

Peninsula Township
Special Joint Township & Planning Commission Meeting
June 13, 2016
10:00 a.m.

Meeting called to order at 10:00 a.m.

Present:

Township Board: Avery; Hoffman, Correia, Chair; Weatherholt; Rosi; Witkop

Planning Commission: Leak, Chair; Hornberger, Serocki, Peters; Wunsch; Rosi

Also Present: Michelle Reardon, Director of Planning and Zoning

Absent:

Township Board: Jill Byron

Planning Commission: Alan Couture

Approve Agenda

Township Board MOTION: Hoffman/Avery to approve agenda. **MOTION PASSED**

Planning Commission MOTION: Peters/Wunsch to approve agenda. **MOTION PASSED**

Brief Citizen Comments - for items not on the agenda

Nancy Heller asked for clarification of the intent of the meeting and whether or not it would be an informal discussion will all in attendance participating. Reardon: Yes, it is an information gathering meeting and all can participate.

Conflict of Interest

Township Board: None

Planning Commission: None

Consent Agenda

1. Meeting Minutes - Special Joint TB/PC

a) April 18, 2016

b) April 26, 2016

c) May 3, 2016

Peters asked that the word "Zoning" be added to April 26, 2016, page 2, item D: Hoists. This was agreed to.

Also in the May 3, 2016 minutes, page 3, "Winery Use by Right, change Amendment 123 to Amendment 128. Agreed to.

Township Board to approve the Consent agenda: Hoffman/Witkop. **MOTION PASSED**

Planning Commission to approve the Consent Agenda: Hornberger/Wunsch. **MOTION PASSED**

Business- Agriculture Round Table Discussion

Reardon said that we are discussing language for the following zoning ordinances: 1) Food Processing Plant; 2) Local Food Production Facility(new item); and 3) Winery/Chateau. The goal is to strengthen what we already have.

Hoffman suggested that we take each item one at a time rather than discuss all of them at the same time.

Starting with Food Processing Plant language, the major changes are that setbacks are increased and standards of source of production.

Heller asked if pre-existing structures do not meet the standards would the owner need to ask for a variance. Reardon: No.

If "majority" means over 51% , should we add the definition of "majority"?

Wunsch asked for an explanation of Food Processing Plant. Reardon: It has no retail operation but may be wholesale. It would cover both food and MLCC products.

Witkop asked why the proposed setbacks were placed. Do we need to increase setbacks? Do we need to increase product used to "majority"? Reardon: there could be noise and/or odor problem and shipping could cause the need for increased setbacks. The subcommittee thought we needed some buffering. Mark Nadolski: Then address the noise and odor problems. Rosi: With more

active use of the land there will be trucks and other kinds of things. Reardon: Perhaps setbacks can remain the same but the noise and odor problems can be addressed. Wunsch: Even the new setbacks are reasonable. Cristin Hosmer: Do we have a diagram or table for setbacks. What are the frontage requirements? Farms, as opposed to residential, already have 330' frontage and 5 acres. Peters: There is a 50' side setback and a 15' accessory building setback. Reardon: We

could look at 50' instead of 100' setback on side. Witkop: Perhaps require buffering. Reardon: Confirmed that Food Processing Plant is a special use. If this becomes a Use by Right, then we need to make standards clear. Wunsch: Witkop has a good point. Perhaps setback could be based on building size. Reardon: A sliding scale could be a problem if someone wants to enlarge. A Food Processing Plant is pretty impactful. A Special Use Permit is needed because of this.

Hoffman: What do we mean by "pre-existing"? Reardon: Perhaps 20 years? We will put a definition of this in the ordinance. She also summarized what we had discussed so far: setbacks, noise/odor, special use permit. She asked, should we regulate the source of produce. Hoffman: I have a concern with hauling produce from elsewhere to produce here. Wunsch: There is a problem with containers bringing in undesirable things. Nadolski: We should have a logical way of enforcing our rules. Hoffman: We are not talking about a roadside stand in this ordinance.

