

Hayes Waterfront Survey Results – Long Answer Responses

Question 10: If you ranked "Other Reason" as a #1, #2, or #3 reason please indicate in the text box your reason for locating on the waterfront.

The zoning on the number of boats appears to have not taken the personal watercraft into account. The green belt appears to have changed from the time that we first located on the lake, 33 feet is the number I recall. A four foot walkway to a dock is not adequate at night and with the aging population. It does not allow for handicap access. The materials used next to the lake need to allow for handicap access. The pruning of vegetation needs to be allowed in a fashion that the lake is clearly visible and does not create a screen. Are flowers included in the restricted vegetation. Has the zoning been enforced or are all of the properties in our area grandfathered, with no greenbelt?

Privacy, quiet

Overall property location.

Lake living is very important and encompasses all aspects of using and viewing the lake

Question 9. On the scale of 1-7, I was not sure which number was "most" important, number 1 or 7. All of the reasons for my purchase of lakefront property would be most important, except for investment appreciation. That was not a consideration

better surrounding houses with a more uniformly up-kept properties

We purchased the property so as to have an open, complete view of the lake, it's ever changing environment, storms approaching. We have been told by Township Officials that "we want to not be able to see your homes when we are in our boats motoring along the 9 Mile Point shoreline". Your policies appear to be in direct conflict with the Supreme Court ruling that it is illegal to discriminate for esthetic reasons. In dealing with the Hayes Zoning Board several times and also knowing of other members of our Association, it is clear that the Township is arbitrary and capricious in your application of the zoning policies. In line with this last statement, the Township's keeping of accurate and complete minutes is a great hinderance to property owners as they try to see if they are being treated fairly or being discriminated against as they attempt to make improvements to their property and/or home. As you are aware or should be aware, MI Law requires that you have almost verbatim minutes of all Zoning Appeal minutes. Instead, it is known that Township Attorneys prefer the vague minutes as they defend the Township against the property owners. I appreciate your attempt to access lake property owners desires on this issue and await the complete and accurate item by item publication of the results of your survey. That would be: starting with item 2- 300 owners responded; 15 less than 5 yrs; 35 5 to 9 years; 50 10 to 14 years and 200 15 or more years.

1 inherited

To be with family.

The Hayes Board does not align itself or follow township survey in terms of protecting / preserving the landscape and water. Continued plans for the massive boat launch and road is not in align with the ordinances and will destroy the lake shore. No private land owner could cut down trees, tear up

shore line, move tons of earth, etc.... The ordinance only pertain to private land owners and local government is only serving themselves.

We wanted sunset views from our house over the water and we wanted Lake Charlevoix over Torch Lake/other because of it's ecosystem (more Up North), interesting topography (size, south arm, Round and Lake MI access) and

Wildlife

To be near the City of Charlevoix and to have access to lake Michigan.

please disregard my answer for question 7. I did not like any choices as worded. Please use only my top 3 answers for question 9. the survey would not accept only 3 answers. Other. The Lake Charlevoix area is one of the best spots on earth

Friends nearby

Access to Lake Michigan

Seclusion

Reasons #1 thru #7 why I purchased my lakefront house is to look at the water. Which is why 80% shoreline coverage within the 50' shore-land protection strip is regulation on steroids. I'd suggest something closer to 30-45% would be more workable and in most cases, still cover the stated intent. In reviewing Section 3.14.1.B (Intent), in no particular order: a.) Visual Barrier - I'm not sure if this means a visual barrier preventing me from being able to see the lake (which seems pretty ridiculous), or a visual barrier to prevent people on the lake from being able to see my house. If the latter, I frankly don't give a shit what the view of the lakeshore looks like from being out on the water; b.) Preventing Soil Erosion - understandable, but it's not clear how or if the actual contour of the lot are taken into account to determine if 50' is appropriate or inappropriate. Or if 80% coverage is appropriate or inappropriate? If the lot is flat near the water, erosion control is less an issue than if there's a steep slope near the shore. c.) Provide a Filter - See b.) above. Additionally, it would seem like Section 4.13 Schedule of Regulations, Maximum % of Impervious Surface (for the entire lot) is as important to providing an effective filter as the 50' closest to the shore, especially for lots that are relatively flat at the shore.

Proximity to Lake Michigan

Question 12: Please feel free to provide additional input on how the Township should protect water quality and how property is developed along Lake Michigan, Lake Charlevoix, and Lake Susan. Survey results are confidential and will be collected and analyzed through a third-party provider and then destroyed.

