

PENINSULA TOWNSHIP

13235 Center Road, Traverse City MI 49686
Ph: 231.223.7322 Fax: 231.223.7117 www.peninsulatownship.com

PENINSULA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

April 2, 2024, 7:00 p.m.

1. **Call to Order** by Hall at 7:01 p.m.

2. **Pledge**

3. **Roll Call:**

Present: Beard, Shanafelt, Dloski, Alexander, Hall, Shipman. Also present: Jenn Cram, Director of Planning and Zoning, and Laura Martin, Recording Secretary

Excused: Hornberger.

4. **Approve Agenda**

Shipman moved to approve the agenda with a second by Beard. Motion passed by consensus

5. **Brief Citizen Comments (For Agenda Items Not Scheduled for Public Hearing)**

Christine Sickie, 9449 Center Rd: here for the Draft Master Plan. Planning commissioners, I come before you as you are the guardians of the development on the peninsula. My family has owned their home on Center Road for 30 years. Earlier planning proposals called to redirect major traffic behind Center Road lakefront homes, but that plan was never implemented. I am making a citizens request for reasonable and safe speed limits for residents' safety and welfare in the use of their property on Center Road. There have been many changes in land use over the years. The increase of subdivisions, the sale of agricultural lands, winery tours and tourists, have caused the traffic on Center Road to dramatically increase. The speed limit of 55 miles per hour makes it dangerous and almost impossible for pedestrian traffic to walk across the road for beach and boating usage for families. This increase in traffic also restricts safety entering or exiting driveways with the sight distance and the curves. Lowering the speed limit would also increase safety for cyclists and joggers. Traffic on Center Road is 45 miles per hour at the base of the Peninsula and increases to 55 miles per hour. I am requesting that traffic remain at 45 miles per hour for the safety and welfare of residents' use and enjoyment of their homes. I realize this request will need additional approval from other agencies such as MDOT for the state highway speed adjustment. I am appealing to your desire to assist your residents with corrective action steps to move this item forward to a positive solution. This would also align with the 2021 master plan draft that residents believe the quality-of-life life has gotten worse in the past few years due to the growth over development and traffic congestion on the Peninsula. I am making this request with my 10-year experience as a former member of the city of Dearborn Zoning Board of Appeals, Planning Commissioner, Master Plan Review Committees, and Urban and Regional Studies. Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Fred Woodruff, 48244 Forest Ave: the existing land use map and future land use map doesn't seem to recognize the private restricted properties. In Leffingwell for example, 80 acres of property zoned residential development has been deemed restricted, so absolutely nothing can be built on it. There may be similar parcels of property in Neahtawanta, maybe in Illini, maybe others as well. For a matter of accuracy in terms of existing land use, and future land use, might reflect those, especially when they're 80 acres.

Hall: interesting point.

Cram: ties in with the conversation we had at the last meeting about showing the current existing land use and including the APA boundary, the conservation easements that have been preserved and having a color that stands out for the public lands and things like that.

Shanafelt: comment about the speed limits. When they were redoing Center Road, we brought that up. MDOT is in control of what the speed limits are, and they were unable to do anything about the speed limit without a traffic study. The issue with a traffic study is it's designed to show how fast you can go, not what we can lower it to. Conflict in trying to make a change there. Acutely aware of it at the board level and have tried to do something about it.

6. **Conflict of Interest:** none

7. **Consent Agenda**

a. Approval of Meeting Minutes: Planning Commission Regular Meeting, March 18, 2024.

