

Zoning March 1st, 2022

TB (5) TPC (5) Clerk (1) Asst. Clerk (1) TA (1) Email Staff and TPC (10)

DATE	SANITARY PERMIT #	ASH COUNTY PERMIT #	LAND USE PERMIT #	NAME OF PROPERTY OWNER	FIRE #	STREET NAME	PARCEL NUMBER	PROJECT TYPE	FEE AMT	ENTERED
1/28/22			CSM	Schuppe, Deena	1861	Big Bay	014-00097-0100	CSM	250.00T	1/31/22
1/31/22		8490	2022-1	Loew, Cynthia, and Gary	1267	Big Bay	014-00132-0300	Accessory	200.00C 145.00T	1/31/22
2/1/22			CUP	Craftivity, Inc	922	Middle Rd	014-00179-0300	CUP	750.00T	2/1/22
2/9/22		8491	2022-2	Mancino/Beckman	3728	North Shore	014-00311-0200	Camper	300.00C 75.00T	2/9/22
2/9/22	Pending			Mancino/Beckman	3728	North Shore	014-00311-0200	Non-Plumb Sanitary	175.00C	2/9/22
2/9/22		8492	2022-3	O'Dougherty Kevin	U/A	Old Fort Rd	014-00008-0700	Driveway Access Fill and Grade	50.00T 150.00C	2/9/22
2/9/22			2022-4	Kelsey, Susan	657	Spruce Ln	014-00003-1300	Driveway Accessory	145.00 T	2/9/22
2/14/22			CSM	Hartzell, Robert	U/A	East of Mondamin	014-00206-2001 014-00206-2130	CSM (Condo Plat)	250.00T	2/14/22
2/23/22	8512	8493	2022-5	Summitonka Stoddard, Bill	3469	Big Bay	014-00023-0300	Dwelling	300.00C 414.00T	2/23/22
1/4/22	8512			Summitonka	3469	Big Bay	014-00023-0300	Holding Tank	400.00C	1/4/22
1/4/22	8511			Summitonka	3469	Big Bay	014-00023-0300	Privy Non-plumb	175.00C	1/4/22

Permits to Date 12

County 7 \$1700.00 (3 Sanitary 750.00)
 Town 5 684.00

Total Permit Revenue \$2384.00

Town Revenue

Permits \$ 684.00
 CSM (2) @ 250 500.00
 CUP (1) @ 750 750.00
 Total \$1934.00

9 Rental Permits @ \$150.00 have been issued to date. These renewals are due annually by May 15th.

Zoning March 1st, 2022

TB (5) TPC (5) Clerk (1) Asst. Clerk (1) TA (1) Email Staff and TPC (10)

I have asked Mr. Hartzell to apply for a CSM related to his Expandable Condominium which he has. This will come before the Town Plan Commission on March 9th, and recommendation to the Town Board will follow. The acceptance or approval of the CSM is not an endorsement of the type of structures which will be a part of this project, and the Town Plan Commission will draft language clarifying this fact. There are concerns related to the proposed buildings or structures, that of being Glamping Units and the development of twin units. These concerns will be addressed following any deliberation or filing of Condominium Articles, Bylaws etc.

Again, from a zoning and legal perspective an Expandable Condominium is a viable land use.

There is presently a dispute between neighbors on Islewood Road. A new owner wants to access Lot 1 from the existing road and believe they have easement; the neighbors are disagreeing with this claim. There is a utility easement across the new owner's property. These 8 lots were created under the same subdivision and access to all seem to have been held in common. The previous owners of Lot 1 never developed access or building on the lot, but it seems they paid fees for the maintenance of the road. This is a legal issue, and the affected parties are going to need to find resolve. At this point the Zoning Administrator cannot issue a permit until there is clear indication of an easement. I have reached out to the Ashland County Land Description Office to see if they have any related information. At permit application I am alerting the Islewood residents with the proposed plans. It seems some of this confusion derives from a filing err at creation of the lots.

Mr. Josh Rowley has informed me his last day as Zoning Administrator for Ashland County is March 5th as he is taking a job with the State. I have not heard anything regarding his replacement.

We have had some correspondence with the County regarding fire numbers. Our ad hoc committee (Rick Reichkitzer, Cindy Dalzell, Paul Wilharm Zoning and Town Administrator) is reviewing existing problems and attempting to salvage our grid. It seems we do have the ability to number a building with several businesses, occupants or condominiums and assign an identifying unit number or letter for differentiation. This provides the Town with more room on the existing grid. Ashland County GIS will maintain the numbers. We are presently working with Ashland County GIS and Communications Officer.

The Town Board posed some questions related to fire numbers. I offer the following response from Dave McGuire, Communications Officer Ashland County:

Morning, Ric

Let me know if the below responses do not answer what Mr. Kuchta or the board are looking for (indulge me please if any of this is old hat):

Zoning March 1st, 2022

TB (5) TPC (5) Clerk (1) Asst. Clerk (1) TA (1) Email Staff and TPC (10)

1. *“Do we know how many other communities in Ashland County still need fire numbers installed under the new requirements?”*

- a. As of now, there are no other major re-addressing projects underway as far as I am aware. There are 4 other communities in addition to La Pointe that maintain their own addressing systems with varying levels of county involvement. At a minimum, those that maintain their own systems coordinate with the county to make sure that address ranges fall within acceptable standards to integrate with 911 systems (I believe 98% error free is the standard for Lumen (Centurylink) who is the 911 provider for the county. This essentially means that for all landline customer address records on file with all telephone providers, at least 98% of those records must have an address that matches the Master Street Address Guide (MSAG) which contains all address ranges for all roads within the county.

Each community maintaining their own system is responsible for assigning fire numbers, installing/maintaining signs. I have no information as to the current status for any of those systems save for the address range information associated with roads/streets and the GPS points collected for those locations.

As far as the draft ordinance that Brittany had forwarded, that document has not been enacted within the county and at this point can really only be considered a “best practice” guide, bearing in mind that it is still in draft and not finalized. I would think it would be in everyone’s best interest to try and follow that document to avoid problems/complications in the future.

2. *“Was this supposed to be paid for out of a federal grant? If so, how much are we supposed to get? Has the county passed any of that money along?”*

- a. I am aware of no grant funding, federal or otherwise, for any addressing projects. I was under the impression that during the initial push for the county’s addressing project many years ago, those municipalities wishing to take part in the system would have had to contribute budgeted funds to support the project. La Pointe and the other 4 that maintained their own addressing systems did not. Please take the above with a grain of salt—I am by no means a county historian and do not have a full accounting of the ins and outs of that project. If there is a specific program that the board is aware of to support addressing work moving ahead, that’s great news.

I think it would likely benefit all the stakeholders to have a conversation together, including myself and Brittany. As of now Dorothy Tank is no longer involved in addressing, however she still remains the most knowledgeable person regarding the history and is willing to join us.

Please let me know if there are additional questions and if there’s a desire to get together as a larger group.

David McGuire

Director of Public Safety Communications

Respectfully submitted 3-1-22 by Ric Gillman, Zoning Administrator