

# PENINSULA TOWNSHIP

13235 Center Road, Traverse City 49686

[www.peninsulatownship.com](http://www.peninsulatownship.com)

## Agricultural Advisory Committee Meeting

January 21, 2025, 2:00 p.m.

### Township Hall

### Minutes

1. **Call to Order** by Kroupa at 2:03 PM

2. **Pledge**

3. **Roll Call**

Present: Bramer, Heller, Hemming, Kroupa, Hafeli, Gomez, Baldyga, Edmondson.

Absent: Seibold

4. **Approve Agenda**

**Hemming:** I would like to add discussion of 201 under business.

**Heller moved to approve as amended second Hemming.**

**Motion passed by consensus**

5. **Citizen Comments: none**

6. **Conflict of Interest: none**

7. **Consent Agenda:**

- A. Approval of Meeting Minutes: Agricultural Advisory Committee Regular Meeting December 16, 2024

**Hafeli:** I'll be helping review the minutes before it goes to the rest of the committee.

**Hemming moved to accept the meeting minutes from December 16 with a second by Baldyga.**

**Motion passed by consensus**

8. **Business:**

1. Sign Ordinance Discussion

**Gomez:** Erin [Hafeli], signs have been an issue with your business, give some background on what you've had to deal with, and what works for you?

**Hafeli:** if at any point someone feels there's a conflict of interest, feel free to make a motion. I can continue to comment from the audience. The information I'm sharing I believe is for the benefit of all the farmers. The area that I've had challenges has to do with 7.11.3 in the ordinance. It's called "Signage Permitted in all Districts." Ordinance page 112. Number one; "Agricultural product signs on the same premises with a general farm or horticultural use while the retail use is in operation." Running into a challenge where it says, "on the same premises." I did obtain a lease from my neighbor with contiguous access to my land, a portion of the land that's fronting Center Road where I'm requesting signage. My SUP does allow for one roadside stand, but even going through the SUP process, my signage request was denied. The area of the ordinance that was pointed to has to do with this language, "on the same premises." It was not enough to have the lease. It needed to, as I understood it, allow for off premises signage for agricultural use. That's one area I can see an improvement as it relates to agricultural signage permissions for those farmers that aren't on Center Road to allow for off premises signage.

In the packet information I included information from MDOT signage. A lot of the wineries have it. These look like Pure Michigan marketing signs, and I did not meet the minimum hours of operation

required for the MDOT signage. There was also a wait list of year and a half. It comes with a pretty hefty cost to pay for the sign itself, an annual sign. But that would be an example of off premise signage. There are some farms that wouldn't qualify for MDOT, and they're left to the discretion of enforcement within the township. We've seen two seasons now where there's been a moratorium on signage enforcement. I think the idea is the agricultural advisory committee is to come up with some additions to our local ordinance for signage that would allow for things like directional signage for U-Pick or harvest, agricultural off premises signage to direct people to a farm. Right now, a lot of farmers are left to put the all call out to the universe. If all of us are doing that, I think it would have an adverse impact on traffic, if everyone is left to their own devices to attract people to their site. Some allowances in signage would help to capture part of the traffic audience that's already here to support all businesses. If they're going to the winery, see a couple other farms on their way that might have another offering. So in addition to the permitted agricultural signs, I'd like to see maybe an expansion there. I don't know what other feedback people have, or if anyone else has had an experience, but I've heard from other farmers directly. Don't see them here today, so I won't mention their stories, but I think I'm not alone in that frustration.

**Hemming:** any recommendations?

**Hafeli:** including the words, "off premises signage." There's nothing in the ordinance that allows for that at this time. Even going through the special use permit process I came up short. I don't know what the magic language is, and I think the board ultimately will have to make a determination on what they're comfortable with. But from our committee, I would love to see a recommendation to the township board that we include an allowance for off premises signage for farms.

**Kroupa:** something like an auxiliary sign?

**Hafeli:** there's plenty of examples of fold retail signs already.

**Kroupa:** that was one of my points, the size of the sign you're allowed should be bigger, maybe 16 square feet, or 20 square feet. Then this might serve as an auxiliary, but some smaller kind of directional sign to get you to where you see the folding sign?

**Hafeli:** yeah, I think there's yard signs that are easy for harvest direction, but when it comes to more of a permanent directional sign, it should be large enough and identifiable enough that people can see it going a fast pace down Center. A standard retail sign would still be appropriate to consider. I would look at the U-Pick size or directional signs as supplement signs, those are not always out. Harvest is not always ready to come in. Especially in instances where you have a U-Pick that's days or weeks on end. Those type of temporary signs is part of the culture up here, and helps people understand what local farm products are in season.

**Heller:** would it be appropriate to ask the planning commission [PC]? That's where it has to go first to get by. Their requirements and expectations. We can give them a rough draft of what this committee thinks is needed, and then ask their input, and then create an end product.

**Kroupa:** that's how I take this whole committee. That's how we're going to function. We're going to put together what our recommendation is, and then they're going to pick it apart as they see fit.

**Heller:** true. But if we can get ahead of the game and ask for some input from them before we present our desires, it might expedite. What do you think?

**Beard, PC representative:** I think it would be more helpful for the PC to react to recommendations this committee is going to make. You are doing the research. I'd recommend you look at neighboring jurisdictions and their sign language as well. We did that with building heights when we amended that language in the code, and it significantly matches what surrounding jurisdictions are doing. Hypothetically, we could make amendments to the code that would be similar to what surrounding jurisdictions are, some continuity across the region. Speaking for myself, I'd be more

comfortable reacting to your recommendations based on the research and opinions that you are feeding to us.

**Hemming:** to clarify, a list. We feel off premise signs are necessary. For example, on our list would be temporary during opening hours or during season only, maybe some size recommendations, sandwich boards. Is that what you're saying, maybe a list?

**Beard:** all of those things would be legitimate for the PC to consider. Even before we get to the point of actually writing language to amend the code, we want to have that discussion.

**Gomez:** who enforces the off premises? If you lease land, what was the criteria, when you say "Lease it and maintain it," are you cutting the grass?

**Hafeli:** the maintenance, I don't think, is as applicable as the lease hold rights for signage explicitly in the lease. Because it's not directly my land, I obtained use rights from the neighbors, subject to what the township would allow. Give an example of Brys Secret Garden. They do own the land on the corner of Blue Water and Center, but it is off premises to their secret garden location and their farm. I assume they have their own approval right, maybe grandfathered in because they have it up without enforcement. An example of a farm with off premise signage on non-contiguous land.

