

PENINSULA TOWNSHIP

13235 Center Road, Traverse City MI
49686 www.peninsulatownship.com

Planning Commission
Rescheduled Regular ~~Special~~ Meeting
February 5, 2026, 7:00 p.m.
Township Hall
Minutes

1. **Call to Order by Beard at 7:00 p.m.**
2. **Pledge**
3. **Roll Call – Present:** Alexander, Beard, Eckstein, Hall, Hornberger, Shanafelt, Shipman; Township Planner of Record - Sara Kopriva; **Virtual:** Chris Patterson, Fahey Schultz Burzych Rhodes

4. **Approve Agenda**

Motion by Hall to approve the agenda as written, seconded by Hornberger.

Motion Passes

5. **Brief Citizen Comments (for non-agenda items only): none offered**
6. **Communications: none beyond packet inclusions**
7. **Conflict of Interest: none declared**
8. **Approve Meeting Minutes**

- a. **Approval of Meeting Minutes: January 5, 2026 & January 14, 2026**

Shipman identifies minor typographical errors in both sets of minutes as well as improper adjournment time.

Motion by Shanafelt to approve minutes as amended, seconded by Shipman.

Motion Passes

9. **Planner Report**

Kopriva states she has assumed planning responsibilities and continues zoning administration duties. One new application for a shed at St. Joseph’s Church will appear on the March agenda at the applicant’s request. No zoning ordinance rewrite updates available. Notes were not transferred during the staffing transition and no revisions have been made. Meeting with McKenna scheduled to restart the process and develop a work plan. Rewrite Committee reconvenes the first Tuesday in March at 1:00 p.m., open to the public and streamed on YouTube. A special meeting may be considered to continue rewrite discussions if agendas remain full. No questions raised.

10. **Business**

- a. Continuation: Application for Zoning Amendment #207 (Jan. Agenda #206) to conditionally rezone parcel ID #28-11-009-029-10 from R-1A/R-1C to R-1C

Discussion references prior materials and confirms receipt of a letter from the applicant offering voluntary conditions. State law permits conditional rezonings when conditions are offered by the applicant. Any additional conditions would require public hearing. Clarification provided that conditional rezoning is a rezoning with recorded, voluntary conditions binding in perpetuity unless amended. Conditions offered include limiting development to no more than five parcels and protecting all areas of 20% slope or greater from disturbance, except for a wooden stairway to the water. Conditions would be recorded against all affected parcels.

Suzanne Schulz, AICP, of Progressive Companies presents the request, explaining the existing split zoning, total acreage, consistency with surrounding R1C zoning and the Future Land Use Map (Suburban Residential), and

alignment with Master Plan guidance discouraging dual-zoned properties. Conceptual plans illustrate five lots served by a private road, no new curb cut on Center Road, and limited shared waterfront access consistent with ordinance frontage requirements. PC addresses waterfront access limitations, land division process, enforcement of slope protection, potential need for topographic verification, septic approval requirements, and mechanisms for ensuring compliance with recorded conditions. Staff indicates further clarification and draft agreement language will be provided prior to public hearing.

Motion by Hornberger to schedule a public hearing for Zoning Amendment #206 at the next regular meeting of the PC on March 5, 2026, seconded by Alexander. **Motion Passes**

b. PUBLIC HEARING - Zoning Amendment #206 Shoreline Regulations

Discussion: PC is joined by legal counsel. **Kopriva** delivers summary regarding ongoing work on the draft ordinance, noting revisions made following the January 14 meeting. Both clean and redline versions are included in the packet. Remaining discussion centers on shared waterfront calculations, including allowable hoists based on shoreline frontage. A reference spreadsheet outlining frontage, calculated allowances, and existing conditions is circulated for review. Next procedural steps are outlined. Following PC recommendation, the amendment will proceed to the Township Board for introduction and its own public hearing. The Board has tentatively placed the item on its upcoming agenda in anticipation of possible action, with a target effective date of April 1 to align with the spring dock season. Substantive revisions may affect timing. Clarification is provided regarding frontage calculations under current code and distinctions between platted, condominium, SUP, and non-platted properties.

Beard explains public hearing procedure, indicating formal motions to open and close are not required. The public hearing on Zoning Amendment No. 206 is declared open and testimony is invited.

Jim Raphael, 14826 Mallard Dr: References letter included in the packet. Comment centers on clarification of terminology within the draft shoreline regulations, particularly definitions related to shared waterfront ownership docks, shared docks, subdivisions, condominiums, and PUDs. Concern is expressed that HOA-owned waterfront property, held in single ownership rather than shared fractional ownership, may not clearly fall within the proposed categories. Clarification is requested as to whether such developments are intended to be regulated under the provision allowing up to three hoists per 50 feet of frontage, or under the shared dock provision limiting hoists to six. Additional concern is raised regarding ambiguity in the definition of “shared dock,” including situations where a waterfront owner allows access to off-water properties. Request is made to include clear definitions within the ordinance to avoid future enforcement disputes.

Anne Anderson, 10985 Trillium Ct: Expresses concern that shared waterfront communities are being characterized negatively. Shared developments are described as residential communities, not marinas, and allow for resident financial accessibility and/or safety concerns. Support is expressed for development of a clear process to resolve shoreline conflicts. Concern is raised about potential overregulation, specifically the proposed change from measuring four feet above the shoreline to four feet above the high water mark. Practical and environmental concerns are noted, including potential survey requirements, placement of hoists on unstable scarps, and impacts to previously stabilized shoreline areas. Urges flexibility and practical enforcement standards to avoid unnecessary regulatory burden.