Education is a must. People should not be buying a lake lot without feeling educated/informed about their restrictions and why. Realtors need to know so that they can ethically make a sale. The Township board needs to see this as one of their roles. Our Association will work harder at getting info out there.

See above

We purchased our property last summer. We felt blessed that we found a property that we could fix up and spend vacation time with our children as well as plan retirement here in the future. Since we purchased our home, what we thought would be an exciting time for us has only been stress and heartache due solely to Hayes Township. We have felt bullied and have never in our lives had this type of deplorable experience with a city or township. We bought the home having no knowledge whatsoever about the ordinances named above. We cut down a handful of trees to open up a little more view for us. The main reason that we purchased our home was due to the view opportunity and being directly on the lake. No one from the previous owners, to the real estate company to the township made us aware of these ordinances. If we did know, then we would have never purchased the property. Shortly after we closed on our property and cut these trees down, we were notified with a letter of what is completely unreasonable replanting requirements within the ordinance. Why is it that the only people accountable are us, people who are Godly and innocent being bullied by the township? Where is the accountability to the seller, to the real estate company and to the township? The township certainly hasn't missed the opportunity to raise my taxes immediately nor bully innocent people who had no malicious intent. Hayes township should be ashamed of themselves and leave us alone. Move on to more important things and look in the mirror on your processes. The township should directly be accountable to let prospective homeowners know of your requirements. It's really easy to kick out letters after the fact and sit back and point the finger at others. Unbelievably disappointed.

I would like to retain the natural beauty of the Area, which may include efforts to remove or reduce any natural or man made occurrence which might threaten it.

Septic systems within 80 feet of the water should be inspected at least every 2 years. Also, farm animals should be kept away from streams feeding into the lakes.

Our family has owned this property for over 50 years. We are on the Lake Michigan shoreline but there is a 30 foot cliff (sandstone) down to the Lake.

Hayes Township has imposed several restrictions on waterfront owners that are not even feasible to comply with or enforce. Please enforce restrictions that are in place on other residence of Hayes township---like junk cars laying around everywhere.

I, like most of my neighbors ON THE LAKE, feel Hayes Township planning board members have and will continue to place their ridiculous ordinances, taxes and regulations that limit our rights as land and home owners. If you look inland in Hayes Township, the zoning is non-existent. Mobile homes with trash all over, old cars all yards. Yet their focus is constantly on saying "no" on doing anything!! Lighten up please!!

I have been a member of both Tip of the Mitt and Lake Charlevoix Assn. Currently, I am not, but will probably become a member of both again this coming year.

Land use regulation is only part of the solution. Greater efforts need to be made to engage with and educate waterfront property owners on their opportunities and obligations. Although the land is held as private property, the water is public; the border area between the two does not belong exclusively to either.

The planning commission needs to get out of other people's business. They are far too activist on the shore front and not nearly concerned enough with the rest of the township. This commission is being driven by people who have a fanciful vision of how everyone else should live their lives and

are all too willing to tell them how to do it in a manner not unlike mullahs and evangelicals. The lack of reasonableness in dealing with older platted subdivisions and the unwillingness to tackle individual situations gives rise to a constant uneasiness in the affected areas and results in deep mistrust of the township government. The regulations reflect a tendency to legislate corrective actions when enforcement of existing regulations on those who break them would suffice. Not to mention that special treatment is afforded or appears to be afforded to wealthy property owners. these are my opinions only.

This above statement shows the true colors of the Hayes Township Officials. The lack of keeping these surveys but instead destroying them is just another example of the sneaking, lack of transparency type of local government within our Township. More than likely, by only sending this to property owners along lake shore within the Township, it will be used by Board Members to pass more ordinances that restrict lake front owners and your lawyer/s will argue that said owners were/are all aware of 3.14 and all other ordinances so that you can assess fines, continue to do illegal things like contract zoning where you made our neighbor take out an existing deck that was in place because the Township did not do it's due diligence with the original owner who built the deck; as well as making unsubstantiated claims to some owners that they replant trees they cleared to have a better lake view while doing nothing to others who have cleared trees. The Shore Land Protection Act was designed to stabilize and decrease shoreline erosion on steep shoreline slopes. A separate district could legally be set up for those of us who have flat lots, or those of us who have nonconforming lots due to increase in township or state regulation. It appears the township has demonstrated the zoning, planning and township board has turned a deaf ear to their voters. As a final note I strongly object to my tax dollars being spent illegally for payment to the clerk for attending and providing minutes for the planning, zoning or any other piece meal functions. Legally the salaries for all elected officials are supposed to be set by the Board in May before the township election and includes all duties required of the Clerk. The Clerk is not supposed to be paid for individual meetings.

