

**PENINSULA TOWNSHIP
SPECIAL MEETING PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES**

13235 Center Road Traverse City, MI 49686

October 17, 2016 5:30 PM Township Hall

Meeting called to order at 5:36 p.m.

Present: **Leak, Peters, Rosi, Serocki, Couture, Hayward**, and Rachel Mavis (recording secretary).

Absent: **Hornberger, Wunsch**

Brief Citizen Comments - for items not on the Agenda

None

Conflict of Interest

None

Consent Agenda

None. Handled at 7:00 p.m. meeting.

Business

Zoning Rewrite Process Committee

Hayward presented a six point process for adopting the Consultant Proposed Rewrite of the Peninsula Township Zoning Ordinance. Documents were received from Patrick Sloan (McKenna) on October 17 and are available for review. The suggested process is as follows:

1. Review current status with the contract. McKenna will be sending two current drafts that are clean and searchable for review. Also, a letter will be sent updating how many local meetings are required to attend.
2. Sections will be identified that are non-controversial, not dependent on other sections, as well as sections that do not require a Master Plan amendment before adoption can take place.
3. Sections that are controversial and need additional consideration will be identified. A timeline for considering them for a future ordinance amendment will be established.

4. Begin the public information process once documents are reviewed. This will include PC or township newsletters, public information meeting (*not* hearing), media contacts, and possibly surveys. Leak suggested that Hayward be the spokesperson for the board when it came to media contacts - Hayward agreed.
5. Obtain final draft from McKenna.
6. Hold public hearings.

Peters asked if **Hayward** had the sense from Sloan that the second draft would include some of the things mentioned in the proposal (pictures, hyperlinks, etc.) to make it simpler to edit and search. The PDF version would be acceptable on the website and in packets, but in order for the PC to best review these documents and see the technical side of them, pictures and hyperlinks would be helpful. (Suggestion was also made for it to be in a Word document, prior to PDF format.) How complete towards the final project can the next draft be? **Hayward** agreed that this would be helpful and would request that from Sloan.

Couture asked if this document could be sent electronically (in addition to a printed document) so that hyperlinks could be easily accessed.

Rosi asked for more details on the phone survey, and if that would be the most beneficial option. **Hayward** explained that mailings are limited (it's necessary to wait on responses to come back in from residents), but with a phone survey, responses are immediate, as well as the ability to follow-up on that response. **Rosi's** concern is that since the master plan is value-driven and the zoning side is technical, the survey wouldn't look at the technical side of things and that the average person would be caught off guard with a cold call and not be able to give adequate feedback. **Hayward** clarified that the phone survey would come after the public information had been released, and was designed to allow the public to let the board know if anything had been missed.

Leak asked if **Hayward** was interested in appointing a separate committee to be reviewing the new drafts from McKenna - **Hayward** said it would depend how much additional time board members had available to commit to the project. It was suggested that instead of having a separate committee, the project would be handled at an early PC meeting and available members could be a part of it.

Peters pointed out that board can't move forward until the next draft is available. She requested that the new draft have as many technical examples as possible in order to move forward.

Hayward noted that according to Sloan, more information will be coming at the end of October.

Audience member asked for clarification - the terms *section* and *article* have been being used, but which word is accurate? The verbiage seems to have changed within the same document, interchangeably. **Serocki** clarified that sections are part of an article - the article is the chapter, then sections are part of the article.

Peters - If Sloan is saying that info will come at the end of October, and the info is to **Hayward** at that point, then sent to board, what would the board be able to accomplish at the November meeting? Should an additional meeting be planned? (5:30 meeting, prior to the 7:00 meeting)

Serocki affirmed that a 5:30 meeting could allow the board to clear up what sections are controversial and what's not, as well as wrapping up the parts that have not been covered yet. **Leak** agrees. **Hayward** suggested that the timeline be driven by contact from Sloan, not a specific time. As more information becomes available from McKenna, the board would be able to move forward. November may be a bit optimistic.

Peters suggested that after the new draft is received at the end of October, the board could go through it (comparing old draft and new draft) and have the two versions side by side. **Leak** suggested that when the new drafts come in, **Hayward** will call for a meeting.

Peters will discuss with **Wunsch** when the ag section can be addressed (both from a Master Plan standpoint and a zoning standpoint.)

Serocki clarified that in November, both the information in the new draft and incomplete sections would be addressed. **Leak** confirmed that once next part of draft is available, **Hayward** would call for a meeting. **Peters** suggested that a 5:30 p.m. meeting be scheduled next month to visit the areas that haven't been completed (back end of definitions, PUD, and subdivisions), in addition to the new draft.

October 10, 2016 Report on the Master Plan Goals and Actions Implementation Plans

Peters thought it was a successful meeting and accomplished what she expected to. The PDF version of what was done in each category is created and on website. (PC received the Excel version). They covered environmental, historic districts, shoreline, then spoke about capital improvement plans and road issues. She proposed that in addition to an ag meeting, there be a second meeting in November and address back areas and commercial neighborhoods. One meeting would address just ag, one would cover everything else. Are people willing to have two meetings between now and the end of November? Afternoon/evening meeting? Group said yes. **Peters** will work with **Wunsch** to get two meetings on the calendar for November so that the group can get a handle on all actions in the master plan and which ones need to be addressed and who should address it. The ag one may be in the afternoon, while the other will be in the evening. **Hayward** will set a time.

9. Citizen Comments

Margaret Achorn asked if the packet will be on the website. **Hayward** - yes.

10. Board Comments

Serocki doesn't have any minutes from June 23 (morning meeting - 10:00 am). They are not on website. Agenda and packet are on website, but no minutes. It was a joint meeting between town board and PC. **Hayward** will look into it.

11. Adjournment

MOTION: Peters / Serocki to adjourn at 6:49. MOTION PASSED.