

PENINSULA TOWNSHIP

13235 Center Road, Traverse City
MI 49686

www.peninsulatownship.com

Township Board Regular Meeting

March 24, 2026, 3:00 p.m.

Township Hall

Minutes

1. **Call to Order** by Sanders at 3:00 p.m.

2. **Pledge**

3. **Roll Call**

Present: Sanders, Clark, Alexander, Wunsch, Sanger, Chown

Absent excused: Milliken

4. **Governmental Updates:** none

5. **Conflict of Interest:** none

6. **Consent Agenda:**

A. Invoices

B. Minutes from March 10, 2026, Township Board Regular Meeting

C. Old Mission Women's Club Annual Barn Sale Signage Request

D. Article – "Peninsula Township Fights \$50M Winery Ruling with Appeal"

E. Article – "Michigan Tourist Town That Turned into Weed City, USA Pushes Back on Pot"

F. Correspondence

1. Alex Lagina

2. Brad Niergarth/Maura Sanders

Chown has additional letters that will be included in the minutes.

Alexander moved to approve the consent agenda with a second by Sanger.

Roll call vote: yes – Clark, Alexander, Wunsch, Sanger, Chown, Sanders

Passed unan

7. **Approve Agenda**

Chown moved to approve agenda as presented with a second by Alexander.

Motion passed

by consensus

8. **Brief Citizen Comments (for agenda items only):**

Sally Erickson, 2228 Kaukauna Court: I am the builder and developer of Port of Old Mission. I know you are going to introduce the shoreline regulations this year. Thank you for decades of attention to this matter. Our biggest issue still will be dealing with enforcement. We've been working together for decades. It's a big burden, that's the void. Enforcement was the problem that got us to where we are today. We are a real-world example of increased density lowering the value of property adjacent to shared frontage properties. Our property is also a shared frontage property. However, we've abided by the three boats that we are allowed and people who wanted to use our property wanted a quieter use, and we have not had the interest in our shared frontage because of the overuse of the

property adjacent to us. If you increase to the triple, you're going to not just doubling but tripling the density on those properties. The properties adjacent to those, whether they're single family residential or shared frontage like us, their values are lowered. They're given a little bit of bait because they're given three boats for their usage, but they're given less usage than a shared frontage usage, so it's still not fair to the single family residential. As a developer, I should be jumping up and down and saying, "Yay, you just made my property more valuable. You gave me more boats." As a steward of the land and of the lake, that's not my position. We have an amazing shoreline. Michigan has one of the greatest shorelines in the entire world. We have one of the largest shorelines in the country. You, stewards of our shoreline, have one of the greatest pieces of shoreline on the Great Lakes. It's a huge responsibility, and I appreciate your dedication. I look forward to clean, clear rules that can be enforced, and I look forward to having people that can support Dave [Sanger] and his role so that whatever is decided can be enforced. Thank you.

9. Business:

1. Second Public Hearing on Proposed Fire Fund Millage Rate for Fiscal Year 2026-2027 (Sanders)
Sanders opened the public hearing at 3:05 p.m.

Pierre Ingold, 1151 Londolyn Terrace: it's just operation funding, not new equipment or new anything, right?

Sanders: operational funding would include any new equipment.

Ingold: yes, but it's not the new fire house?

Chief Gilstorff: it encompasses all the operations for the fire department. A payment for the new facility is rolled in.

Ingold: that's all I needed.

Sanders closed the public hearing at 3:08 p.m.

2. Updated General Fund and Special Funds Budget for Fiscal Year 2026-2027 (Sanders)

Sanders reviewed the increase for the planning, zoning and assessing administrator, who received a slightly higher increase than the standardized three percent increase.

Legal costs are budgeted at \$434,600 for the general fund departments. The majority are winery-related legal costs. \$89,028 to cover legal costs for specialty funds.

The general fund encompasses the town board, supervisor, clerk, board of review, treasurer, assessing office, general office, elections, buildings and grounds, planning and zoning, zoning board of appeals, and agricultural advisory committee.

Specialty funds include roads, fire, police, parks, cemetery, Hessler Log Home, Pelizzari Natural Area, Dougherty House, replica log church, building, cable counsel, Purchase of Development Rights, tower, lighthouse, lighthouse gift shop, sewer, water, and compactor station.

Board discussed balancing some of the special funds and some changes in the numbers compared to previous years with options for balancing the budget as efficiently as possible without compromising the integrity of operations.

