

CITY OF MUSKEGON
PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
MINUTES

June 10, 2021

T. Michalski called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and roll was taken.

MEMBERS PRESENT: L. Spataro (Muskegon, MI), B. Mazade (Muskegon, MI), T. Michalski (Muskegon, MI), J. Doyle (Muskegon, MI), J. Montgomery-Keast (Muskegon, MI), S. Gawron (Muskegon, MI), F. Peterson (Muskegon, MI)

MEMBERS ABSENT: D. Keener, E. Hood

STAFF PRESENT: M. Franzak, C. Cashin

OTHERS PRESENT: D. Skoglund of Muskegon Rescue Mission, A. Maike of Baker College, M. Smillie of Bethany Christian Services, J. Osterhart of Capstone Companies, A. Harris of Dockers, B. Grimm of Sandbar.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A motion to approve the Minutes of the regular Planning Commission meeting on May 13, 2021 was made by J. Montgomery-Keast, supported by J. Doyle and unanimously approved.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Hearing, Case 2021-13

Request to rezone the property at 1747 7th St from I-2, General Industrial to B-4, General Business, by Muskegon Rescue Mission.

SUMMARY

1. The property measures 1.2 acres and has frontage on 7th St and Park St.
2. The Muskegon Rescue Mission is requesting a rezoning to B-4, General Business, in order to develop the property as a center for social services, childcare and training.
3. The property is adjacent to the Rescue Missions shelter at 400 W Laketon Ave.
4. Notice was sent to applicants within 300 feet of the property. At the time of this writing, staff had not received any comments from the public.

Staff recommends approval of the rezoning. This section of the neighborhood is continuing to see a shift from industrial uses to more neighborhood friendly commercial/service uses, which is recommended by the Master Plan.

Time was allotted for public comment with contact information provided. No comments were received. A motion by J. Montgomery-Keast was made to close the public hearing, supported by J. Doyle and unanimously approved.

A motion that the request to rezone the property at 1747 7th St from I-2, General Industrial to B-4, General Business be recommended to the City Commission for approval was made by J. Montgomery-Keast, supported by L. Spataro and approved with S. Gawron, F. Peterson, J. Doyle, B. Mazade, J. Montgomery-Keast, L. Spataro, T. Michalski voting aye.

Hearing, Case 2021-14

Request for a special use permit to expand a non-conforming structure no more than 30% at 1683 Edgewater St, by Ron & Sherri Balaskovitz.

SUMMARY

1. The property is zoned R-1, Low Density Single Family Residential.
2. The lot measures a half acre and has 66' of frontage along Edgewater St.
3. The house does not meet the side setback requirement of six feet on the northern side. The chimney encroaches onto the adjacent property and the eaves appear to be on the property line. This makes the house a legally non-conforming structure.
4. The applicant is requesting to add a covered porch to the front of the house and would like to continue with the current non-conforming setback (zero lot line). The zoning ordinance states that a non-conforming structure may be expanded by no more than 30% with the issuance of a special use permit.
5. The existing house is 1,872 sf. The proposed addition is 372 sf (20% addition).
6. Notice was sent to applicants within 300 feet of the property. At the time of this writing, staff had only received one comment. Ned Carter at 1741 Edgewater supports the proposed addition.

Staff recommends approval of the request as long as the adjacent property owner does not have an objection.

J. Montgomery-Keast asked M. Franzak if the porch was going to be just a covered roof or will there be walls interrupting the sightline view. M. Franzak was not sure what the homeowner planned for the walls and the homeowner did not attend the meeting.

Some public comment was mailed and emailed in regarding this case, see attached. Time was allotted for public comment with contact information provided. No comments were received. A motion by J. Montgomery-Keast was made to close the public hearing, supported by L. Spataro and unanimously approved.

A motion that the for a special use permit to expand a non-conforming structure no more than 30% at 1683 Edgewater Street be approved was made by L. Spataro, supported by B. Mazade and approved with S. Gawron, F. Peterson, J. Doyle, B. Mazade, J. Montgomery-Keast, L. Spataro, T. Michalski voting aye.

Hearing, Case 2021-15

Request for a special use permit to allow for a private office use (non-school related) at 1903 Marquette Ave (Baker College), by Bethany Christian Services.

SUMMARY

1. The property is zoned RM-1, Low Density Multi-Family Residential. This zoning district allows colleges as a special use permit, however, the college was in existence before the ordinance was amended, so there is not a special use permit on file and the college is considered a legally non-conforming use. Offices are also allowed with the issuance of a special use permit.
2. The college is proposing to lease extra office space to Bethany Christian Services. They are proposing to lease building H (please see campus map on following pages).
3. The property measures 38.5 acres.