**Gomez:** so would the approval be for that farm business, or would it be through whoever owns the actual property?

**Hafeli:** I've put a temporary sign, a directional sign on the corner. David Sanger as the enforcement officer, did come into my place of business with my signs from the road during business hours and told me I was in violation. So they'll be physically removed. I spoke up at a board meeting in 2023 and since that time, there's been a moratorium on enforcement, which I believe might still be the case. I don't know if it needs to be reworked, but there was noted examples of inconsistent enforcement, starting in 2023 at least. I think that the intent would be that either everyone is going to be enforced consistently, and or updates to the ordinance to allow for some of these changes.

**Gomez:** you said that for business hours of operation, this enforcement of the township... So for the Pure Michigan signs for a roadside stand, if you have a self serve U-Pick, what are your hours of operation? Not necessarily open from nine to five, so that still doesn't qualify for a Pure Michigan sign?

**Hafeli:** we could go through the detailed package information as far as what MDOT does require, but there's a number of requirements.

**Gomez:** so it is MDOT, not the township.

**Heller:** the TOD [Tourist Oriented Directional] signs are under their jurisdiction, but they state they maintain and they don't. I am one of the fortunate ones that have tremendous amount of road front footage on M-37 and they do not maintain. I maintain them if they get maintained at all. They just come in and plant them all of a sudden, you have another sign.

**Hafeli:** is the township notified when there's new signs going up?

**Sanders, Township Supervisor:** not that I am aware of.

**Heller:** they maintain the signage, but they don't maintain the tall grass, the weeds.

**Hemming:** put a list together, number one would be to include in the ordinance off premise signs. Maybe subheading A would be some sort of definition for temporary seasonal operation. An off premise sign, in your case at Center Road, I don't think it'd be unreasonable for it to be there for whatever your season is, to put it up and take it down only during your hours of operation...

**Heller:** that's too labor intensive.

**Hemming:** going to lead to signs that are not attractive. Sandwich board, instead of something that's attractive and appropriate. Some sort of definition there, as far as when it can be up, maybe some size requirements. I don't know how large anybody's thinking. The kickback is going to be,

somebody doesn't want a sign every 200 feet up and down Center Road. Consider that. But what sort of size, location in the right-of-way of the road or on private property?

**Heller:** has to be private property.

**Bramer:** per MDOT rules.

**Hemming:** make a list of those things that the PC can use.

**Hafeli:** I'm hearing a request for additional neighboring jurisdiction signage research, combining that with some of the research we've already consolidated, maybe in a table format so we can all digest it without reading 700 pages. Recapping, potentially what a recommendation might look like for off premises signage. And we're talking not the ordinance language, which will be developed at PC level, we're talking about big concepts.

**Bramer:** did include the Bingham Township and the Elmwood township sign ordinance. They do have-

**Edmondson:** Dave, can I talk?

**Kroupa:** I'm John.

**Edmondson:** ok. Is it you first or what's going on, as far as getting to make a comment?

**Kroupa:** let Jen [Bramer] finish and then go ahead.

**Heller:** raising your hand is the nicest way and John you're going to have to be the scope.

**Bramer:** in the Bingham ordinance, there's temporary signs, incidental signs, fixed signs, there's definitions of all these things. Portable signs, wall signs. Laid out nicely.

**Edmondson:** I apologize I'm late. Where are we here talking about signs?

**Kroupa:** first piece of discussion.

**Edmondson:** I would like to know what would be applicable to [Jen Bramer and Erin Hafeli]. I have plenty of signs at my own roadside show. I think the Wunsch Farm sign at Wilson Road, which is off premise, three sided, on somebody else's property, larger than the ordinance allows. To me, looks appropriate. To me, that would be a good example as far as size.

**Kroupa:** what would that size recommendation be?

**Bramer:** would you include the whole truck in the size?

**Edmondson:** exactly. I think that's fabulous. It's an eye catcher. That's what a sign should be.

**Kroupa:** but from a definition, is that 25 square feet, 30 square feet? What would you say?

**Edmondson:** just off my head, I would assume the truck to be 12 and eight feet tall.

**Kroupa:** 12 by eight, you're getting into billboard size.

**Edmondson:** it is. But to me, it's not offensive.

**Kroupa:** like 96 square feet.

**Edmondson:** I think it looks cool. It does what a sign tries to do. Efficient. Putting a lure out there.

**Hafeli:** precedent images, pull images of existing signage on the peninsula?

**Edmondson:** yeah. Also, I know a lot of farm markets that I deliver to, from Mackinac City to all over the state and other states. They all have significant signage. It doesn't seem to be inappropriate, but I know in our community, we have advocated not to have billboards. But look at the example of the Wunsch Farm, it looks great. I used to have my 56 Cadillac out there, had three flags from the Cherry Festival.

**Kroupa:** that's another piece of the ordinance, you can recommend get repealed, that piece that says you can't use trucks or vehicles involved in the sign.

**Edmondson:** oh, is that in the ordinance now? I didn't know that.

**Kroupa:** that could be a recommendation you make, see that repealed. From this standpoint, get somewhere between nine, which is now, and 96.

**Edmondson:** we're talking off site.

**Kroupa:** that's the piece we're talking about right now.

**Heller:** I want to thank Erin for getting the private property owners permission. That should be one of the requirements. Trying to maintain around signs costs.

**Hafeli:** so continued discussion for February on signage. Don't have to move off this topic, but summarizing, collect more information. I can work as a secretary to summarize our comments today, review before the next meeting.

**Hemming:** question for the PC. Would you like someone on this committee to review and present [other] township signage policies as compared to us, or is that something you would do?

**Beard:** if you can look at surrounding jurisdictions and find consistencies that would be workable for Peninsula Township, highlighting those would be a great shortcut for us.

**Bramer:** there's definitely consistent in these I sent in.

**Heller:** yes, thank you. I read those and I learned a lot.

**Kroupa:** in the information Jen forwarded, a lot of them said 24 square feet. A four by five sign is a good compromise. Isn't huge and it's big enough that the safety aspect of people driving by on Center Road and they don't have to slam on their brakes because something caught their eye but they couldn't read it. Information about text size, font, different distances, finer points of sign crafting. I think a 20 square foot sign gives you enough room to work with to make that font big enough for the safety aspect.

**Bramer:** a lot of them were at eight foot high. Now we're at six.

**Kroupa:** market would dictate, wouldn't put a 2 foot by 10 sign up. Width and height that is aesthetically pleasing.

**Gomez:** recommendation wise, how we look at the size of your farm market drive, just one sign? If you have 300 feet of Center Road, is it one five by eight sign at the south end, have another one on the north end?

**Kroupa:** I thought what made sense was one sign like that at your home base, and then an auxiliary sign off premise in one direction or another of your choice. Wouldn't want then sprinkled all over the township.

**Hafeli:** no bread crumbs?

**Kroupa:** one business having 15 signs trying to direct everyone from every possible route.

**Gomez:** one off site, then one-

**Kroupa:** that was my thought, as far as the size of the auxiliary sign, I figured it could be a smaller size. But if Erin thinks it should be the same size, that's fine with me too. Her business is off Center Road, you would want the most eyes on your biggest sign.