Beard moved to approve the consent agenda as presented with a second by Shanafelt Motion passed by consensus

8. **Business**

a. Special Use Permit (SUP) #123 Peninsula Shores PUD, Amendment #5 - Introduction

Cram: the Peninsula Shores SUP #123, amendment #3, was approved on May 10, 2022. That amendment changed the location of unit 1 from the southeast corner to the northwest corner. It also eliminated a steep shoreline access. The blue outline in this corner is where unit 1 was moved to. The applicant submitted a fourth amendment which the planning commission recommended denial of in December. It was scheduled to go to the board on February 13 of 2024. Some new information was presented so the item was tabled to the March 12 meeting. At the March 12 meeting, the applicant Kyle O'Grady noted he had listened to what he heard during the public comments and from the planning commission regarding proposed amendment number four and has looked at things in a different way after being out on site with his partners in the business. Would like to pause the review of amendment number four, so the planning commission can consider amendment number five. Our fee schedule allows someone to propose a major amendment prior to final approval. At some point, we do need to formally withdraw one of the amendments. My suggestion was that if the planning commission after the introduction tonight felt comfortable with moving this forward to a public hearing, we would formally withdraw amendment number four. The applicant would like to keep amendment number four tabled indefinitely to move amendment number five through the process and a condition of approval of amendment number five would be that number four would be withdrawn at that time.

Amendment number four proposed a new unit of development. The original approval allowed for 41 units of development; amendment number four considered 42 units of development. Details of this fifth amendment include keeping the units of development at 41. They would like to relocate or adjust where the lots are. Right now, there are two lots in this location [blue line in packet]. The one

lot would move up to where unit 1 moved, so there would be two units in the northwest corner. Unit 30 gets reduced. The advantage is the open space increases slightly from 65 percent to 66 percent. That equals approximately .75 acres of open space to the center of the development. By not having a development unit at the corner of Waters Edge and Shoreline Court, open space is preserved. This move also helps to connect the area of open space along the shoreline with the open space in the center and preserves a view from a public right of way to the shoreline. The applicant has proposed a planting plan for that area to formalize it as a pollinator garden. I have forwarded the application to our engineer Gourdie-Fraser, they are reviewing. Had an initial conversation with Fred Gilstorff, Fire Chief. He has been up to the property and met with Kyle and verbally noted he didn't have any concerns with the proposed rearrangement of the units. I will request written comments from him via email. The only concern I had initially reviewing this is the proposed setback for unit 11, proposed at 15-feet which would be consistent with a side yard setback. I would consider that to be a rear yard, because generally speaking, the rear yard is opposite of the front yard. There's a 30-foot setback for front and rear, and 15-feet on each side. However, the way the applicant has configured these setbacks is consistent with previous approvals. As your current planner and zoning administrator, I have a different interpretation. The applicant would like to maintain that at a 15-foot setback because it provides more building space. I would like the planning commission's input on that interpretation. Otherwise, I did not have any major concerns with things as proposed and if the planning commission is comfortable, could move this forward to a public hearing at the May 7 meeting. Applicant is here.

Kyle O'Grady, 901 South Garfield Avenue suite 202: thank you for coming in this storm, and your efforts on the review so far. This is hopefully a good example of the planning commission giving an applicant feedback and the applicant learning and understanding that and coming back with adjustments according to the recommendations. On the record we believe [amendment #4] meets the zoning ordinance. It was shared with us by a majority of votes that it was not believed to do so. We went back to the drawing board to take the feedback that was given to us to make an adjustment. If you have any specific questions, happy to address them. Thanks for the oversight and I echo the points Jenn made. Thanks for your consideration again. Appreciate it.

Dloski: we went through quite an ordeal citing unit 1 at the north end. Now it appears they want to put two units there, and they're taking a unit out of the building envelope for old unit 1 and put it into open space. Is that what's happening?

Cram: unit 1 gets reconfigured, it shrinks. If you look at the total square footage-

Dloski: they're putting buildable area in open area. Look at unit 11, half of it is in the common space.

Cram: yes. They're also reducing unit 30 and adding more open space, see more green there. South of the property, they're also reducing one and a half units there.

Dloski: the issue we had with the neighbors was with unit 1. Now unit 11 is going to be further into their back lots. Does it exceed the landscaping boundary?

Cram: no, it does not. The landscaping was provided within the 30-foot PUD setback. The units don't get any closer to the north than they currently exist now. The open space actually increases from 65 percent to 66 percent. And they still meet the lot coverage requirements.

Shipman: when we approved unit 1 being there, what was the setback?