Staff recommends approval of the request. However, if more non-education related requests are made in the future, the college should consider a rezoning to a business district.

L. Spataro requested that the staff or commission advise the property owner to rezone the entire property, so it doesn't need to be done one case at a time; M. Franzak agreed.

A. Maike clarified that this this request is actually for educational purposes, it's just a younger client base of children preparing for adoption services.

Time was allotted for public comment with contact information provided. No comments were received. A motion by J. Montgomery-Keast was made to close the public hearing, supported by L. Spataro and unanimously approved.

A motion that the request for a special use permit to allow for a private office use at 1903 Marquette Ave be approved was made by J. Montgomery-Keast, supported by J. Doyle and approved with S. Gawron, F. Peterson, J. Doyle, B. Mazade, J. Montgomery-Keast, L. Spataro, T. Michalski voting aye.

Hearing, Case 2021-16

Request to vacate the alley north of Holbrook Ave and east of Huizenga St, by Newkirk Electric Associates.

SUMMARY

1. This alley exists only on paper and does not function for traffic.
2. The applicant owns both properties that are separated by the alley.
3. The applicant is requesting to vacate the alley in order to expand outdoor operations.
4. The area is zoned for industrial and is part of the Medendorp Industrial Park.
5. Some of the outdoor storage areas are causing blight, visible from Laketon Ave, Roberts St and Keating Ave.

Staff recommends approval of the request, contingent upon the applicant screening storage areas with a wooden privacy fence. It also appears that barbed wire, which is not allowed, has been installed on some of the newer fences.

J. Montgomery-Keast asked M. Franzak if the fence had to be wood. M. Franzak clarified that it doesn't need to be wood, but preferable not the metal slats that weave into the chain link, as they rust and fall apart.

Time was allotted for public comment with contact information provided. No comments were received. A motion by J. Doyle was made to close the public hearing, supported by J. Montgomery-Keast and unanimously approved.

A motion that the request to vacate the alley north of Holbrook Ave and east of Huizenga St be recommended to the City Commission for approval with the following condition:

1. The applicant properly screens the outdoor storage from all vantage points on Laketon Ave, Roberts St and Keating Ave and removes barbed wire fence toppers before approval is given.

was made by L. Spataro, supported by J. Montgomery-Keast and approved with S. Gawron, F. Peterson, J. Doyle, B. Mazade, J. Montgomery-Keast, L. Spataro, T. Michalski voting aye.

Hearing, Case 2021-17

Request for dimensional requirement departures for a proposed building at 450 W Western Ave, by Andrew Harris.

SUMMARY

1. The property is zoned FBC, Downtown.
2. Staff has reviewed the plans and have determined that the following departures are needed:
 - a. To allow for a retail building type instead of a mixed-use building.
 - b. The building width at front street shall be built to a minimum of 90% of the overall width of the front street property line.
 - c. Building shall have a flat roof with parapet.
 - d. Building shall have a cornice expression line at roofline.
 - e. Height of parapet wall shall be between 12" minimum and 4 feet maximum, measured from roof line (no parapet wall).
 - f. The terrace is required to be placed at the build-to-line
 - g. Steps to access the terrace shall occur at intervals of not greater than 50 feet.
 - h. Terrace finish level above sidewalk shall be 42 inches maximum (no dimension provided).
 - i. Storefronts shall extend across eighty (80) percent of the overall length of the first story and shall be interrupted by the required 18" to 32" wide pilaster spaced as indicated by building type.
 - j. Entry door is required to be recessed three (3) feet to eight (8) feet from the facade wall of the building. The angled wall (the wall that connects the storefront to the door) in the recess area shall match the

main storefront window.

- k. Storefront window glass shall be eight (8) feet high minimum, measured from the adjacent grade of terrace (no dimension provided).
- l. Transparency: Storefront frontage shall have 60% to 80% of the facade be windows between the top of the storefront base and bottom of sign band (or horizontal expression line). Entry door transparency shall be included as part of the required transparency calculation.
- m. Required 18" to 30" high storefront base.
- n. Overhead doors that replace storefront windows are required to meet the transparency requirements listed above.

Staff recommends approval of the plan, with some modifications. Staff will be meeting with the applicant before the meeting to amend the plan. This is a unique parcel in the heart of the entertainment area of downtown and this pedestrian friendly development will encourage more pedestrian interaction among the arena and convention center. Low walls of the terrace that are designed for seating are encouraged.