**Baldyga:** which is relatively consistent with the current number of signs and having larger at the premises. That other question of directional signs or seasonal signs, get into various signs that you are allowed and don't need a permit. Currently have a good list of signage and square footage. But it's the secondary, auxiliary sign that is the challenge. I agree with John [Kroupa], the size of the sign as well, nine square footage being largest of all of those options, from construction sites, to seasonal agricultural products, to roadside stands. I would say that can be addressed or increased. Primarily from the safety issues. Some of it is the lack of visibility or being able to trim the road. A lot of bushes close to the road that does lead to people slamming on the brakes. Trying to make that safer on and off from main roads.

**Heller:** the committee should discuss the acceptability of signage on vehicles. It's not permitted at this point.

**Kroupa:** have that as the next bullet point?

**Hafeli:** an area we can look at neighboring jurisdictions too-

**Heller:** they're very clear.

**Bramer:** vehicles are like farm implements, like tractors or something. Wheels.

**Heller:** I don't know. I want some thought given to it between meetings.

**Hemming:** does Leelanau allow vehicle signs?

**Hafeli:** I haven't read their local ordinance, but you see a lot of farm equipment and cars advertising.

**Bramer:** I don't think it's explicitly denied it.

**Hemming:** a fine line between a 40 foot semi trailer with a sign on it, or an antique tractor parked out front.

**Edmondson:** where do you draw a line with a vehicle that you're on the road with every day, park at your farm, or pick up your product and go wholesale someplace else? That's where you park, and it could be considered a sign, but you're waiting for the next day to go someplace with it, and maybe the next day you're not going anywhere. A licensed vehicle, probably stay away from.

**Bramer:** there is something in the Bingham ordinance that talks about vehicles with signs. If it's your business vehicle. Might be interesting to look at.

**Kroupa:** further thoughts on off premise signs, get to vehicle discussion next.

**Edmondson:** we have an ordinance already, and it is enforced poorly, if at all. I know we're trying to come up with a solution, the off premise is probably the most difficult. Maybe a question for Maura [Sanders], do we have time to enforce, or do we choose to enforce?

**Kroupa:** that's above our pay grade.

**Edmondson:** if we're trying to create something new, if we aren't going to have enforcement, what are we doing here?

**Kroupa:** let's go forward with the idea [it will].

**Edmondson:** something that needs to be considered or conveyed to our town board.

**Edmondson and Kroupa talk at same time inaudibly.**

**Gomez:** that's why we're trying to work on an ordinance.

**Edmondson:** don't we already have one?

**Heller:** there's been a moratorium, and all heck has broken loose on Old Mission Peninsula. With no guidelines, we all tend to get a little exuberant.

**Hemming:** one of the things about writing an ordinance is making it easy to enforce and simple to understand. Things the PC may be asking us is, from our perspective as growers, how can we simplify this so we can work with it?

**Edmondson:** I agree. Just trying to expound on reality.

**Kroupa:** move on to the vehicle part of the discussion, 7.11.2, letter eight; "Signs utilizing vehicles, trucks, vans, or the wheeled devices, tripods, sandwich boards, or unless specifically allowed elsewhere in the ordinance, changeable message boards." That is part of the list of; "The following signs shall not be allowed in any district." Is it your contention Dave [Edmondson], that we should strike number eight and allow?

**Edmondson:** what was that?

**Kroupa:** basically signs utilizing vehicles, trucks, other wheeled devices, are not allowed.

**Edmondson:** I would advocate that we strike that, yes.

**Kroupa:** anybody have any thoughts on that?

**Hafeli:** I appreciate it when I drive past Local Yokel's and I see clearly what they have. It's a no-cost way for a farmer to update what's available. Even if you're doing a yard sign, those could be 30 to 75 bucks, depending on how sturdy you make it. I don't have a problem with the sandwich board style signs. Practical and they convey useful information. Personally, I'd rather see a truck or a van than a Pure Michigan sign. I think those feel a little bit more like Disneyland than having a nice farm character or community character associated with more customized signage. I don't know if the right thing to do is just strike it all together, because this is for everywhere. Are we going to be

seeing a car parked at the side of a neighborhood for a garage sale? If we're talking specifically about agricultural signage, maybe there's a permitted exception on this area.

**Kroupa:** could be vehicles only allowed in the agricultural district, know there's more space to accommodate.

**Baldyga:** I think it's a dangerous road to go down by allowing vans, vehicles and trucks. Think the Wunsch sign with the old truck on the corner is tasteful because you like that truck, and I agree it's great. But at what point does the van and or semi box truck become that the road is lined with these vehicles? What we're finding valuable on a farm versus driving down Center Road on a daily basis, is what we're trying to balance here. Where do you draw the line on square footage, type of vehicle? I agree with the sandwich boards for what's fresh, has to be a provision for that. But it's the size and scope. There are no billboards allowed on M-37 because it's a scenic highway. That is what a box truck or a van is, a pseudo billboard. On the square footage side, it has to take into account what it is mounted on and temporary versus fixed, on premise versus off premise.

**Edmondson:** another example, Bonobo has an old state truck out there. Looks great. It's fairly large as far as square footage. I don't see that as offensive at all. Tasteful. Got to be careful about what we restrict because we need to let the farmer express himself in a way that he thinks is appropriate. If it gets to where it is inappropriate, it seems like we would get some noise from somebody. I don't think anybody's going to park a semi out there to specifically add signage for their operations. Most of these operations are small. At one time, I had a reefer truck, big cheery on it, Peninsula down the center of the cherry, and "Edmondson Orchards." It was 24 by 10 maybe. It was going someplace regularly, and if it was parked off the road 250 feet you're still going to see it. Are we talking about a specific sign for a road or off premise? I'm not going to park my equipment off someone else's property. Off premise signs should have permission. I'm not quite getting where we're zeroing down to here.

**Gomez:** agree with Chris, a lot of it is going to be language. "Other wheeled devices." Can I park a trailer and put a plywood sign on it? Where it gets dangerous. What is the definition of a van? Put a sign on the van, or spray painting something on it?

**Baldyga:** mount it to the the top or even higher than? Asking a single person to have an interpretation. I do think we can talk about changes to [the ordinance], especially if it's the off premise. If you can get a lease to have use of signage on someone else's property, then park a box truck with a 20 by 30 side with a sign on it, that's a dangerous road.

**Edmondson:** I think that's totally inappropriate and very unpractical that would occur.

**Hemming:** a small way to address that, has to be licensed and insured, has to be on premise. Also a dangerous precedent for somebody who's delivering fruit with a company vehicle that has the name on the side might just be loading cherries. How could you ban that? Licensed and insured, wouldn't be some junk parked there with a sign on it. On premise would be necessary. Becomes tough to enforce. And yet at the same time, an antique tractor is pretty cute. Don't want them lined up and down Center Road. But an antique tractor on premise as a display, is that a sign?