It is very difficult to employ a one size fits all strategy for all waterfront properties. Most is not all of the rules developed appear to focus on smaller lots. Larger parcels often have very different needs and requirements to ensure full enjoyment. These needs should be considered when they do not pose a risk to the water quality and safety of the environment. We should let the perfect be the enemy of the pretty dawg gone good!!

Hayes Township does not do an effective job of monitoring the shoreline protection strip. There are many violations within Michigan Shores Subdivision. In fact, many residents think that Hayes Township doesn't care since there has never been any enforcement regarding the protection of the natural trees, shrubs, and native grasses. There are some properties where the majority of trees have been removed. I only know of one enforcement when a storage building was being erected near the shoreline. I would strongly encourage Hayes Township to write citations where violations exist. Violations go back years, as well as those that have occurred within the past few years.

We were extremely disappointed to see permits granted for permanent, oversized docks on Oyster Bay. We urge Hayes Township to take every possible measure to ensure that Oyster Bay does not become some sort of private marina, over-docked and over-crowded. We must protect the land and waters, AND ensure that the McMansion dwellers are not permitted to spill their fertilized landscapes into the eco-system.

Protecting the natural state of land and water and protecting water quality should be the top priorities. Desires of individuals to use/exploit land or water in ways that do not protect the environment are low priorities

After owning our property on Lake Michigan at 9 Mile Point Drive for 9 years, we've decided not to build a primary residence on our lot. We love the property and would have built on it other than the restrictive setbacks which preclude us from a house that could be large enough without going long and narrow. The access to a front facing garage would take up the majority of the width of the building envelope. Our lot is a standard size 65 ft. wide. With the existing 15 foot side setbacks the home could only be 35 ft. in width. Since deciding to sell the lot, at what might be considered a fair amount of money, we've seen many interested parties walk away from a purchase for the exact same reason we're not building. An additional 5 ft. on each side added to the building envelope, allowing for a 45 ft. wide home, would allow for the use of house plans that showcase the front of the house, by allowing for a side entry garage. A side facing garage, according to builders we consulted, on the building envelope as it exists, would be iffy at best with nearly zero room to turn in and out, not a great idea in the winter. Any revisions to the current setback regulation would be a huge game changer.

waterfront property owners should be able to trim trees and remove brush (not mature trees) to enable a view of the water across more than 20% of thier lot and should be allowed to create a beach area within the 50 foot greenbelt. Sand is a good filter too. hayes has gone to far in taking away property rights of lakefront owners and trying to punish people for things put in place 20 to 30 years ago by previous owners. I am not in favor of creating more grass clearcut lawns all the way to the water, but there needs to be a more reasonable balance to allow lot owners to enjoy the waterfrontage they own.

Removal of illegal/violating retaining walls and remediation to the shoreline should be prioritized. There is a large property on the north side of Lake Charlevoix with a huge rock retaining wall that was built approximately in 2012. This seems in violation of this ordinance and should be removed and the shoreline remediated. Trees and vegetation in the understory were largely removed leaving possibly less than 80% of the vegetation. It is heavily landscaped. The property is for sale. It seems the property should be in compliance with the ordinance in order for it to be sold to a new owner. Water quality is of the utmost importance. Taking care of the shoreline is one of the most important ways to protect the water. We'd like to see the ordinance strengthened, not weakened.

Landowners should be allowed to groom their property to enhance view, access and usability.

I really think this country is over regulated. Please try to keep things at a minimum.