L. Spataro was concerned that this facility will not comfortably be able to operate and outdoor deck year-round, therefore will not be an asset to downtown. F. Peterson mentioned that he looks at this current proposal as an incremental improvement that will allow for the applicant to open a space quickly and then possibly over time develop something bigger in the space. A. Harris said they are working hard to find ways to make this space function year-round, with fireplaces and heaters. A. Harris there is room for 100 seats in the building at tables and at the bar. L. Spataro asked if there would be food at this facility, since there is not a commercial kitchen in the drawings. A. Harris stated they are planning to host food trucks on the northside of the property to serve their guests.

Time was allotted for public comment with contact information provided. No comments were received. A motion by J. Montgomery-Keast was made to close the public hearing, supported by J. Doyle and unanimously approved.

L. Spataro liked the maximized interaction that this space will have with the street and accepted the developer's word that this will generate year-round activity.

A motion that the request for dimensional requirement departures as described in the staff report at 450 W Western Ave by Andrew Harris be approved with the following departures:

- 1. To allow for a retail building type instead of a mixed-use building.
- 2. The building width at front street shall be built to a minimum of 90% of the overall width of the front street property line.
- 3. The terrace is required to be placed at the build-to-line
- 4. Steps to access the terrace shall occur at intervals of not greater than 50 feet.
- 5. Storefronts shall extend across eighty (80) percent of the overall length of the first story and shall be interrupted by the required 18" to 32" wide pilaster spaced as indicated by building type.
- 6. Entry door is required to be recessed three (3) feet to eight (8) feet from the facade wall of the building. The angled wall (the wall that connects the storefront to the door) in the recess area shall match the main storefront window.
- 7. Required 18" to 30" high storefront base.

was made by L. Spataro, supported by J. Doyle and approved with S. Gawron, F. Peterson, J. Doyle, B. Mazade, J. Montgomery-Keast, L. Spataro and T. Michalski voting aye.

Hearing, Case 2021-18

Request for an amendment to the Harbour Towne Planned Unit Development to allow for a storage container to be placed at 3505 Marina View Point (Dockers).

SUMMARY

1. The property is part of the Harbour Towne Planned Unit Development (PUD).
2. A storage building was not part of the original PUD, so it requires an amendment to the PUD.
3. The container is currently located on site and was being used temporarily during construction. The applicant is now in need for permanent storage for the restaurant facility. The applicant is proposing to paint the container and add murals to it as well.
4. The container is larger than 200 sf (320 sf), so the Inspections Department would require a building permit for it to become a permanent structure.
5. Notice was sent to applicants within 300 feet of the property. At the time of this writing, staff had received one comment from Chris and Beth Cok, 1466 W Harbour Towne Cir who are opposed to a container and would prefer similar construction materials as used in the restaurant building.
6. Please see the enclosed site plan and rendering.

Staff recommends approval of the request as long as the trailer is removed.

B. Mazade stated that this shipping container was supposed to be used for construction purposes, but has been blight on this property for nearly three years and has already been being used as a storage container for much of that time. He also mentioned that a parking plan was approved by the Planning Commission on April 15, 2021, but now this new plan has the previously approved landscape islands removed from the parking plan. A. Harris said that he had a miscommunication with his parking lot contractor and she started work before official approval, but that he did tell her to fill in the landscape islands because they were two giant holes in their parking lot. He also mentioned that he is aware that the shipping container is an eye-sore and he had been planning to paint the shipping container, but didn't want to if it was going to be removed. He was also unaware that these items needed to come before the Planning Commission. J. Montgomery-Keast asked if the newly proposed triangular parking lot islands would be added and A. Harris said they would be if approved.

A. Harris commented on a public comment email regarding the trash bins, gates and storage container being open. He stated that he has directed staff to keep these items closed, but also has issues with Harbour Town residents using some of the trash receptacles and leaving the gates or bins open.

Some public comment was mailed and emailed in regarding this case, see attached. Time was allotted for public comment with contact information provided. Ed Bailey from 1410 E. Harbour Towne Circle called in to remind the Planning Commissioners of the PUD in place and that the Dockers is not their own entity. Dockers is only one part of the PUD and decisions need to be brought forward for public comment and made to benefit all members of the PUD. No other public comment was received. A motion by J. Doyle was made to close the public hearing, supported by J. Montgomery-Keast and unanimously approved.