Cram: the 30-foot PUD setback was maintained.

Shipman: I've been to the site a few times, but I would want to do another visit.

Cram: I was going to recommend that. Neighbors have expressed concerns around the area where unit 41 is located, based on the topography and vegetation.

Beard: which neighbors?

Cram: neighbors to the west. Mention again, this proposal meets the zoning ordinance. They are maintaining the 30-foot PUD setback, and the proposed property line is inside of that. In addition, there is the required 15-foot setback. There's at least 45 feet from the edge of the lot line for proposed unit 1 to the property line of the development.

Shanafelt: a lot of discussion when we moved unit 1 up to this area. One of the main concerns was the buffer. The trees were planted to help with that and there was the 30-foot setback. Having two units there increases the intensity of use. I actually would be inclined towards your interpretation that the back is in fact the back against the buffer. Given the idea we want a buffer, I was surprised there wasn't a proposal to add additional trees. I will say it's very creative, trying to do it this way. My compliments on that. But I think that intensity of use issue is real. I also want to make sure that the dock complex as drawn is consistent with our current zoning. Do they have enough shoreline to allow 20 hoists? Don't want to inadvertently approve this outside of our current zoning.

Cram: I'll review that.

Alexander: concern for the trees, just put those in and now a proposal to increase the amount of building there.

Cram: highly unlikely the construction will affect the roots. We could add a condition of approval that they be protected during construction though.

Alexander: these two lots have individual septic, two individual septic for this right?

O'Grady: yes, two additional. I did have Grand Traverse Health Department at the site for preliminary approval of those.

Cram: this proposal doesn't add any additional on-site septic systems because it maintains the 41 units.

O'Grady: addressed Armen's [Shanafelt] comment. Respect where you're coming from. Jenn put on the record at the township board meeting regarding that neighbor who had some input on this project, fairly enough being a neighbor. It's been stated on the record that the condition of approval to plant those trees and the spacing of those trees for amendment number three has been met. This same neighbor is sending certified mail to our township stating that he had a professional to measure the trees on our property without our permission. If there was contact, a meeting scheduled or "Hey, do you mind if we take a look at this?" That's one thing. I just want to tread lightly. We all know and love our neighbors, but this particular circumstance is a little bit troubling given the extreme extents this individual has gone to continue fighting a condition of approval that our planner has stated has been met. I appreciate the input.

Shanafelt: my comment had nothing to do with any interaction going on. It was just a reaction to the footprint of unit 11 moving over. My memory of the site is not strong enough, I don't know what the actual buffer looks like there. Trying to be consistent with what was done with unit 1, to make it consistent with what you do with 11 and 12.

Cram: a site visit will be helpful, to see there really aren't impacts to that neighbor. Kyle can provide some additional information to show you where the views are located for that neighbor and what they've done to obtain those views.

Shanafelt: has not escaped me that putting trees there might be a bad thing.

O'Grady: when we're on this site visit and you're driving into the subdivision, see what we're highlighting in our main objectives of the amendment, preserving that view shed when you're on Boursaw. When we were going for amendment number three to move unit 1 to the north side of the development to protect those views along the road. You'll notice when you're driving on Boursaw that instead of seeing those units 11 and 12 from the road, will be shifted towards the northern part of the subdivision to keep out of the public view. I would encourage that visit. I have all of the properties staked to show what we're proposing and how it's different than what exists. Both the existing as well as the proposed outline staked. We hired a landscape architect to put together what Jenn was referring to, an open space plan. Instead of having this lot 11 at the corner of Shoreline Court and Water's Edge, this intersection will be much more user friendly when turning that corner. There's not a house there, open space instead. Our goal was to eliminate the clutter in that area, increase the safety, move those lots to a different location. Anytime I can make myself available to meet you out there, more than happy to do so.

Beard: amendment 4 took what was lot 41 and split that to create 41 and 42. Looking at this site plan for that end of the cul-de-sac, does this amendment five maintain the square footage of those two lots that you proposed in amendment four?