The waterfront preservation ordinances while well meaning are a bit of regulatory overreach and very much an "I got mine, screw you too" approach to environmental stewardship. To the benefit of long term property owners, who did not need to abide by current setback and vegetation preservation limits. This creates an unfair dichotomy for anyone who may wish to buy and build on a waterfront property. Limits for newer property owners on their use of their private property for location of homes and landscaping are significantly more stringent now than the more lenient, grandfathered in ordinances of longer term residents. People may purchase waterfront property hoping to enjoy a lake view that is not restricted by leaving 80% of existing vegetation intact. Much like their longer term neighbors whose landscaping may have removed significantly more vegetation and created more unobstructed views. Also limiting are requirements for building sites

that are set back in some cases twice as far back for a new property owner than their neighbors (i.e. 50 vs 100 ft setbacks from ATHW.) The new property owner may have spent significantly more for their property purchase than did their neighbors but don't have the option for a similar lake view. Additionally their home may have to set back twice as far from the lake as their neighbors. I would like to see a better balance between the rights of property owners to use and develop their property with preservation regulations that may or may not significantly impact the health of the shoreline and lake ecosystems.

Tipp of the Mitt Watershed and Lake Charlevoix Association have done nothing to prevent the destruction of pristine lake Charlevoix lakeshore and natural landscape for the sole purposes of creating a massive boat launch and road infrastructure. Hayes Township operates under a different set of zoning and guidelines than private land owners. This survey points out the importance of protecting our waters as well demonstrates given the design plans for the camp seagull show irresponsible certain township officials have performed.

The Township is going about the development of Camp Sea Gull all wrong. Providing a boat launch and fishing pier removes the scenic value from the lake and the land. All the parking except for a few handicap spots should be close to the Boyne City Road. There should be NO boat trailer parking. It saddens us to see trees cut for a new road path, required lighting on a pier that destroy the darkness of the lake, natural lake flow that will be disturbed by the launch, pier and boat wake wash. This is a location that should be used for daylight only non-motorized fun: kayaks, paddle boards, large swimming area, picnicking, tennis, volleyball, horseshoes, etc. Yes, we have seen all the plans, which are environmentally unfriendly across the board; lake damage, shore damage, plant/tree destruction, unnecessary use of man-made materials, light pollution, noise pollution, smoke pollution, trash, plus public liability. Why isn't there a DEQ survey run? Why isn't Charlevoix Planning Commission running a survey? This has always been a place where children played and learned to be good stewards of Lake Charlevoix; where are the good stewards now? This issue is bigger than Hayes Township and its self-serving, conflict-of-interest board. Everyone who has property around the shore of Lake Charlevoix should be surveyed, as it affects all. Really, a cement pier for fishing? This is SO sad, such a waste of money and beauty destroyed

Comments regarding question #5: *A 100' shoreline protection strip places a burden on individuals with small or narrow lots such as mine. **A requirement of 80% vegetation coverage ignores the type of soil and/or sand on a lot. My lot has a considerable amount of sandy beach and planting in that area would be expensive and difficult to establish and/or maintain. It has been this way (its natural state) since the property was purchased more that 30 years ago. ***I purchased my waterfront lot with the expectation of being able to see Lake Michigan! To say that I cannot prune natural arborvitea and keep them at about 10-15' high so I can see over the top of them from inside my home is ridiculous and devalues my property. Also, trees and shrubs can benefit from PROPER pruning.

Increased scrutiny should be given to run-off from certain commercial enterprises, such as golf courses and farms.

I believe that Susan Lake should be dredged. The mucky bottom is disgusting, The water is discolored and most of all the fish have grubbs all over them. The fish that you catch are not worth eating because of the smell of the lake. The boat ramp is so shallow that you can't launch your boat without bearing your vehicle up to the windows. The lake all around is very shallow which causes the lake to be very warm in the summer, which leads to a very bad parasite problem. If you

dredge the lake it will allow for cooler temperatures and better fishing, and a cleaner lake. Also there are zebra mussels thought out the lake, although it make for clearer water, they still are not native to this lake.

Regulation needs to be specifically designed to prevent abusive intrusion of other property owners rights, not to satisfy some individual or small group's ideal vision of what the lake front was or how they would like it to be..... Too much regulation can have a detrimental effect on the value of lakefront property and the economy of community. In question #7, The explanation of the difference between the two different lists was not clear, so we opted for no change until we understand the difference in the two lists of plants. Question #10 ranking is not clear - hopefully the order was #1 being the highest priority and #7 being the lowest priority - that is how our responses were arranged.....

I believe the first 50' should be regulated to the max. However I believe the second 50' from the HWM should be reviewed and worked more cooperatively if natural products are used. While I believe the Zoning "Manager" would normally do the right thing, I do think the Zoning Board can get a little "power-trippy" on the second 50' no offense intended. With the investments we homeowners are making we don't want to cause trouble or ruin the natural habitat / water quality but we do want to enhance our home's settings based on what's more common where most of us originate from. So we understand a balance needs to be struck thus more relief in the second 50' should be acceptable with natural products and native plants.