Sally Erickson, 2228 Kaukauna Ct: emphasizes shoreline safety and consideration of all bay users. A photograph is submitted illustrating a dock configured in a “snake” style that requires boats to pass through adjacent frontage. Concern is raised regarding dock placement extending near property lines and impacts on neighboring frontage. Request is made that shared frontage docks be centered within their linear frontage rather than placed near edges. Reference is made to Port of Old Mission approval in 2001 specifying allowable frontage, number of families, boats, and parking requirements, and a request is made that previously approved entitlements for other neighborhoods with shared frontage be compiled and reviewed as part of the ordinance analysis.

Additional request is made to further limit the number of hoists, suggesting a lower baseline with incremental increases tied to frontage. Reiterates safety and long-term shoreline stewardship as primary considerations.

Scott Conaway, 11630 Snowfield Ct: President of Old Mission Estates HOA. Comment acknowledges the Commission’s work and overall support for the draft ordinance, with concern focused on the proposed requirement to measure four feet above the high-water mark. Asserts that in this area, the ordinary high-water mark has not been reached in recent years, which would require seasonal removal and relocation of boat lifts across Peninsula Drive. Practical enforcement concerns are raised, including determining the high-water mark and monitoring compliance. Safety concerns are emphasized regarding transporting and staging large lifts across a heavily traveled road twice per year, as well as traffic control challenges. Aesthetic impacts are also noted if lifts and docks must be stored on upland common areas visible from the roadway. Comment urges reconsideration of the high-water mark standard due to safety and logistical burdens.

Dirk Mammen, 10878 Wood View Terrace: expresses general support ~~is expressed~~ for the draft ordinance, with concern focused on the requirement that hoists be placed four feet above the high-water mark. Comment requests flexibility in that standard, noting that strict application may require removal of trees, disturbance of stabilized slopes, and increased erosion risk. Says most boat owners already place hoists as far upland as practical to protect from ice damage, and that requiring placement above the high-water mark could create greater visual impacts along the roadway. Reference is made to local shoreline stewardship efforts, native plantings, and environmental considerations. Suggestion is made to include language allowing practical or reasonable placement to address site-specific conditions.

No further public comment is offered.

Public hearing is closed and the matter returns to the PC for deliberation, with legal counsel present to capture proposed edits. Beard asks Commissioner Hall to lead the discussion. Page-by-page review begins using the redline draft; a wording correction is identified in the intent statement (“regulate impacting...”). Discussion addresses regulating unattached swimming platforms/“rafts” and freestanding hoists, with consensus to define and subject these items to shoreline placement/setback rules, with drafting delegated to counsel. Beard notes that these requested edits and the offseason storage issue prevent PC action this evening and require a revised draft for later decision. Additional edits include capitalization consistency, clarifying “point of contact” to “point of access” with the shoreline, and revising offseason storage language by removing “ordinary high-water mark” and shifting toward a site-specific standard intended to preserve shoreline passage and avoid forcing storage across roads or into vegetation. Definitions for “shared dock” versus shared waterfront ownership are flagged as needing clarification to reduce confusion. A discussion on the minimum lot width table affirms its purpose as limiting intensity of use. PC maintains the existing “five feet per additional family” standard and requests an introductory explanation for the table. Appreciation is expressed to counsel and staff for drafting support. Following deliberations, the Chair cites the PC bylaws (Meetings, Section 8, Public Hearings, Subsection 7) stating action is taken no sooner than the following meeting unless the delay is waived by majority vote; customary delay is therefore not required, and action may be taken the evening of a public hearing if the PC moves to waive this provision on the bylaws.

Motion by Hall to schedule to hold a special meeting February 19 at 7 p.m. for the purposes of reviewing the next draft of the Shoreline Regulation Ordinance, seconded by Hornberger. Motion Passes

- c. Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Discussion
 - Amendment 201 Acreage
 - Signage Draft Ordinance

Staff requests adding rewrite-related discussion items to the February 19 agenda if McKenna documentation is received, focusing on sign ordinance revisions and special use permit revisions; this is accepted as discussion-only items.

11. Reports and Updates – Verbal:

Agricultural Advisory Committee: Beard reports that work continues on internal data collection regarding potential changes related to Amendment 201 acreage thresholds. Draft sign ordinance feedback from the AAC includes opposition to a permitting requirement for temporary/seasonal signage and objection to a proposed 15-foot setback from the right-of-way. Subcommittee work on small processor guidelines and a broader recommended rewrite of A-district uses by-right and by special use permit; additional AAC recommendations (including Amendment 2011 and agritourism definitions/uses) are described as a significant package requiring further review. Next AAC meeting is scheduled for February 17 at 2:00 p.m. at the Township Hall.

Town Board - Alexander notes the Board mediation committee met with wineries; positions were exchanged and common ground was found with hope for a follow-up meeting. Positive movement is referenced in WOMP lawsuit. Possible mediation in the Meihn matter is discussed for next fall (September/October timeframe), with date.

Non-motorized Transportation - Shipman reports public engagement planned for April 28 at Old Mission Peninsula School, likely 6:00–8:00 p.m., with subsequent engagement and administrative review to follow.

12. Brief Public Comments (please keep comments to 3 minutes or less): none offered

13. Other Matters or Comments by Planning Commission Members:

Hall: public input and correspondence are considered and influence deliberations

Hornberger: notes ordinances can be revised in the future as needed.

14. Adjournment

Motion by Hornberger to adjourn, seconded by Shanafelt.

Motion passes

Meeting adjourned at 9:23 p.m.