O'Grady: same as proposed in previous amendment. Overall, the open space has increased, given the adjustment to the other lots that have been referenced. We have 15 percent lot coverage with the approval of our PUD, that is also decreasing to 14 percent.

Shipman moved to schedule Special Use Permit #123 Peninsula Shores PUD, Amendment #5 for a public hearing at the next planning commission meeting with a second by Beard. Motion passed by consensus.

Cram: would like to organize a site visit, could advertise that as a special meeting of the planning commission so you could all meet together.

b. Draft Master Plan – Vision Statements and Action Steps - Discussion

Cram: discuss what is currently called "Vision Elements". The master plan committee includes, Sara Kopriva from Beckett and Raeder, Kevin Beard, Randy [Hall], Maura [Sanders], and me suggested to change "Elements" to "Statements." Is the planning commission okay with this? [heads nod yes]. Tonight, I'd like to walk through the 12 vision statements and the action steps to make sure they make sense and we're accounting for everything. The vision statements are organized into three categories: Land Use, Mobility, and Places, Character and Governance. As we're going through these, think about whether or not these statements should be in order of priority, or just organized by Land Use, Mobility and Places with no priority for the action steps, as they're currently presented a little unorganized. On page 49 in your packet, number one through five relates to Land Use, six and seven relates to Mobility, eight is Places, Character and Governance, then nine jumps back to Land Use. To keep the similar vision statements together, I would recommend putting them in order. When you get to chapter nine, Implementation and Summary, the vision and organizing principles are all over the place.

Hall: what is the order in principle?

Cram: they would be organized by their subject area in chapter six, and then in number order when we get to the implementation in chapter nine.

Shanafelt: like your use of going to "Statement." To make it not seem like prioritization, say; "Twelve vision statements in three distinct categories." Then you have clearly defined groups that can be dealt with as units.

Cram: thank you. Add "three distinct categories."

Beard: do away with the numbering. Some of these are under the purview of the planning commission. Some belong to the board with our input or advice. Eliminate numbering scheme.

Hall: in favor of not having prioritization. I am curious, to the extent that the master plan is reflecting the survey results, did the survey attempt to prioritize citizen goals or desires?

Cram: I don't think so.

Shipman: we looked at answers to individual questions, then we took that information to form this.

Shanafelt: wasn't a large enough sample.

Hall: in favor of not having prioritization.

Cram: put them in order by distinct category and get rid of the numbers.

Beard: referred to as three categories in the paragraph above.

Shanafelt: leave the "Island like geography" first.

Cram: leave them in their current order, other than move the land use together.

Commission agrees.

Cram: moving on to page 50. Under the vision statement, "Continue to implement any and all steps that reduce build out potential." Received comments from the community that they thought this was maybe a bit harsh or could be worded differently.

Hall: seems overly restrictive.

Cram: "Continue to implement steps that reduce build out potential."

Shanafelt: I wouldn't change it too much. We've had this draft master plan for five years, it's gone through revisions and this language hasn't changed. As soon as you start changing intent, open the rest of the document to changes. I like the little softening that still keeps the intent.

Commission agrees.

Hall: should 'Steps' be 'Policies'?

Commission agrees.

Cram: I believe the summary missed something important. If trying to implement policies to reduce build out potential, look at land division ordinance and PUD regulations to encourage people to pursue PUD and cluster development and preserve open space. Look at all tools to reduce buildout.

Shipman: looking at the action steps further along, it just says; "Park Land Additions."

Cram: I think that's a mistake. I made the same note under chapter 9.

Shanafelt: bring back proposed language?

Hall: make it short.

Cram: yes, I think it could be a sentence. Number three; "Ensure that future development is constructed in ways that thoughtfully balance all land use needs." Under the first sentence; "Even with potentially new PDR activity resulting from a third *levy*." Call that a millage?

Commission agrees.

Cram: number four; “Constructively and collaboratively work toward the goal of adding commercial value to local agricultural products without creating areas that add noise and congestion.” I would recommend removing “Commercial” and just say “Value”. Value added agriculture is a thing.