Reardon: There is a natural disaster clause in this proposed ordinance. Witkop: Should we eliminate Food Processing Plant altogether? Reardon: No, we already have it. Wunsch: So 3 tiers would work: 1) Small scale, 2) Mid-scale with retail, 3) SUP for large scale. Reardon: That is what we have. Leak: Would hops fit into a Food Processing Plant ordinance? Peters: Then are your processing Old Mission grown crops? Bern Kroupa: Good idea to move "use by right" to 139. Setbacks and their reduction to 15' make him nervous. Keep the ag setbacks the way they are. Witkop: 15' is the current ordinance. How do we do that? Reardon: Quite a bit of township property is zoned ag but used as residential. Hoffman and Reardon: If 15' setback is in the ordinance now and we increase it to 50', what do we do about pre-existing structures. If we change one thing, are we creating another problem? Heller: if we have 15' setbacks and use vegetative buffers, we might have a problem with invasive species.

Moved on to discussion of Local Food Production Facility. This is a new category. It will not include making of alcohol products. It would be for small scale operations such as growing strawberries and making jam. It would include retail. It would be the same type of thing as a use by right winery is right now. There was a discussion of building and retail size. 2,000 square feet; 500 square feet for retail? Joan Westphal: That is way too small. We should not exclude

farm products when wineries are getting so big. We need equity among any products. Reardon: a food processing facility is still in the ordinance. Westphal: We need retail. Reardon: That is in the ordinance. Then a discussion of the size of the facility, the retail space, and size in general was held. A discussion of closing time was held. Reardon: This does not allow a farm market. Then she said there had been some interest in a farm market on the Peninsula. Reardon: Staff will research size. Hoffman: Some homes are bigger than what we are discussing. Maybe have a sliding scale tied to acreage. Reardon: a higher category than Food Production Facility exists. It is what we refer to winery but does not have to be a winery. Hosmer: Material used in the facility must be stored inside. A larger facility would be needed for that. She said that a 9:30 p.m. closing would be appropriate. Kroupa: Ordinance 139 is not just a winery ordinance. It addresses all agriculture. Correia: A 6:00 p.m. closing is quite restrictive. Witkop: What we currently have in Ordinance 139 is a farm processing facility. What we are discussing blends in to smaller parcels and smaller structures. Reardon: Remove winery wording to expand the ordinance to what it is today. Heller: I want to remind the Boards that these are not hobbies. They are businesses. Keep that in mind when making reasonable guidelines. Kroupa: in creating 139, we were working for other issues too. Wunsch: How does the public feel about our addressing these issues. I am hearing a lot of push back. Hosmer: The ordinance is broken and needs to be fixed. Westphal: I disagree. The horse that draws the wagon is the Master Plan. Also do we want activities to go on after 6:00 p.m.? Peters: I want to hear more from the whole community. David Taft: I wish this could be a round table. There are a lot of strong personalities in this community. Unfortunately we got into a lot of detail. How is this ordinance working. What is the function of the wineries. What about the number of them. Do we want to expand that number. Do we want more tasting rooms. It is an issue of traffic and safety. Do we want mini-restaurants and mini-bars? What about selling wine by the bottle to drink on site: Brit Eaton: 65% of sales need to be to the consumer. How many wineries do we allow to get into the market. It will come down to safety. Todd Oosterhouse: It all has to work together. For example, cherry trees. If people do not see them, they will not buy the cherries. Reardon: In answer to Wunsch, staff needs enforcement assurances.

Witkop: The set up for our next meeting needs to be conducive to more interaction. Wunsch: We need a white board and sticky notes. Our next meeting will be at 10 a.m. on June 23 (the ZBA meets that evening).

Motion to adjourn:

Township Board: Witkop/Hoffman moved to adjourn the meeting at 12 noon. **MOTION PASSED**

Planning Commission: Wunsch/Serocki moved to adjourn the meeting at 12 noon. **MOTION PASSED**

Respectfully submitted,

Donna Hornberger, Secretary
Planning Commission