

**PENINSULA TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
Regular Meeting Minutes  
July 18, 2016**

Meeting called to Order at 7:00 PM

Present: **Rosi; Serocki; Hornberger; Peters; Couture**-Chair. Also present, *Claire Schoolmaster*, Planning and Zoning Co-coordinator; *Michelle Reardon*, Director of Zoning and Planning; *Peter Wendling*, Township Attorney and *Mary Ann Abbott*, Recording Secretary.

Absent: Leak (excused); Wunsch (excused)

**Couture** informs audience that “ the 81”is not on the agenda tonight.

**Approve Agenda**

**MOTION: Hornberger/Serocki** to approve Agenda.

**PASSED UNAN**

**Brief Citizen Comments - for items not on the Agenda**

*David Taft, 952 Neahtawanta Road* would like to speak about the “81”project. Despite being approved by both the Planning Commission and the Town Board, the developer has now presented a plat proposed under use by right for the same site to be considered at the August 15<sup>th</sup> meeting. He does not understand how a developer can propose two plans for the same site, which makes it cumbersome for staff and board to evaluate a second proposal. *Taft* is concerned about contamination on this property. *Taft* urges the Planning Commission to ask the developer why he has not initiated an Environmental Assessment, asks the Town Board to ask the same question and asks for a status update at the Public Hearing on this matter.

*Margaret Achorn, 11284 Peninsula Drive* has procedural questions. At the last public meeting the public requested that the applicant present visual materials with video so the public can see the materials. The applicant presented material at 5:00 PM tonight and wonders if there has an escrow account been established.

*Amy Teare, 8563 East Beach Trail* bought property in Underwood Farms based on the Master Plan. The Master Plan online showed her where she wanted to live—in an area that protected the nature. Respect for old growth trees, open space, animals and nature. You are drawing people here. There are newcomers here that are very concerned about the movement.

*Rebecca McMullen, 7181 Hilltop Avenue* has a request that the board sending notifications to residents who are affected by the decisions that may be made will be greatly appreciated.

**Conflict of Interest**

**Serocki** noted that she had a conflict of interest with SUP# 127 and would be excusing herself during that portion of the agenda.

**Consent Agenda**

- a. Reports and Announcements (as provided)
- b. Correspondence (as provided)

c. Meeting Minutes

i. April 18, 2016 Meeting/PC portion (recommend approval)

ii. June 20, 2016, 7:00 PM Meeting (recommend approval)

**Rosi** notes that there is no Town Board Report but the Town Board on July 12, 2016 to discuss the Braemar Special Drainage district. The Road Commission was not present so no action was taken.

**MOTION: Peters/Serocki** to approve the Consent Agenda.

**PASSED UNAN**

**Business**

**1. SUP#127 – Vineyard Ridge (public hearing and potential recommendation)**

**Serocki** removes herself from the Board and takes a place in the audience.

*Dustin Christensen, Mansfield Land Use Consultants, 830 Cottageview Drive, Traverse City* presented an overview of the proposed 47 Single Family Planned Unit Development known as Vineyard Ridge.

**Couture** opens the Public Hearing on SUP#127 opened at 7:17 PM.

*Amy Teare, 8563 East Beach Trail* asks if there are any old growth trees on this property? Also asks what type of units this development will have.

*Laura Serocki, 6924 Center Road* when looking at Master Deed there was a lot of discussion on Limited Common Elements and General Common Elements. She did not see a map where these were defined. She would like to know if the limited common elements are part of the open space. If they are then the people who live in that development are allowed to walk in that area. Also on page 7 E. It talks about a yard area having similar Common Elements but she did not see that on the condo plan. Also on F. are the delivery boxes on Open Space or in the Building Envelope. Also there is not a lighting plan so will if there be lamp posts be on the open space so it will decrease the open space to less than 65%. There are several areas where common elements discuss Exhibit B, but there is no Exhibit B in this book. She is very concerned about limited Common Elements and how it will impact the 65% common Open Space. Generally we like PUD's because of the 65% Open Space but when she looks at the map it does not look like it because of the space between the homes. Nothing can be placed in these side yards. It should be placed the Master Plan or Association Plan so owners are aware that they cannot use this. Also curious on how the Township is going to monitor this.