Commission agrees.

Cram: I included the version from the original master plan, for clarity purposes. Know there were some typos and changes that were picked up in this. Because the page numbers changed, I thought it would be easier for people following along to use this version. The typos and corrections we went over at the last meeting will be carried forward.

Shipman: jumping ahead, but the action step numbers will go away as well, correct?

Cram: with your approval, yes, I made that assumption.

Commission agrees.

Cram: page 51. Under current number five, “Protect the shoreline and wetlands to the maximum extent possible through both regulation and education centered on vegetation protection and enhancement areas like Pyatt Lake Natural Area, and other beach and coastal wetlands are an important buffer against pollution and flooding.” I feel that rambles, maybe stop after “Enhancement.”

Commission agrees.

Hall: to say; “Maximum extent possible,” then you can’t do anything with them.

Cram: I've been getting pushback from the contractors because our zoning ordinance is currently consistent with this and I would think any proposed amendments would be that we don't allow fill in the wetland, we don't allow fill in the floodplain. We haven't been since the floodplain elevation increased; it changed the location of where some improvements may be located.

Shanafelt: once it's gone, it's gone. Problematic from an ecological preservation standpoint, and “Maximum extent possible” doesn't necessarily mean do nothing. It actually says maximum extent possible as a function of regulation.

Shipman: hot topic in the survey as well. There was a strong response.

Beard: how many of the wetlands that you just referred to fall into the category of state or federally regulated wetlands?

Cram: we have both.

Beard: most of that can't be filled or adjusted or modified without some sort of mitigation.

Cram: EGLE regularly issues permits to fill, one went to the ZBA with no mitigation. The state actually looks to local zoning and supports it being more restrictive than the state because the state doesn't have the resources to have people out there reviewing and inspecting. They'll send us a permit application to review and make comment though.

Beard: sentences like “Areas like Pyatt Lake” could be moved over to summary section.

Cram: agree. I also think the summary should include something with regard to shoreline development. It talks about, “but it is prudent to improve regulations and education efforts regarding vegetation removal.” What about adding additional impervious surfaces through shoreline development with patios and decks?

Shanafelt: has to do with storm water run off, better to capture in that sense?

Cram: bring you a draft that moves “Areas like Pyatt lake” over, adds something about the proposed development, balancing proposed shoreline development with preservation of natural resources.

Commission agrees.

Cram: number eight, "Operate under the best possible form of government with suitable and essential public facilities." Under the summary, second sentence, should it be "Increasingly people are asking if a general township-" add "General" because that would describe what we currently are?

Commission agrees.

Beard: leads to the next question; "State options." What are those options?

Shanafelt: three other options. Either you list all three or you say, "State law provides."

Cram: "State laws provide three options?"

Hall: I like it how it is.

Dloski: keep it simple.

Shanafelt: ambiguous here; "State law provides options for changing the structure of local government." Which is true, we have two options for changing our current local government, one is by vote of the board one is by vote of the people. But are we trying to say we have options for changing, or trying to say, there are different types of government?

Hall: I think that's what the intent is.

Shanafelt: drop "Provide options" and drop "Changing" and just say; "For the structure of local government."

Cram: "State laws provide options for the structure of local government."

Hall: "Provide different options for structure of government."

Cram: got it. On page 52, I noted for number 11; "Continue developing an outstanding park system throughout the township with hubs at Mission Point Lighthouse Park, Bowers Harbor Park, and Pelizzari Natural Area, discussed under Places, Character and Governance, not Land Use.

Mary Morgan provided a comment to me on Monday; "Hi Jenn, I believe I took this snapshot from the draft master plan document that was part of a recent packet. I don't know if it's necessary or appropriate but wanted to ask if adding some blurb about the Peninsula Community Libraries local history room should be included in this line item. Many are still not aware of this resource, and I would like to see more people visit as well as donate items of interest."

Commission agreed could be included in item 12.