**Edmondson:** look at any farm stand, even just a farm. People like to have their things out there that create a visual attraction. Is that a sign?

**Hemming:** I would propose licensed and insured be a requirement for any vehicle with logo or signage parked on premise.

**Bramer:** my little tractor isn't licensed or insured.

**Hemming:** you don't have a sign on it either.

**Edmondson:** it's an agricultural piece of equipment. Doesn't need one.

**Bramer:** but if I put a sign on it?

**Edmondson:** [inaudible]

**Hemming:** seeing here what [PC] face when they're trying to write the ordinance. Ton of complications.

**Kroupa:** do other people support Dave's idea of striking that? Spinning our wheels if we have at least four people thinking we should strike that. I wouldn't strike that. I think prohibition on the vehicles makes sense. "Anything with wheels" is a whole can of worms. I would get rid of the sandwich board piece. I don't know why that's in with vehicles. If you don't want sandwich boards up every single day... Makes sense for being able to list fresh produce and things that are in season. But maybe there's something that says, this isn't going to be up 360 days a year.

**Heller:** you used the plural, are you saying several sandwich board? Be careful.

**Kroupa:** no, I just mean everybody's operation is how it is.

**Sanders:** for the PC, it'll be a differentiation. General signage versus agricultural signage.

**Bramer:** comment on my sandwich board, I wouldn't have that there. I don't have a problem with anyone else using them. I personally don't like it. I like my signs to be nicer, like the one at my house. A big investment, costs a lot of money. While I was waiting, because I was promised multiple times the sign ordinance would be changed over the last three years, I utilized the sandwich board because it was a cheaper alternative. I want to be able to put a nice permanent sign on my property. But also have my products. I have a whole list but we can get there.

**Kroupa:** going back to the vehicle piece, do we have a consensus that we should leave that in place?

**Hafeli:** sounds like leaving it in the general signage but maybe making some qualifications for agricultural district signage.

**Baldyga:** gets back to conversation about checking to see what is appropriate in other townships, see if someone else has a great way to differentiate between vehicle and agricultural signage.

**Kroupa:** I've been looking at anything we recommend as being specific to the agricultural district.

**Hafeli:** make sure we're pointing to the right provisions in the ordinance. Or if it is specific to agricultural, it would be new provision.

**Heller:** does everybody know that the packets go online? Go to [peninsulatownship.com](http://peninsulatownship.com), under documents. Usually the packets are there. Or call the deputy clerk to get your information. A lot of reading but very valuable.

**Hafeli:** focusing on two areas as it relates to agricultural signage. Off premises, and then this idea of something similar to section eight for the general. I'll review and pull additional neighboring jurisdiction land. Then circulate, keeping the Open Meetings Act in mind, the information for people to digest before the next meeting.

**Heller:** Erin is tasked with a monumental job. She also asked for assistance. I'm not available.

**Sanders:** perfect example of having a subcommittee able to help you gather that background.

**Hemming:** done with number eight?

**Kroupa:** Jen, anything with what we should tackle next?

**Bramer:** with signs? Yeah. The way our farm is on Gray Road, we have a lot of road frontage, Center Road and Gray Road, but our driveway is a little bit down Gray Road. Have had a hard time figuring out where we would put a permanent sign. Center Road is probably the ideal spot. It would be nice to be able to also have a sign at the entrance to the market, which I believe I can have now after looking at this, it says "entrance way sign."

**Heller:** you're allowed a directional one too.

**Bramer:** products are important for whatever's in season. I like in the current ordinance, that you can have separate signs for agricultural products. "Wall and exterior signs" one we haven't addressed that I see in a lot of the other neighboring townships.

**Kroupa:** signs that are affixed to the building?



**Bramer:** yes. There's a lot of good information in these other zoning ordinances for that.

**Kroupa:** so we should add some form or fashion of mounted to a building.

**Bramer:** yeah. I would like to see that. How many signs are allowable and what size, does it matter road frontage? If I have 400 feet of road frontage, should I be able to have five signs? If I only have 100, able to have one? I don't know if that's something we want to address or not.

**Gomez:** yeah, if you have 400 feet on Center Road, can you put a sign on your north end and sign on your south end, or are you just allowed the one sign? Or does it change if you have one large sign but you can still utilize smaller signs within your road frontage?

**Hafeli:** MDARD I believe allows for one marketing sign. If any farmer is Right to Farm certified, there is at least a minimum allowable for one. The question is, is there a maximum? Either by ratio for frontage or total maximum signage. Question to explore.

**Bramer:** some of these ordinances say it's like one per parcel.

**Edmondson:** obviously entrance, but on a north and south, or east and west or wherever, is practical and reasonable. Even if you're only 100 feet. Most agricultural pieces would have several 100 feet of frontage.

**Bramer:** I did have a little bit of issue at my house. It's a non-confirming piece. Had limited places where I could put it.

**Heller:** something to consider is acreage. That's how they control a lot in the ordinance.

**Edmondson:** I didn't consider Jen's situation on Center Road, just down the street here, but you do see that in a lot of situations, most agricultural pieces are five acres. So really, this non-agricultural piece might happen again.

**Heller:** if your agricultural zoned and conforming, you are required to have 330 feet of road frontage.

**Kroupa:** how would that tie in?

**Heller:** as to how many signs are appropriate, needed, size.

**Kroupa:** what would your recommendation be?

**Heller:** I think less is more. I think Jen's signs are tasteful. I'm wary of sandwich boards, not that they aren't effective and tasteful, but there are a lot of them out there that are not.

**Edmondson:** what's your example of not tasteful?

**Heller:** I don't wish to share that at this time.

**Gomez:** clarification on acreage. If you're farming and you have 80 acres where it's off the road, is that part of your acreage that goes towards how many signs you get?

**Heller:** would have to be discussed and decided. I don't know. A lot of the ordinance centers around acreage farmed and what you're permitted to do with it.

**Hemming:** I think road frontage is the number. If we want to have more. Right now we have one sign plus an entrance sign. 300 feet frontage, two signs. To me, that's plenty. Now we're also talking about off premise, now we're three signs. That's quite a few signs. Size is more important.

**Bramer:** not necessarily always sale signs, some people want to have their farm name signs out.

**Edmondson:** is that included in a sign for your market then?

**Bramer:** it's included in the agricultural district sign ordinance I would think.

**Kroupa:** and as far as the affixed to a building sign?

**Bramer:** Bingham Township; fixed sign, wall sign, or combination of the two, need to get a permit. Maximum height is eight feet above an altered grade, and 16 square feet per parcel.