Township zoning and building regulations should be strengthened and much more firmly enforced. Fines for violations should be sharply increased so that they have the required deterrent effect.

We feel the Township should take every precaution possible to protect the water quality of these lakes. This is so important for our future generations, and we want them to be able to enjoy it as much as we have. This includes public access to the lakes as well. Protecting from too much building on the lake and preserving our parks is important to us.

We are all for protecting the environment and the shoreline... however I think regulations are often written to be enforceable and leave no room for judgement or common sense. Not all waterfront properties are the same and trying to treat them the same usually leads to regulations that are unnecessarily restrictive for most properties. For people who have owned their property many years the addition of regulations over the years has severely limited what they can do to make improvements to the point their property values are very negatively impacted. They can't improve and they can't sell. Do to this lack of consideration, we do not favor adding any additional restrictions.

There must be a reasonable balance between private property rights and the need to protect Lake Charlevoix. For example: If allowed to add on to an existing structure within the 100' setback, reasonable guidelines should be established to allow for conscientious enhancements while protecting the lake. These 2 positions (enhancements/protection) need not be mutually exclusive where there can be ordinances that reasonably assert both points of view. I would be available to discuss further if interested.

There needs to be a more reasoned balance between homeowners rights & environment Protection. The balance now is too far to the protection side. In our neighborhood I have heard numerous stories of homeowners being denied making investments/ Improvements to their property (i.e. Adding a 2nd story to house -- would add value to the House/neighborhood, and

would negatively impact no one). We all care about maintaining/growing our property values. We don't want to make Improvements that have a negative impact on either those values, or on the beautiful Natural environment. More balance is needed.

Pollution control should be number one. The shoreline varies. To require the same vegetation in all areas is not realistic or practical. Some areas have been neglected for years and overgrown with invasive and other nonnative species that should be allowed to be removed. 100' is way too far as a structure protective zone. Question 7 had no acceptable options. Question 8 are all important options. Thanks for doing this survey. It was a great "thinking" point. The shoreline management is complex but critically important. Regards. I will seek more info on the Watershed and Lake C Assoc

If you don't want people burning leaves/yard waste then you must provide a composting or disposal site or some other means to dispose of it. Otherwise, they have no choice! Many people on Lake Charlevoix obviously do not follow rules for number of boats allowed or maintenance of shoreland protection strip. These people are very wealthy and would be happy to spend money on a lawyer to fight this kind of restriction. I am guessing that is why enforcement of these restrictions seem to have been ignored. I think one boat per 100 feet is not going to be reasonable for these rich people. I think it is reasonable to trim trees to a degree to give a view of the water. The root systems are intact and continue to serve their purpose. While I am very supportive of keeping our air and water clean and keeping shorelines in more of a natural state, I would not appreciate someone telling me what kinds of plants to plant on my shoreline. And if I spent millions of dollars on land and a house, I would not be happy that someone was trying to tell me how many boats I could have, and that I could not have a nice lawn to enjoy the lake. It is a hard balance! We do maintain the shoreline protection strip and try to be good stewards of the water by using our common sense. No one likes to be told what to do with their own property.

The boat launch off of Susan Lake should have some level of monitoring during the summer months. Visitors leave trash, dog droppings, and are disrespectful of the area. Illegal activity has also been reported by the neighborhood watch at the boat launch, which makes our quiet neighborhood unsafe for the families that live here. A HUGE issue is also the speed limit on the way to the boat launch--it needs to be lowered to 25 residential speed limit.

Be vigilant about invasive species near the lake and remove in an environmentally sensitive way; contact Tip of the Mitt or LCA. Leave fallen trees where they lie to return nutrients to the earth.

Look for FLEXIBLE ways to protect environment & shoreline without being too restrictive. If I am going to re-shape my beach area because it is a mess, I would like the opportunity to replant new plants, or move things around.

We must be more vigilant about septic systems below or near high water mark. These systems must be fixed! We should fine for beach sanding, herbicide use and lack of a shoreline protection strip. Running grass to the beach is especially harmful and homeowners should be informed. The use of sea wall should be prohibited and where it isn't truly necessary, it should be removed.