*Britt Eaton, 1465 Neatawanta Road* is concerned about the amount of traffic on the Peninsula. He says just "stop". The Master plan says we should enjoy the environment that we have. This highway will be measure and widened to allow for the traffic we have. Just Stop

*John Fisher, 10493 Center* is perplexed at the lack of interest in doing a traffic study with the list of all these developments. Traffic is awful on Center Road. At some MDOT is just going to approach the Peninsula to say they are going to have to accommodate the traffic from development.

*Rebecca McMullen, 7181 Hilltop Road* states turns on Matheson every day. Adding 47 more homes is not going to help Center Road. She does not know how approving this plan is going to make our community safer, better or more united.

*Brad Bickle, 11328 Center Road* wanted to point out that 2.3(d) 1 says that a curb cut permit from MDOT shall be required prior to issuance of the permit. How does the planning commission measure the threshold that MDOT has before they decide to widen M37.

*Ray Weigel, 19135 Whispering Trail* has a 17-mile drive down Center Road. Thinks the problem is the tourists because he does not have a problem in the wintertime. He is here to thank the board and congratulate the Township on the information that he can find on the Township website. He is a rule follower and if the development follows the rules and do what they are supposed to do he would not be opposed to it. The Peninsula will be developed. It is a beautiful place. He would rather see something with open areas.

*Margaret Achorn, 11284 Peninsula Drive* asked that her statement on open space and drawing for this project be put in the minutes of the meeting. She wonders if this is what the residents visualized as open space. (See packet information for a copy of this statement)

*Tom Elliott 719 W. Orchard* wonders if vacant properties will be able to tie into this sewer and water that is coming in from the north.

There are no further questions from the audience. Public Hearing is closed at 7:36 PM.

*Dustin Christensen, Mansfield Land Use Consultants* is asked by Couture to address the questions from the audience and board. He answers: Mostly 1<sup>st</sup> generation growth, which is noted in packet. Very few specimen trees; All units are single family detached; limited Common elements and general common elements are indicated on plan and color coded; no proposed exterior lighting; Exhibit B not included in packet but will be included when approval is obtained; MDOT is satisfied with the plan that was submitted to them; Open Space calculation according to the ordinance needs to exclude building envelopes, the roadbed plus 2 feet of shoulder width and parking lots. Sewer and water can be accessed.

Further discussion by the board on the questions asked by the public and answers from the applicant. Traffic study; Topography and movement of land; open space and distance between buildings; storm water; Soil & Erosion permit; Building phases of plan; environmental assessment to look as Lead and Arsenic;

*Applicant* you have to look at what the ordinance allows. There are alternatives for that site. Applicant presents a drawing that would show what the use by right would allow on this property.

**Hornberger** states that the reason for a Planned Unit Development in this Township is to preserve the natural features in the township. She saw very large trees that would have to go because the land would be disturbed.

Further discussion resulted in the following Motion.

**MOTION: Hornberger/Rosi** move that seven topics be investigated and brought back to the Planning Commission: Traffic study, Specimen Trees, Soil Erosion, Escrow for Engineering and Legal, Open space and driveway issues, Grading Review, Property History and Environmental Assessment

The consensus of the Planning Commission that the information would be sent to the Staff in two weeks before next meeting and to be received by the Planning Commission one week before the meeting.

A special meeting will be tentatively held on August 22, 2016. If information requested is not available by August 8<sup>th</sup> then will be postponed until the September meeting.

**PASSED UNAN (Serocki recused)**

Serocki returns to the Board.