**Hafeli:** I assume the PC when we're making these recommendations, would want to see borrowed language footnoted. If we're taking the language directly from a neighboring jurisdiction, you'd like that context as you look at our summary?

**Beard:** yes, reference points, rational behind it.

**Bramer:** in the Elmwood Township zoning ordinance, the wall sign for agricultural rural is 12 square feet. Area bonus for dark or opaque background, six additional square feet. Could be 12 feet above grade. Could have one per business, per wall. It has to be on premise.

**Hemming:** [if] you've got flowers, you put something on the wall that says, "Petunias so much a bundle," does that count as a sign? Or are we talking something on the side of the building that says maybe the name of your business?

**Heller:** something permanent.

**Bramer:** affixed to the building, is what they say. Personally, I would just put my logo on the building.

**Hemming:** and not count the sign that says, "Petunias, \$10 a bundle?"

**Bramer:** I wouldn't put that on my building, but I guess someone could.

**Hemming:** your display is against the wall, and you have so many per bouquet or whatever. I'm asking this question because the township is going to want to know, does that count as a sign? Because it's on the side of the building.

**Bramer:** a retail display? I think it's your sales area.

**Hemming:** does that count?

**Heller:** no.

**Kroupa:** have to measure every couple square inches.

**Hemming:** would that have to be enumerated in the language?

**Beard:** I would have to look at it. Off the top of my head, make the argument that painting your logo on the building constitutes a sign. There's other things in here where you're going to mount a sign on the building, you've got dimensional requirements you have to meet.

**Hemming:** what I'm asking. If she has cherries for sale for \$4 a quart, there's a nice display and a sign attached to the wall, come under the ordinance? Do we need to define it to that extent?

**Bramer:** talking about within my sales area? Limit signs that I can have in my stuff for sale?

**Hemming:** an over zealous enforcer might come and say that's a sign.

**Beard:** probably would be defined as a sign, even if it has a temporary nature, in that the product for sale during the time period may change.

**Hemming:** so the answer is yes, we need to address that when talking about signs on the side of a building?

**Sanders:** I would address it anyways, just to get clarity across the board.

**Hafeli:** I know you can get the building affixed sign through a special use permit along with if you're going for approval of a development. I don't know how that would work with an existing building. My retail site in my SUP allows for both an identifying logo sign on the building, with specifications. It can't exceed more than 25 percent of the total surface area of the front, or some language like that. Plus a smaller size. Also allows for one roadside directional sign. My comment was, I didn't want the roadside directional sign on a dead-end street where no one can see that. Can I get the use rights to put that sign at the corner? The affixed sign, there's examples where they've approved signs on buildings through SUP, but we should put that under the areas of examination for agricultural by right.

**Bramer:** I do have a sign on the side of my roadside stand at my house. I have letters. But I was told that was fine. I asked for approval, even though I didn't need it. I was told that wasn't part of the square footage calculation.

**Hemming:** so the language could say something like, "Temporary sales display signs are excluded."

**Bramer:** within your sales area.

**Baldyga:** the distinction you made on painting a cherry or something that represents something for sale, is different than a company logo. If you paint a 10 by 12 company logo, that may be construed

as signage, versus something that is an item for sale. When we put up a couple panes of glass that say "2 Lads" on the front of our building, [a previous township planner] said, "It's got your company name, that can be construed as signage." Eventually said, "It's off the road, it's not your logo." But they considered that. A terrible place of interpretation, what's art and something beautiful, like a cherry, versus a logo that may be interpreted as signage.

**Edmondson:** at our retail outlet, we like to put a picture of a cherry on a board, nine square feet. Nothing more than that. There was discussion about it back with Rob Manigold [previous township supervisor], he said, "No, that's not a sign." He called it art. I wonder what people think of that here today.

**Hafeli:** your, as an example, the corn?

**Edmondson:** yeah.

**Hafeli:** with the word, "Corn?"

**Edmondson:** no word. Keep within nine square feet. Whatever was available, have a painting.

**Kroupa:** I would think it's a sign. Trying to convey information.

**Edmondson:** yeah. That was the interpretation of the supervisor at the moment. With signs, it's important to allow the farmer to be creative. It's important not to stifle that.

**Kroupa:** I agree. The whole thing is the balance. Feel good about the affixed building part? The total number, went back and forth, ended where we already existed. Any other subtopics for the ordinance?

**Hafeli:** leave space for any citizen comments when we get to agenda item nine to include feedback from the community, I'll take that under consideration in my notes.

**Kroupa:** ok. We can see after it's compiled, look it over and hopefully have it in a place can take some action next month.

## 2. Continued Discussion of Prioritizing Committee Strategy and Topics

**Kroupa:** list of items [from] our first meeting. Didn't get an electronic survey to culminate a list of top five, or however many agenda items we want to tackle in the amount of meetings we'll endeavor to do at this committee. Try and run through it a little in person, anybody's items they feel the most passionate about, or take another run at the electronic survey?

**Hafeli:** I'm happy to send an electronic survey out, for expediency. In the package of information, here was one word document that included a consolidated list between Kevin, Jen and I for the topics that were brought up at our first meeting. I put that information into chat GPT to come up with a suggestion, [produced] an optimized for success approach in your package information. There are sub actions underneath those broader categories, should still be room for reprioritization as things come up. My suggestion would be to start with the optimized for success approach and then add or reprioritize as we see fit. Or I can send out an electronic list, and everyone can vote in the order of the committee's priorities.

**Kroupa:** if you can put the big list into an electronic survey, vote on that to get down to the top seven or top 10. I like what you did with chat GPT. I would also add one other item the survey, temporary structures.

**Bramer:** I was impressed by the chat GPT results.

**Heller:** yeah.

**Kroupa:** does anyone have any other topics beyond the list in the packet?

**Bramer:** was there anything about wind, alternative energy stuff?

**Kroupa:** no. [reads list]

**Bramer:** maybe that's part of agricultural land use, more broad than just growing crops.

**Kroupa:** what is the current standing on that? Are we not allowed to have any?

**Bramer:** we had to get a permit to put some panels on our building, on our roof.

**Heller:** there is a section in the ordinance.

**Hemming:** still state level?

**Bramer:** not state, no. Just township.

**Hemming:** state recently passed something that the township couldn't... don't know how long that is going to last. The problem with solar is for any field, need to be next to a trunk line, which we're not. We looked into it.

**Heller:** but for self, you can.

**Kroupa:** I think you can put solar or wind on your own property, but you can't sell back to the grid.

**Heller:** special use permit to get it on your property. I think you can [sell] if you have excess, not tremendous excess, something in there, minor overage.

**Baldyga:** have to be within 10 percent of your estimated annual usage or something. But we're not in an area that will allow us to have specifically a farm for energy sales.