Beard: go back to nine; "Continue to view alternative energy as having a potential role in Peninsula Township." There was legislation introduced at the state level that would preempt local control, over approving or siting solar farms and wind turbine wind farms. I'm not sure that is something the township would want to give up the ability to control that.

Cram: we will have to look at amendments to our zoning ordinance. I think that will change things for us.

Beard: it hasn't passed yet and may not pass, but if it's not passed this session, it will be introduced again in future sessions, because the momentum for alternative energy generation facilities is out there, and it's going to continue. I think we have to look at that issue of what the state could do to preempt, but also how we can control the location of turbines, the height of turbines, and any potential agricultural land being used or leased for either of these purposes.

Shanafelt: the last sentence, change the word "allow" to "regulate"? That captures the whole thing you just talked about.

Cram: our zoning ordinance has relatively new amendments, amendment 199 and 200 were specific to solar. But we have not updated our zoning ordinance with regard to wind. When you read through the master plan it talks about making those similar updates. We are tracking this legislation moving through and know we may have to move sooner than later.

Beard: there's legislation pending, that would preempt local ability to control short term rentals. We made a couple of edits to the language in the plan regarding that. Should be looking at, how they could be used, who could use them, for what length of time.

Shanafelt: include a specific statement about short term rentals and accessory buildings here? The description talks about what we want, but we don't talk about what we're trying to avoid.

Cram: got it. Page 55. We noted at the last meeting we are going to update this to show the Agricultural Preservation area plus PDR, create an existing land use legend that is more generalized, so it's not confused with the existing zoning district map. Beckett and Raeder is working on that and we'll have a draft to show you at the next meeting. Page 57, label the zoning district map as unofficial and for reference only. Page 58 started initiatives and action steps. On page 60 under shoreline regulations, update shoreline regulations. This is in progress. Study group is meeting, and policy recommendations will be moving forward shortly.

Beard: the illustration at the bottom of page 60 with a 35-foot shaded area and the language about the normal high watermark. What does that illustration show?

Hall: text above refers to limitation on tree cutting.

Shanafelt: maybe in parentheses, "illustrated in the figure below."

Cram: ok. On page 66, "Pursue development of updated zoning to address winery and winery issues and add more flexibility to other agricultural businesses." This is in progress; a lot has been completed because we did adopt amendment 201 which repealed winery chateaus and amended wholesale and retail farm processing. Amendment 203 updated our farm stands. This spring and summer I'll be bringing forward some other value-added uses as well. Under 67, there's the initiatives and action steps to develop updated regulations for B&B's which we have discussed at the planning commission level. Talked about creating a more streamlined process for it and updated the fee for it.

Future land use would look very similar to existing land use with the agricultural preservation area. Noted the acres that have been preserved and the future land use map would highlight that with the renewal of PDR, more land would be preserved through the PDR program. Otherwise, minimal changes because based on the vision statements, we're not supporting up-zoning and increased density.

Page 75; "Pursue development of a corridor plan and a study of local roads focused on the identified strategy elements." I can't stress how important this is. This is one thing we need to move forward with. Has been talked about at the planning commission level and the board level.

Page 77; "Forming a working group to begin developing a non-motorized transportation plan to represent an amendment to this master plan. This plan includes exploring options for safe routes to school funding and zoning amendments to require bike parking improvements related to new construction." Also in process. The non-motorized study group started meeting in January of 2021. Thanks in large part to the leadership of Susie Shipman, and many others in the community. We have support from TART and Cherry Capital Cycling. The group has been active in applying for grants

to create a non-motorized plan. Love to schedule time for Susie to come before the planning commission and the board to update them on what's happening with non-motorized.

Shipman: I would love to, coinciding with receipt of a grant.

Cram: page 81; "Continue steps towards developing an updated Park and Recreation plan." That has been completed. The non-motorized plan is in progress. On page 82, under Governance, there is a study group that has convened and is working on that. I missed including that in my prologue but made a note of it, so I won't forget it.

