300 square feet of property from me so that the lot in question would equal 2 acres.

The Current Zoning Allows 2 Single Family Dwellings per acre on the parcel in question, whereas the change to Mixed Use Commercial Core would allow up to 16 dwellings per acre for Multi-family dwellings as well as a number of other incompatible uses. This would be a drastic change from the surrounding Single Family homes use. It sounds like too many people on a small/narrow parcel.

This change has the potential to create a number of issues with water, sewage, parking, noise and traffic on Maple Street, as well as diminish property values for the surrounding property. Who would want to buy property next to 5 or 6 homes OR 16 Multi-family dwellings with no or very small yards, with no room for a picnic table, grill or a swing set for the kids.

Having 25 or more people living on less than 2 acres of land in the neighborhood would lower the quality of life for us all. This change is not compatible with the surrounding uses nor the Master Plan and appears to have no benefit to the residents of Maple City nor Kasson Township.

Sincerely,

Thomas O. Deering

John & Linda Kuhn
5811 S Lime Lake Rd
Cedar, MI 49621

June 17, 2024

Kasson Township Zoning Administrator
PO Box 226
Lake Leelanau, MI 49653

Re: Opposition to proposed rezoning of Kasson Twp parcel 45-007-002-013-01

We are writing to voice our opposition to the proposed rezoning of the parcel located at 8419 S Maple St.

As the neighboring property directly across the street from this parcel, we are strongly opposed to this proposed zoning change. Maple Street is a quiet, residential street of single family residences. This change would be "spot zoning" where one parcel is singled out and changed without regard for the neighborhood. It would create additional traffic on our quiet street and does not fit in. It could also adversely affect the property values in the neighborhood.

While we are encouraged by the efforts to provide affordable workforce housing, we do not feel this is an appropriate location for it. We believe that this should remain a residential property, and not be changed to Mixed Use Commercial Core.

Respectfully,

John and Linda Kuhn