**Hafeli:** well, there's no trunk line today. Is this something we want to put as a possible topic of discussion? Some information lately in the news on research for growing crops under solar. Something we want to explore as a possible topic to get out in front of it?

**Kroupa:** something to put on the survey.

**Bramer:** if I recall, there is something in the master plan about alternative energy?

**Beard:** the legislature has preempted local jurisdictions from disallowing the placement of solar arrays and wind generation turbines. Crux of the matter, local or state control. May not be an issue today, we don't have transmission facilities. But the way that legislation works, at least as much as I've read, is that if you get a company that looks at the peninsula and says, "We need to put in some turbines," that'll start the wheels going in figuring out how to run the transmission lines and the collection. And the locals will have very little say in how that is accomplished. Maybe something that some of the farms would want to look at as a way of generating income. But probably something the majority of the population is not going to want to see. Given how much effort has gone into protecting the view shed over the last 50 years, anticipate opposition.

**Baldyga:** I think the rotor height, every time that we've explored it, the townships maximum height requirement for rotor height, small enough makes us less attractive for the wind guys. The height ordinance is already restrictive out here. The solar option...

**Beard:** a lot of south facing slopes that could work for that, if you've got the transmission lines.

**Sanders:** page 63 of the master plan, for initiatives and action steps, alternative energy, and that will lead you right into agritourism and agricultural viability.

**Hafeli:** I will get the survey out. Once we have a list of priorities from that, I will marry that against the optimized for success approach.

**Kroupa:** does the township have a commercial Survey Monkey account?

**Sanders:** see if the planner set one up. You guys can set one up.

**Kroupa:** the free one has limitations.

**Sanders:** I'll check.

### 3. Discuss Meeting Schedule Survey Results and Set Meeting Schedule

**Heller:** the township has some ordinance to set meetings times for the fiscal year.

**Kroupa:** for the whole year?

**Hafeli:** that is correct. Becky [Chown, township clerk] advised that as a committee we are supposed to determine by April 1. We can make changes to those but we would need to get something determined so we can publish by then.

**Sanders:** at your March meeting, if it takes that long to figure out your calendar for the next fiscal year, that's fine.

**Discussion of meeting time options. Survey will be sent out to confirm consensus.**

4. Discuss Staggered Term Lengths 2 versus 3 years

**Kroupa:** not supposed to all leave at the same time. Maura recommended the secretary and the chair be a three-year term.

**Sanders:** the vice chair and chair shouldn't be on the same term schedule.

**Hafeli:** that puts [Hemming] at two. You ok with that?

**Kroupa:** Chris [Baldyga] and Loui [Seibold] as alternates should have staggered. Because Chris is here, you can choose.

**Baldyga:** three-year.

**Bramer:** if someone leaves the committee, are the alternates appointed?

**Sanders:** usually, but you as a committee get to decide who you recommend to be on the committee. Chair makes the recommendation to the board [who appoints].

**Kroupa:** of [who remains], does anyone have a preference?

**No preference**

**Kroupa assigns two and three years alternating down the seated arrangement, starting with Edmondson at two, Bramer at three, Heller at two, Gomez at three.**

**Hafeli:** Bramer three, Heller two, Hemming two, Kroupa three, Hafeli three, Gomez three, Edmondson two, Baldyga three, Seibold two.

5. Discussion of 201

**Hemming:** I spent some time reading it a few nights ago, it's integral to what we're trying to do here. I feel it's extremely pro-corporate agriculture. Because the minimum requirements to get into making wine, or whatever you're going to do, are so large that it requires a huge amount of investment, which either leads to a large investor or a large investor that has corporate backing. I think that's something that got missed when it was passed. The other thing that happens is, if somebody wants to start a winery, there's minimum requirements for acres. In my opinion, the only minimum requirements to start a winery or any other agricultural processing facility, is the piece of land is big enough to hold the building and parking. I don't want a wine or processing plant. If you have large requirements for acreage for these facilities, they're going to grow that product, which takes market away from me. If what we want to do is support agriculture on the peninsula, someone who wants 20 acres, which I see a trend towards small parcels. That person needs a market, and that market is that facility that's being required to have enough land to grow their own product. So you've taken the market and the incentive away from the person that just wants to grow. That market is important to maintain the agricultural land as just agricultural land and not a processing facility. I think that somehow got missed in 201, because all the requirements are extremely large, extremely expensive and beyond the reach of the person that wants to grow 40 acres. We need to keep that in mind as we go forward, if we truly are wanting to support agriculture.

**Heller:** along with your buildings and parking, the parcel is necessary to meet the setbacks, and the lot coverage. People don't know that unless you state it.

**Hemming:** yeah. An example would be Peninsula Fruit Exchange. Had no intention of growing cherries. It has handled hundreds of millions of pounds of cherries, apples, peaches, pears and plums. Went through that facility that was built by a person that was not a farmer, wanted to be that intermediary. That supported Old Mission agriculture. Didn't want to grow anything. These large requirements, that would have never existed.

**Baldyga:** is that considered, though it's an agricultural processing and holding facility, a commercial facility because it doesn't actually grow anything? Or is that an agricultural facility?

**Hemming:** the reason agriculture is considered agriculture and not industry or commercial, is taxes. If agriculture was taxed as a business, all of our cherry trees would [be] production units,

and would be taxed. Why the definition is different, even though in practicality, it's a business. Is that an industry, or is that agriculture? To me, you can't have one without the other. And I'm not sure the definition is that important. I think it's more important to understand without one, you don't have the other. I don't see anything wrong with somebody with a five acre lot, having a farm market and buying all of their cherries, apples, peaches, whatever, on the peninsula. Not growing a single one. It's a market for people that want to do that part of the business. As a business person, I've often recognized people have different skills. Somebody who's really good at making wine may not be the best grower of grapes. If you recognize that you have the best of both worlds and you have a better product.

**Baldyga:** can we make recommendations, as agricultural advisory, if that's not an agricultural facility, can we create input towards that?

**Hafeli:** part of the ecosystem.

**Hemming:** I would advise it as an agricultural facility. There's always this fear, that somebody's bringing tanker loads of grape juice out here to make wine. That's a different quantity and quality of wine, a different market of wine. That's a small part of the big picture. We're stuck on wineries because of the lawsuit, but I don't believe somebody's going to build a winery on the peninsula with the idea that semi loads of grape juice are going to come out of Washington. I think that's a false fear. If somebody wants to build a winery on the peninsula, it's to make peninsula wine. That's the priority. If somebody builds a fruit packing plant on the peninsula, the priority is to pack peninsula fresh sweet cherries, or apples or whatever it is. Peninsula Fruit Exchange, now it's called Seneca, they bring brine cherries out here every summer from Leelanau and Benzie County. They try to prioritize Old Mission cherries, because they're close, and that's why they're out there. It's not that they don't bring some in. They need to in order to fill the tanks. If cheap was the priority, they could have had that plant in Benzie County cheaper than Old Mission Peninsula, and probably better access to larger quantities of fruit. The big picture, looking at business as a profit, whether it's agriculture or commercial. I think the township needs to recognize the current 201 actually penalizes the average farmer on the peninsula, by removing some or all of the market for produce grown out here. I wouldn't plant grapes. From what I'm seeing and hearing, there's enough grapes out here planted. They can't sell them all now.