Page 85, get rid of the numbers to make things clearer. The action steps would be consistent with other areas. Number two for instance, Parkland Additions, doesn't belong there. Noted under number 11, so it's a duplicate. I would remove that and add a note about looking at revisions to the land division ordinance and PUD to try to minimize build out and/or provide creative options to cluster development.

Shanafelt: make sure to include in your prologue the Meeker Addition happened.

Alexander: in number one we said nothing about a traffic study. But if we look at the summary it talks about the importance of traffic studies. Consider as an action step?

Hall: Jenn, what do you think the timeline looks like right now to complete edits and adopt this?

Cram: we will look at this again at our May meeting. Our plan was to bring back the draft existing land use map and future land use map to get your input on that. Also bring back an updated redline of changes that have been made thus far to reconcile this. From there, see how many additional changes need to be made. Potentially schedule a special meeting in May to do a public hearing. I'm thinking May/June at this point, depending on what happens at the May 7 meeting.

If you want to review the prologue I drafted, I welcome your feedback. I thought it would be helpful to include the date and a brief description on what was accomplished. I will be adding the study group related to governance and the completion of the Meeker addition to this and the timeframe.

Beard: I had envisioned in your prologue an opening narrative of a paragraph or two. I'll type this up and send it off to you. I have a few lines here, an introduction to the timeline that you provided. On page 80, when we start talking about public facilities. I want to make sure when we're talking about a CIP, it's clear we're talking about a Capital Improvements Program. There's only one little line in here that references that.

Shanafelt: currently our funding doesn't allow us to have a capital improvement plan.

Beard: doesn't allow us to, or no available funds?

Shanafelt: the latter. Until we figure out how we fund ourselves going forward, if we get an idea of what we can fund, then it makes absolute sense to go full force into it.

Beard: would identify the outstanding needs in the township. With or without an identifiable funding source, to be able to present that to the community would be a valuable thing.

Shanafelt: an example of doing that well is our fire chief and fire department, in their planning for fire station one. Obvious need but did work setting us up to review that realistically.

Beard: more general comment, it shows up a couple of places in the bigger document talking about townships and why we have townships. A couple places in the document try to answer that. The real answer is, it's because of the Northwest Ordinances in 1785 and 1787, where congress dictated a method of surveying Michigan, Wisconsin, and Indiana on a square mile by square mile grid pattern. Identified townships as being a 36 square mile, a six mile by six mile boundary, and identifying that

as the local form of government. The planning document hints at that historical reference, but it doesn't articulate it well. I'm hoping we can include something of a history lesson as to why Michigan looks the way it does, and why townships exist the way they do. True that the model of government does follow the New England style of town hall meetings and the like. But this whole idea of the survey, driving the definition of a township, and then identifying the township as the local form of government, is pretty unique. When we start talking about the forms of government, Dr. Lynn Harvey, who was the professor and director of the MSU Extension, made the point that our forefathers and mothers never envisioned a situation where townships would be as heavily populated or have as much political power as they have today. The thought was that the cities would be the centers of population and the townships would be the agricultural areas. And as the population drifted to the cities, they would grow and annex portions of the townships. That all went out the window following World War Two, with the extensive use of the personal automobile that allowed people to drive miles and miles between home and work. Population centers shifted from the cities out into the townships. And with that came the political influence that townships now have.

Hall: draft a short paragraph about the history and suggest where it could be inserted?

Dloski: the master plan is not a history book. The master plan is a vision for the future. Focus on the mission. If we start doing this, we're never going to get the plan finished.

Cram: Kevin [Beard] did give me his history lesson and I thought we had agreed to consider in the next master plan. If we want a short statement, I welcome that as well.

Hall: we'll get to it but I'm comfortable leaving it out of this version of this master plan.

Cram: the discussion the subcommittee had is, there's been a lot of work and effort that has gone into this master plan. Looking at moving this forward, prioritizing our revisions. Number one, it makes sense to capture typos, formatting, simple things like that, that doesn't change content. We've addressed that. The most important things about the master plan are the future land use and the vision statements. Important for us to make sure we get it right, to influence the next five years.

Hall: important to have this finalized and adopted no later than June.