Your first question under #5 above is misleading. The context of the requested responses within #5 "pertain to how the shoreland protection strip should be used", yet the first question asked is "No structures, except for launching ramps and docking facilities including steps and retaining walls, shall be allowed within one hundred (100) feet of the shoreline on Lake Michigan and Lake Charlevoix, and within eighty (80) feet of Susan Lake." Why the difference? Did you mean to ask if "No structures..... within 50' of the shoreline....."? In addition, in the Michigan Shores subdivision,

practically all of the lakefront lots in the neighborhood requires some level of zoning variance approval due to the small lot sizes. Yet instead of creating a new Zoning District with setbacks, including waterfront, appropriate for the sub-division lot sizes, we're stuck with R-2 designation. The on-the-record reasoning behind such designation vs. a new district is due to the lack of township budget money to survey the sub-division. Seems like a poor decision.

When I bought my Susan Lake parcel, there was a clear view of the lake. In the ensuing years, trees have grown in many spots. I don't like being told that I cannot change my property back to how it looked when I first bought it.

I've been a Lake Michigan waterfront property owner for 31 years. I have maintained a 50" shore land protection strip with natural vegetation, primarily cedar, spruce and birch trees. Along the waterfront, when a dead tree or shrub is removed, I leave the root system in place to protect the soil. That said, I should be allowed to trip the tops of trees to maintain my view of Lake Michigan. I believe this is a reasonable tradeoff with the zoning regulations.

We think preserving the water quality is very important. We like a common sense approach that protects the water while allowing property owners to enjoy the waterfront. Some of the statements in this survey are more complex I think than we can simply answer in sliding scale survey. For example, when you say invasive species should be removed, what does that mean? Is it Zebra mussels? Does it come at a large cost to property owners? Is it landscaping that doesn't fit the non-invasive criteria? Are any properties grand-fathered in?? What if your cottage is closer than 100 ft to the high water mark and you want to put an addition on it, are you grand-fathered in, or are you out of luck?

Community Survey:

Do what is necessary to protect the water, education is important it is a slow process and we all need to be good stewards of the his great resource. Thank you this survey is a great start. Pat Phillips

Flexibility in regulations is necessary to fit specific property situations. My property on Oyster Bay may well be the most eco friendly in the area, perhaps by far, but I doubt even it could pass some of the regulation details discussed here (if I even understand them). One piece that seems to be missing from the discussion is the subject of beaches, beach grooming and beach weeding. Also, the appropriate topping off and limbing up of intervening trees to allow a view of the water from the house is very important to the value of the property.

I think one of the most important parts of owning lake property is being given as much available rights/responsibilities as possible..... before the purchase is complete. While many people have an idea that special responsibilities exist with lake property, most of us do not know fully what our rights and responsibilities are and, may not even know where to look for the information. So whether it's up to the home owner selling the property to provide the information to the Realtor; then that person's responsibility to ensure prospective buyers understand before they purchase..... I'm not sure. Lands here are beautiful and special. When purchased the new owners need to have the appropriate information in their hands so they know from the start what is expected.

Protecting water quality and the area adjacent to the water (as seen in the Shoreland Protection Strip illustration {section 3.14}) is very important in maintaining the excellent water resource of our community, not only those of us living here now, but also for future generations.

Existing structures and infrastructure should be grandfathered and new construction should meet all requirements.

We purchased our water front property for the enjoyment of living on the water and being able to SEE and HEAR the water. We oppose any attempts to regulate how we landscape our property. Water levels change, mostly to the negative. Meaning the levels we have experienced for many years is considerably lower than when we purchased the property in 1987. Plant material is a considerable distance from the water's edge. Our lots are small and narrow. We do not have much flexibility in how we use these small parcels. Once a structure is place on the lot, there is very little room to create an outdoor living space for the purpose of enjoying the scenery. Any attempt to regulate the vegetation on our parcels diminishes the very reason we purchased water front property. Subsequently this affects our property value. As note to the zoning board; there has been a distinct lack of communication with long standing property owners and new property owners regarding any zoning regulations for water front property. These regulations should be shared with potential buyers BEFORE they complete a purchase transaction so that it is very clear what is allowed in terms of landscaping .Work needs to be done with area realtors, banks, title companies and any officials that are involved in the sale of property so that zoning regulations are clearly shared with prospective buyers. Current property owners should be grandfathered approval for alterations to their property since it has been the failure of the township to make zoning regulations known to all residents. People are learning about supposed regulations AFTER landscaping has been completed.