**Hafeli:** there's the discussion of co-ops too. With the glut of grapes last season, an outlet where people could pool together to create a farm product that's supported by the citizens of the community, or some type of a supportive processing. What I hear you saying, is amendment 201 prohibits those type of farm product processing unless you're an actual farmer.

**Hemming:** restrictions makes it extremely difficult. It prioritizes large investments, large corporations, big investors, and ignores what is the trend and type of agriculture that is on the peninsula, and that's in small parcels, unique markets.

**Bramer:** when 201 was passed, my husband and I did some calculations. The minimum investment to reach what was needed was about ten million dollars, minimum. Which is staggering.

**Hafeli:** also have farmers, as in the case with Devils Dive we heard at our last meeting, they had already planted their agricultural product and were midstream, getting to the point of production with the small wine makers license, and their path forward was derailed with amended 201. Especially as it relates to people who have started this investment and the rules changed once they already have the crops in the ground, does a disservice to those farmers. I don't know if that was taken into consideration when it first came out.

**Edmondson:** this peninsula's scale, 201 isn't going to do anything. We don't have that scale. All the private, large operations are already in place, because they've already grabbed all the prime for grape. I was on the committee that supposedly initiated 201. I was the only one that voted against

it, because all the other people on it were either PTP [Protect the Peninsula] or anti-agricultural, anti-winery. 95 percent of the growing committee signed a letter that we did not support 201. But it sailed right over the board. In my eyes there was a real effort to squash the little guy and support only corporate type farming, which is unrealistic out here. If we want to see agricultural progress out here, we've got to entertain our scale and what a smaller investor can accommodate.

**Kroupa:** 201 will be on the survey.

**Edmondson:** high priority. Unfortunately, our constituents, I don't think understand that.

**Gomez:** point of clarification, on prioritizing things we're going to discuss. We are not going to get rid of 201 because there's nothing else in place, or we'll be back to where why the township is in the lawsuit. We can start discussions and build ideas of what we'd like to see, but can you tell us, will the township board be able to do anything until the WOMP [Wineries of Old Mission Peninsula] lawsuit is done? We can start discussion based on what we like to be in groundwork.

**Sanders:** the township right now won't take action on amending anything. But that doesn't mean that the work shouldn't be done and have something ready to go. Because we don't know what the outcome is going to be. Not going to pass anything that will get changed at the federal level. Groundwork should be laid, because something is going to be changed.

**Hafeli:** what about those case by case examples for people that have crops in the ground already? To allow for farm processing, would it be an SUP? Would it be a variance to amendment 201?

**Sanders:** talking about Devil's Dive, their council and township council have been in discussions, and we are trying to figure out which course of action we can take.

**Hafeli:** so it's case by case right now.

**Hemming:** there was an area in California that [my wife and I] traveled with some local wineries, and some of those wineries were 10 acres. That little tasting room was basically a corner in the garage. In my mind, that fits out here, as opposed to the ten million dollar. If you got 10 million bucks tied up, you got to do something more than taste a little bit of wine in the corner of a garage. I know there's some little co-op stuff going on out here, where people make their own wine, take it home, and drink it themselves. I asked one of them, how about have a little tasting room in the garage? "Well, we can't." I think we need to allow for that. It's not just the wineries, it's the farm markets.

**Baldyga:** large scale farming out here in general, as we've seen, because we've gone from larger style farming, where a lot of the product goes off wholesale, creating products elsewhere. The value added smaller farm is almost the only way we're going to see success. It is the future. Even the wineries we've got, as big as they are, rely heavily on distribution across the state, and distribution is slimmer margins, typically lower prices, so you need to be really efficient at your farming. Growing anything out on Old Mission, there are a lot more efficient, larger scale places where land is cheaper and closer to infrastructure. It might not be as delicious and wine is a game of details and nuance of growing it in this place. But you can do it a lot cheaper elsewhere. These large scale wineries that are distribution based, the chances of them being the future out here are small. I think the smaller value added businesses is the future out here. Doesn't have to have a public facing thing either, that side of roadside stand as a winery, or no public facing. There aren't allowances for that to a great extent in 201. It's a millionaire's game if you want to try to operate under 201 now, which is unacceptable. Needs to be made approachable for anybody with five or 10 acres and a dream. That should be an option on your piece of land out here.

**Gomez:** on your first comment, are you then agriculture or are you a business if you're just going to buy five acres and you don't have to grow? Figure out what it means. Yes, we are business, but you're not a business without having that agricultural business. Do you have requirements for these, this idea they just have to buy and they'll buy from out here. When Seneca first bought out

here, a lot of growers of that brine industry out here got dropped by that, and they were allowed to do that. This idea that you buy five acres, and you don't have to plant because you can buy out here. Is there a requirement? Or, will they start bringing tankers? If they don't have to buy out here, it's the same thing that happened with that processing facility.

**Hemming:** as I understand the law you can't require them to buy out here. Get's into interstate commerce and other things. But I do believe, with discussions I've had with some people that are involved in that company, they kind of wish some of those people they hadn't dropped and they were still growing brine sweet cherries. Some of this is the evolution of business. There was serious consideration in leaving my brined cherries in because of Seneca. That gave me some second thoughts over whether or not to take those trees out. I made that decision because at my point of life, you're either in or you're out. Seneca gave me second thought, I was confident I [would] have a market out here. I believe if it wasn't for Seneca, there wouldn't be any brine cherries out here, because I don't have any idea where you would sell them. Seneca is keeping what brine cherry business there is out here, here today.

**Sanders:** the property that [Seneca] is one of the only industrial zoned places out here.

**Hemming:** do you know history of zoning out here? They laid a map of peninsula out, hired someone to zone, and called all the farmers to come up and approve or disapprove. You have a choice. The frontage we have in front of our house was proposed to be zoned residential. My dad said, "I'm not paying taxes on residential property." He crossed it off as agricultural. Today, I wish it was 100 foot lots. I'm not going to say it wasn't well thought out, but it was heavily influenced.

**Edmondson:** property owners choice at that time.

**9. Citizen Comments:**

**Fred Woodruff, 48244 Forest Ave:** I served on the study committee that led to the Maner Costerisan report. My suggestion to you, as you move along, we discovered there were some subjects that were way over our head, and recommended the township agree to bring in a consultant to address the issue of organization and finance and township government. You guys may get there. I'd like to compliment you on what you're doing. What did you call your program?