Cram: on every agenda until we get it adopted.

Beard: required to distribute this to the surrounding jurisdictions for their review and input?

Cram: already done that. Received no comment. Just required to schedule at least one more public hearing with the planning commission.

Shanafelt: timing would be then, look at the final form at our June planning commission meeting, and then send it to the board for approval?

Cram: yes. Look at the changes we discussed today and last time at the meeting. Maybe have a special meeting in May that is the public hearing so that it could go to the board in June.

9. Reports and Updates

a. Shoreline Regulations Study Group – Verbal Update

Cram: the shoreline regulation study group has had four meetings. At the last planning commission meeting on March 18, Judy Spencer came and made public comments. Prior to the fourth meeting on March 21st, she resigned. There will be some additional information from her in the May 7 [planning commission] packet. My hope is we continue to hear from Judy because she did provide valuable input in this process. Our next meeting is on April 8. We leave time at the end of each

meeting to take public comments. At the April 8 meeting I'll be presenting policy direction for single waterfront ownership. That will move back to the planning commission at the May 7 meeting. At the March 18 planning commission meeting, talked about a letter to all the shoreline owners. That is in process. Because of all the conflict issues we have, the existing zoning ordinance notes that a land use use permit is required before putting in any docks and hoists for shared waterfront. The letter may request that people who have shared waterfront ownership come in and apply for those land use permits. We may not have amended regulations passed prior to docks and hoists going in, we can at least look at the configuration and learn from what's happening this summer to influence future zoning ordinance amendments.

b. Agricultural Advisory Committee/Value Added Agriculture – Verbal Update
Cram: based on what I've learned from participation on the Citizens Agricultural Advisory Committee, the farm operators on that committee wanted to have a voice. They felt the policy direction moved forward differently because there were citizens also on that committee. And that is true. The purpose of that study group was to hear from a diverse group, the residents as well as the farmers. While I was working for Larimer County, I was the staff liaison to the Agricultural Advisory Board, an appointed board that advised the county commissioners on all matters related to agriculture. That was an opportunity for those operators to prepare reports and plans for the county commissioners of things that were important. If we don't have agriculture, the rural-agricultural character of this area will go away. Ask for letters of interest, members will be appointed by the board. I'm recommending 9 to 11 members, a diverse group of farmers. There would be a board liaison so committee members may ask questions of a board member. Likewise, there would be a planning commission liaison who would come back and report every other month to update the planning commission as we work on zoning ordinance amendments.

10. Public Comments

Fred Woodruff, 48244 Forest Ave: I would suggest you think about Kelley Park and Haserot Beach with the new boat launch, and the other facilities that are at least thought about going there. Besides the launch, that would be a significant park hub. With regard to the PDR, transfer of development rights and donation of development rights, does the future land use plan contemplate expanding those programs beyond the purchase of residential development rights from farmland? My understanding is the ordinance and historically the PDR program, has been focused on purchase of residential development rights from existing farmers. Doesn't deal with any other development rights. Nor does it apply to residentially zoned property. You were talking about wanting to cluster housing and transfer development rights. I would suggest you think about that. I don't know if that's beyond the scope of what you're trying to do today.

Cram: with the update to the PDR ordinance number 23, amendment number three, we did add the potential if someone wanted to sell more than their residential development rights that they could. In round five we received a couple [applications] that are looking into that. It proved to be challenging in doing the appraisals. Thus, the delay in getting the appraisals completed. We plan to show on the future land use map that we anticipate more land will be preserved because of the PDR millage being renewed. We want to show land has been preserved through a conservation easement, so the use of that land must support agriculture or open space. The future land use map should show in the next five years we're able to purchase the lands people are interested in putting into the program.

Shipman: I looked where we talk about the hub parks, and in some places, we say the three names, and in some places we say four and include Haserot Beach as the fourth. Check for consistency.

11. Other Matters or Comments by Planning Commission Members: none

12. Adjournment

Beard moved to adjourn with a second by Dloski.

Adjourned at 8:41 p.m.