**2. Master Plan 5-year review (Discussion of sub-committee and possible recommendation)**

*Reardon* reported that the Master Plan 5-year Review Sub-Committee met and is making a recommendation to the Planning Commission as reflected in their memo of July 12, 2016. The recommendation is three-fold. There are two strong recommendations coming to you.

1. Compare the future Land Use map for conflicts with current uses. And prepare digitized and readable maps for ease of use. This work is to be recommended with a budget and a timeline. Staff can put together this budget and timeline.
2. The Planning Commission would also recommend to the Township Board to create a professional level survey for about 2018 in order to prepare for the next 5-year Master Plan review in 2021 and the PDR expiration in 2021/2022.

The third recommendation is that the Planning Commission would create a work plan from the Master Plan Goals and Action steps to act as a guide to the PC over the next 5 years.

**Couture** would like to see the Planning Commission work towards the goals of the Master Plan which include maintaining the integrity of existing roads, provide scenic turnouts, access for health and safety and future trail ways.

*Reardon* asks if the Planning Commission is comfortable with suggestions 1 & 2. Staff would then prepare a request to the Town Board with a suggestion that a professional survey should be conducted. The Town Board needs to look at what that would take.

Consensus by the Planning Commission is that they would like to proceed. Staff will prepare a resolution for the next meeting.

**Citizen Comments**

*Rebecca McMullen, 7181 Hilltop* feels that the bike trails would help to take some of the traffic from the roads. She suggests that when developments approach the Planning Commission that trails be built into their plans.

*David Taft, 952 Nehtawanta* laudes the Planning Commission for the firm ways they asked questions. The Planning Commission does have to make tough decisions. The Master Plan drives the Zoning Ordinance, so why are you re-writing the Zoning Ordinance. And can you ask the developer if they can still make money with a lower condominium plan.

*Amy Teare, 8563 East Beach Trail* states that the Master Plan is what brought her to the area. What would happen if the developer made the development smaller or turned it over to the conservancy. Also there are accidents happening now at Underwood Farms.

*Margaret Achorn, 11284 Peninsula Drive* felt that the Planning Commission did a wonderful job tonight. Asking again procedural questions that the applicant should notify the residents in the surrounding areas. She again is requesting for visual aids so that the public can see what is being presented. The applicant left but she would ask that about the ramifications of fire access in phase one, and the turf parking area by the pool may be part of the open space but where will people park for gatherings and how does this affect fire access. Will there be escrow for this project and for "81".

*Curt Peterson, 1356 Buchanan Drive* appreciates the task force for the Master Plan. Questions if his area is to be rezoned to residential. There is pressure to have this area developed. He does not want to see Nelson Road paved.

*Ben Buchan, 1472 Nelson* has heard stories about changing the zoning of his farm. *Reardon* says there is no talk about rezoning and asks that he calls her office.

*Rob Manigold, 2876 Old Mission Road* hopes that the Planning Commission will invite Gordon Hayward in for a cup of coffee as he has a lot of information. Also it is time to look at a traffic study. And the property of the Vineyards was originally called a home farm.

### **Board Comments**

**Peters** asks Wendling if we were going to make sure that we are going to get information on how to review Plats.

**Hornberger** also asked about the language on two tandem projects could not being presented at that time.

**Peters** also asked about the information on Ordinary High Water and Waters Edge and if that information will be coming from Wendling.

**Rosi** asked about management of boat docks. Wendling could prepare a letter to the Town Board and State or DNR if requested.

*Reardon* just saw email from Wunsch that he had a problem with harvest and will not be here.

**Couture** appreciates Ms. McMullen's supporting comments about the bike paths. **Rosi** It was talked about in TC Talus but the problem was negotiating with the farmland. There was some apprehension of this, but you could create some family friendly trails that were part of the road system. **Couture** will look into this to do some brainstorming. Also asks what the Traffic Study will entail. *Wendling* it would give you a base count and impact on roads by the development.

**MOTION: Peters/Serocki** to adjourn at 9:41PM

Respectfully submitted by Mary Ann Abbott, Recording Secretary.