L. Spataro was disturbed that the parking lot design was changed without consulting staff, because of requirements for drainage and landscaping. He also mentioned that if storage is needed, Dockers should look into building a storage structure that is in line with the existing architecture on and around the property.

A motion that the request for an amendment to the Harbour Towne Planned Unit Development to allow for a storage container to be placed at 3505 Marina View Point be recommended to the City Commission for denial was made by B. Mazade, supported by L. Spataro and approved with J. Doyle, B. Mazade, J. Montgomery-Keast, T. Michalski and L. Spataro voting aye and S. Gawron and F. Peterson voting nay.

Hearing, Case 2021-19

Request for a special use permit to expand a non-conforming structure no more than 30% at 1031 W Laketon Ave, by Sand Bar.

SUMMARY

1. The property is zoned B-4, General Business.
2. The structure is considered legally non-conforming because it does not meet the required 10 foot front setback on Franklin Ave. The current setback of the building is only about six inches.
3. The applicant is requesting to continue that non-conformity by constructing an addition to the building that would match the same front setback on Franklin Ave.
4. The zoning ordinance states that a non-conforming structure may be expanded by no more than 30% with the issuance of a special use permit.
5. The existing building measures 4,097 sf. The proposed addition is 1,500 sf. However, only 300 sf (30' x 10') of the addition would be considered in the required front setback.
6. There is currently a temporary sitting area on site that was allowed during the pandemic. This tent area would be removed in order to construct the addition.
7. A parking plan is currently being developed and will be presented at the meeting. An initial review shows that the site may be losing about nine parking spaces. The parking section of the zoning ordinance states that there must be one (1) space for every seventy-five (75) sq. ft. of usable floor area, or one (1) space for every three (3) seats, whichever is greater. The building would be a total of 5,597 sf after the addition, but not all of it would be useable. More information will be presented at the meeting.
8. The former alley to the south has been vacated and appears to have been replatted at some point. This area now allows for access around the building and allows the addition to meet the required 10' side setback.
9. Commercial uses are required to screen themselves from residential areas with a privacy fence of at least five feet. There is no fence on site at the current location, but staff recommends requiring a fence as part of the approval.
10. A stormwater management plan has recently been submitted to the Engineering Department and is under review. More information will be presented at the meeting.
11. Notice was sent to applicants within 300 feet of the property. At the time of this writing, staff had received one comment from Dwayne Hekkema at 990 W Laketon Ave. Please see his comments enclosed.

Staff recommends approval of the request as long as a shared parking agreement is made, the stormwater plan is approved by Engineering and a privacy fence is installed to screen from residential uses.

M. Franzak shared that a shared parking plan with Muskegon Catholic Central has been approved by Ken Rasp, President of Muskegon Catholic Central. L. Spataro suggested that the Planning Commission keep in mind that this bar was in place well before any of the neighbors moved into the neighborhood. J. Doyle asked M. Franzak about screening the bar from the neighboring house and what was going to happen to the vacated alley. M. Franzak said they will need to screen the neighboring house and the alley is currently vacated, but the businesses on the block have agreed to keep the alley open to vehicles. B. Mazade asked M. Franzak about the quality of life complaints from the public. M. Franzak mentioned that this property is currently zoned for business and that is not changing or expanding, only a change in the setback for this property. T. Michalski is concerned about the crowded parking with the enlargement of the building. J. Doyle asked about the motorcycle parking that appears to be along or in the alley. M. Franzak stated that he spoke with the applicant and the site plan does not include the all, so those parking spots go up to the alley but not into the alley.

B. Grimm stated that he is planning to have a band stand, a cooler and approximately 30 additional seats in the addition. His hope is that with the addition the sound will be better controlled for the neighborhood to the south. Regarding parking, B. Grimm mentioned that he has talked to the businesses to the east and west of his property about shared parking and only Wesco agreed to allow SandBar guests to park there and he does not want his guests walking across Laketon Ave. B. Mazade asked B. Grimm about the quality of life for the neighbors of the bar. B. Grimm said he agrees with L. Spataro's comments about these neighbors buying a home next a bar, not the other way around and that most of the motorcycle traffic that people complain about are coming from Wesco.

Some public comment was mailed and emailed in regarding this case, see attached. Time was allotted for public comment with contact information provided. No comments were received. A motion by J. Montgomery-Keast was made to close the public hearing, supported by J. Doyle and unanimously approved.