**Hafeli:** chat GPT.

**Woodruff:** we used that to get the RFP for the consultant. The document you came up with is very interesting. But when you look at it, you can't pick and choose and copy things, so you've got a choice of 127 pages. If I wanted to get your stuff out, so I can look at it and study it, is there a way to deal with getting individual documents so I don't have to go through 127 pages?

**Hafeli:** I had to learn how to consolidate them into one, I'm sure I could unwind that.

**Woodruff:** it's a very good document to lay out your priorities and your strategies. I'm heading over to a PDR committee meeting, and I think what you guys are doing and what they're doing need to come together at some point.

**Michele Zebell, 2616 Bowers Harbor Road:** when I see things that I think are innovative, that cause us to think outside the box, I'm going to forward them to you. What appealed to me about the solar panels was that it created a micro climate that possibly could grow Paw Paws, which I don't think anyone out here is growing. I'm thinking maybe we can imitate to some degree what goes on in southern Michigan, especially with climate change. I read that adding sheep to graze those areas adds fertility. That would make it interesting to folks who are coming out here to purchase products, to find that there were sheep wandering about. Also pollinators and getting seed and getting a grant to help pay for pollination to help improve the entire environment, but also the growing area. I want to commend you for having this committee and being on it. I want to encourage you to think about innovative ways to continue to have agriculture maybe looking a little bit differently in some cases, and also cooperative efforts. Because you are looking at smaller



farms, then maybe there need to be cooperative efforts in marketing and sales, in educating the public, so that they are more inclined to come to you to pick some of the products that you're selling. I'd love to go to something that taught me about the various types of apples and how they're used and the order in which they grow, so that I don't always miss my favorite, because I never think of it soon enough, and by the time I do, I don't want to buy them because they're a little past their point. So if you don't mind me sending things your way, I'm going to keep doing it. I'm also going to encourage you to whatever you add in the way of another avenue for revenue, that you tie it to agriculture. Because in the future, I think that small farms are going to be necessary for local areas, for people to be fed. And it may not look like it does now, but in another 20 years, even 10 years, perhaps five, I think it's going to have to change. You are the folks, they say we have to feed the world, I think you're going to need to feed the community. Thank you so much for what you do. I know you wear a million hats as farmers. I don't know how you keep your sanity because of that. I'm grateful for you all. Thank you.

**10. Board Comments:**

**Hafeli:** part of your package material was a case study. Talking about collecting that information. I am actively still working on my SUP. I hope to continue to work with the township on coming up with some mutually agreeable language. As of right now, we don't have a meeting of the minds as it relates to some the income restrictions in comparison to the Farm Market GAAMPS. As those matters come up on the board, I'll ask to be recused. But hopefully we're able to come to a resolution in the next few meetings. But as of now, we do not have an agreement on the language.

**Edmondson:** question about your facility, why are you under special use permit?

**Hafeli:** when I purchased the farm, there was an existing special use permit that allowed for the farm market. The original SUP contemplated a much larger greenhouse development that did not occur within the one year time frame. The former owner lost those rights. Because SUP's run with the land, not the owner, I continued operations that were still in existence. Anything that I need to adapt at the business plan level, in terms of adding accessory uses in this case, needs to go through an SUP process.

**Edmondson:** you're saying there was an SUP tied to that property, but it wasn't... I don't understand. You said it didn't complete the SUP?

**Hafeli:** the original SUP that was on the land, contemplated a secondary portion of the business. When I purchased the farm and continued operations, I'm continuing on with those pieces that had already been developed and proceeded. But I do not have rights that were included in some of the original SUP.

**Edmondson:** so there was a SUP on the property that had already been started, you need to amend that.

**Hafeli:** yes. I'm presently trying to achieve a special use permit amendment to the original. It would be continuing operations for those items provided for in the original SUP and adding a subordinate use, which is in the amendment.

**Edmondson:** so an SUP doesn't go when it ceases, or it doesn't comply with... or doesn't fulfill the SUP? Trouble understanding what's going on.

**Hafeli:** I'm not sure on your question.

**Edmondson:** if you don't keep up with your requirements of the SUP, doesn't the SUP get dissolved?

**Hafeli:** I'm keeping up with all of the components of the original SUP. They had already commenced action on, for instance, value add processing of lavender to make essential oil. That was provided for in the original SUP. But they did not build a 2,000 square foot greenhouse that was also provided for in the SUP. If I wanted to build that, I would have had to come back and

requested that specifically, or they would have had to come back with their year. I don't expect to do that piece of it. What I'm asking for is an additional use, and that's being handled by an amendment to the existing SUP.

**Edmondson:** so originally, it was a different person that put the lavender in?

**Hafeli:** correct.

**Hemming:** maybe to clarify what Dave's asking, you're a new person. You're doing a different business. Can't you apply under a whole new idea?

**Hafeli:** this farm is 10 acres, and amendment 201 would then prohibit me from being able to produce my essential oil.

**Hemming:** because you are a small farm.

**Hafeli:** I made sure before I closed on the transaction to get written confirmation from the township that I had the value added processing rights intact. That was an integral part of the decision making to purchase our farm.

**Bramer:** but you are subject to the allowances for GAAMPS for Farm Markets?

**Hafeli:** there are allowances in my existing SUP that are consistent with some of the Farm Market GAAMPS. But the language that was proposed with the amendment is in competition with Farm Market GAAMPS. There is a financial restriction. I encourage you to read the additional information in the case study exhibit that's in red. In the package materials, what's proposed is in excess of the requirements under the Farm Market GAAMPS. I do have my farm market certification. And I think there is language in the current farm stand ordinance, which was enacted in the township to be consistent with GAAMPS. The layer of language as proposed in my application, to me is in excess of what should be the requirement.

**Beard:** this committee should draft and approve a set of bylaws to operate by. Could use the PC's bylaws as a template. You can change language in there with some modifications to some of the text. Recommended for any group like this that's going to operate on a continuing basis, your document for operation. The other thing I want to highlight for you, I sent this to Erin. MSU Extension, in cooperation with Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy, and the Leelanau Conservancy, have a workshop coming up February 13, Passing the Torch, Farm Transition Planning in Northern Michigan. They are going to cover a bunch of issues around trusts, wills, gifting, buying, selling, and transitioning farmland to the next generation, or a new set of operators, some kind of succession planning. Given that agriculture now is about less than 2 percent of the population of the country and an aging demographic, we know this is a hot issue. There's no cost to it, but they do want you to pre-register. Erin will send you the links and you can look it over.

**Edmondson:** always evolving, wise to keep up with that.

## 11. Adjournment

**Heller moved to adjourn with a second by Hemming.**

**Motion approved by consensus**

**Adjourned at 4:09 p.m.**