A motion that the request for a special use permit to expand a non-conforming structure no more than 30% at 1031 W Laketon Ave be approved subject to the following conditions:

1. A privacy fence is installed on the southside of the property to screen noise from neighboring houses was made by F. Peterson, supported by J. Montgomery-Keast and approved with S. Gawron, F. Peterson, J. Doyle, B. Mazade, J. Montgomery-Keast, L. Spataro and T. Michalski voting aye.

NEW BUSINESS:

None

OLD BUSINESS

None

UPDATES ON PREVIOUS CASES:

The Verplank facility at 151 N. Causeway was approved at City Commission.

OTHER

None

ADJOURN

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 5:43 PM.

Public comment that was mailed or emailed in, regarding cases listed above:

Case 2021-14: 1683 Edgewater St

This is to inform you that I have no objections to the proposed expansion.

Edwin W. Carter

1741 Edgewater Street, Muskegon, MI 49441

Regarding today's Planning Commission Meeting case # 2021-14 for 1683 Edgewater St., we support the approval of the permit. We live next to this residence.

Sincerely,

Chuck and Kathy Bieszka

Ron and Sherri Balaskovitz have applied for a variance to extend their front porch. Attached is a variance request that I had submitted to rebuild the house at 1677 Edgewater. My request was approved by the zoning board. Also. Attached is the survey including the building envelope also.

As long as I have in WRITING from you that my approved variance will not change and I can rebuild the house at 1677 Edgewater I am not opposed to the variance that the Balaskovitz's. are requesting.

Let me know if you need anything else.

Thank you,

Tom Blake

This is in response to Case 2021-14 1683 Edgewater St.

We think it's great to see neighbors investing in their homes. The porch addition as designed will blend into the existing home perfectly.

Mike & Joan Eichenberg

1661 Edgewater ST

Mr. Franzak, my name is Kevin Moore, I live at 1695 Edgewater Street and received a notice dated May 26th 2021 regarding the petition from Ron & Sherri Balaskovitz.

I am writing you to show support of the petition and the request for a special use permit to expand no more than 30%. I do not have any objections.

Respectfully,

Kevin Moore

Case 2021-18: 3505 Marina View Point

I am a condo owner at 3710 Channel View Point. My driveway and entrance to my condo is in full view of the parking lot for Dockers. We have been facing this very green container for the last few years at the east end of the parking lot along with the garbage bins that are rarely kept up or clean.

I have no problem with a storage unit placed there, but should be hidden by fence or some barrier that would be representative of the buildings around it so that we don't have to look at the mess that's there now every time we come home or leave my condo. Dockers is open approximately 4 months a year. The containers and garbage area is in full view for 12 months a year. It seems to me that the city would be very concerned about the looks that all people coming in and leaving the restaurant (4 months) as well as all residents on Channel View Point (12 months) and Marina View Point (12 months) have to endure. Now this area is an eyesore and it's the 1st thing people see when coming into the establishment and/or our condos.

We need to keep the lakefront property in the best shape possible for all visitors coming to our city whether neighbors or visitors. There is only one Lake Shore. Please make this area a pleasing site rather than the mess it looks now.

Thank you

Ken Bandstra

Dear Mike,

We are writing this letter to share the perspective of Harbour Towne Condominium Association (HTCA) related to the recent petition for an amendment (Case# 2021-18) to the Lakeshore Recreational Planned Unit Development by Dockers Restaurant to allow a shipping container to be placed at 3505 Marina View Point. Our Association is not taking a specific position on this petition, however we are requesting that certain stipulations be included in any and all future amendments.

Those stipulations include the following:

- Any permanent structures have an exterior appearance consistent with the color and architecture of the existing Harbour Towne structures surrounding Dockers Restaurant.
- Permanent structures be maintained and landscaped to enhance the appearance of the surrounding area.
- Dumpster lids and the gates of the trash enclosure be kept closed to prevent nuisance animal related issues and street view visibility.
- Outdoor storage of used, seasonal or other nonbusiness related items such as truck toppers, old tables and chairs be prohibited.
- Adequate parking spaces be aligned to the restaurant's capacity limits to allow for all patrons to park in designated parking spots and not on landscaped or dune scaped areas.

HTCA spends considerable monies each year to maintain the appearance of our buildings and surrounding landscape. The natural look of our community and our location continues to keep us one of the most desired condominium communities on the lakeshore. We continue to attract new residents and returning residents to the City of Muskegon. Having a seasonal restaurant within a short walk of our homes is a positive attribute of our community and we support Dockers Restaurant's continued success. We are asking for the City of Muskegon and the Planning Commission to include the above stipulations as part of all future amendments to the Harbour Towne LR-PUD to maintain the appearance and desirability of our development.

Sincerely,

Harbour Towne Condominium Association Board of Directors

Barb Vukits

President

Hi Bryon:

I received an email from a resident that listed some concerns. I'm forwarding his concerns to use as you will. Thanks again for all you do. ED.

- They have displayed a complete disregard for the City ordinances and for the surrounding residential community. "Good neighbors!" Hah!
 - They've placed a rusting storage container on the property they rent without advance approval. Their oblivion to the ordinances has continued for a couple of years now.
 - In addition to the truck topper, there is a table and chairs in the copse of scrub trees next to the container which apparently serves as a break area for employees. These are table and chairs that they wouldn't be caught dead putting in a customer service area either within or on the deck of the restaurant. However, it's apparently OK for these to be placed away from their customers but in view of the HTCA residents or others entering their parking lot.
 - The container meets no City building code or standard. It is not anchored to the ground. It looks like one corner is not even on the pavement of the lot. Someone has attempted to level it on the parking lot by using a broken scrap of lumber under one corner and with no support at all on the opposite corner

Edward Bailey
College Supervisor/Instructor
Baker College of Muskegon

Case 2021-19: 1031 W Laketon Ave

From: Dwayne Hekkema <dwaynehekkema@gmail.com>

My name is Dwayne Hekkema and I live at 990 W. Laketon The sandbar should not have a permit. The sandbar has been sore in the residential area now for the last couple years. The people leaving the bar at night trying to find there cars pushing their beepers flashing There lights Setting there car alarms off blowing therehorn's wakes everybody up. Not to say how the bikes come in throttling up their motors to go to the bar. And when they leave the bar they Throttle up their bikes when they leave and use Laketon as a dragway to leave the bar definitely waking up everyone in the neighborhood. And there's also the yelling screaming fighting, fornicating, urinating, yes urinating. On my porch I have watched the people urinate on the bar on other peoples cars and other peoples front yards. Also throwing their trash empty beer cans, liquor bottles, empty condom wrappers wherever they might be they just toss it. When I talk to one owner he said he would hate to have that happen where he lived. The other owner said shouldn't live next to a bar. During the day they play their loud music on the weekends and we cannot even enjoy a barbecue in our backyard because we have to be part of a party half a block down at our neighbors. None of this should be allowed for some reason it is. We often wonder where the The police are at night when they leave the bar at closing and they tear up Lake then waking everybody up. We have found that the owners have no respect or caring of their neighbors. All signs the one business across the street. Does not even turn his sign on late at night because he does not want it to shine another neighbors house. Their gear motorcycle cares about their neighbors by cleaning up their business and being as quiet as possible. We don't understand how one business can totally disrespecting noise ordinance in the city because after 10 o'clock they're supposed to be quiet. They do not have the proper parking for their business now very few spaces. The overflow goes into the residential area which causes a great problem. We should not have to deal with all the drunks that come looking for their cars down into the neighborhoods where they have to park because the bar does not have adequate parking for the business that they already have. Now when they park into the neighborhoods we have to deal with there are people who are drunk and belligerent and want nothing but trouble it seems when you ask them to be quiet they want to fight. We should not have to fight in our own homes just because we want peace and quiet at night. Thank you very much for listening.

To: the City of Muskegon Planning Commission

Concerning: 1031 W. Laketon Ave, Muskegon, MI 49441. (Case#: 2021-19)

From: Cathy Lieg, Property owner at 1020 W. Laketon Ave., Muskegon, MI 49441

I am against the approval for requested property expansion of structure at 1031 W. Laketon Ave known as the Sandbar. My reasons are 1. They already do not have adequate parking and the streets for blocks are full. 2. The bar is already out of control for a "neighborhood bar". The customers when leaving are loud, obnoxious, and completely disrespectful of the residents in the area. Last summer for some reason the City of Muskegon allowed the bar to have live outside music that was so loud everyone in the neighborhood had to listen to it whether we wanted to or not. We were told to call 911 for noise ordinance but honestly we should not have to do this. The amount of motorcycles speeding between the hours of 10pm and 2:30am has increased since the new owners took control of the bar and the clientele seems to have changed. The new owners want to turn it into a Night Club and because the bar is in the middle of a residential area, I don't believe expanding should be approved and there should Never be Outside Music at any time of day or night, it cannot/will not be monitored and the people who live in the area should not be subjected to the noise. The other thing is, I thought that City property/lots has a build limit, would not an increase of 30% violate this?

--

Sincerely,
Catherine J. Lieg