Eight thousand was formerly committed to the non-motorized plan. The board decided to take four thousand from the tower fund and four thousand from cable fund.

The board agreed to limit the appropriations from cable and tower to \$250,000 versus \$500,000 to general fund.

The total real property assessed value for 2026 in the township is \$2,081,512,400. Market value is more than 4 billion. Tentative taxable value for real property is \$1,186,474,397. The significant leap over the last five years is from new construction and uncapped taxes from property sales.

Board reviewed the police fund. Its healthy balance would allow for a third officer and/or increased night coverage in summer. The state police have increased their presence on the peninsula as well.

3. Adoption of Fire Department Fund Rate, Police Department Fund Rate, General Fund and Special Fund Budgets, and Fiscal Year 2026-2027 Calendar via the Appropriate Resolutions (Sanders)

Chown moved to approve Resolution 2026-03-24 #1 to adopt the general fund budget for fiscal year 2026-2027 at the department level and to appropriate spending the budgeted money with a second by Clark.

Roll call vote: yes – Alexander, Wunsch, Sanger, Chown, Sanders, Clark **Passed unan**

Chown moved to approve Resolution 2026-03-24 #2 to adopt the fire department fund budget for fiscal year 2026-2027 at the department level and to appropriate spending the budgeted money with a second by Sanger.

Roll call vote: yes – Wunsch, Sanger, Chown, Sanders, Clark, Alexander **Passed unan**

Chown moved to approve Resolution 2026-03-24 #3 to set the 2026-2027 millage rate for the fire department fund at 3 mills with a second by Sanders.

Roll call vote: yes – Sanger, Chown, Sanders, Clark, Alexander, Wunsch **Passed unan**

Chown moved to approve Resolution 2026-03-24 #4 to adopt the police department fund budget for next fiscal year at the department level and to appropriate spending the budgeted money with a second by Clark.

Roll call vote: yes – Chown, Sanders, Clark, Alexander, Wunsch, Sanger **Passed unan**

Chown moved to approve Resolution 2026-03-24 #5 to adopt the special funds budget for the next fiscal year at the department level and to appropriate spending the budgeted money.

Clark: need to include “as amended” for general and special funds.

Chown moved to approve Resolution 2026-03-24 #5 as amended in our conversation today to adopt the special funds budget for the next fiscal year at the department level and to appropriate spending the budgeted money with a second by Clark.

Roll call vote: yes – Sanders, Clark, Alexander, Wunsch, Sanger, Chown **Passed unan**

Chown moved to amend her motion for Resolution 2026-03-24 #1 to adopt the amended general fund budget as discussed today for fiscal year 2026-2027 at the department level and to appropriate spending the budgeted money with a second by Sanders.

Roll call vote: yes - Clark, Alexander, Wunsch, Sanger, Chown, Sanders **Passed unan**

Chown moved to approve Resolution 2026-03-24 #6 to adopt the fiscal year 2026-2027 meeting calendar as amended with a second by Clark.

Roll call vote: yes – Clark, Alexander, Wunsch, Sanger, Chown, Sanders **Passed unan**

Chown moved to approve Resolution 2026-03-24 #7 authorizing the clerk and treasurer to pay recurring bills to avoid late charges and/or finance charges and authorizing the supervisor to make budget adjustments and authorize bills up to \$10,000 if necessary with a second by Sanders.

Roll call vote: yes – Alexander, Wunsch, Sanger, Chown, Sanders, Clark **Passed unan**

Chown moved to approve Resolution 2026-03-24 #8 authorizing the treasurer to utilize financial institutions of her choice as provided by law with a second by Sanders.

Roll call vote: yes – Wunsch, Sanger, Chown, Sanders, Clark, Alexander **Passed unan**

Chown moved to approve Resolution 2026-03-24 #9 authorizing the treasurer's office to access online banking through Independent Bank, State Savings Bank, and Michigan CLASS with a second by Sanders.

Roll call vote: yes – Sanger, Chown, Sanders, Clark, Alexander, Wunsch **Passed unan**

Chown moved to approve Resolution 2026-03-24 #10 authorizing the township supervisor to receive a three percent cost of living adjustment to \$70,271 annually with a second by Clark.

Roll call vote: yes – Chown, Clark, Alexander, Wunsch, Sanger; Sanders abstained **Passed by majority**

Sanders moved to approve Resolution 2026-03-24 #11 authorizing the township clerk to receive a three percent cost of living adjustment to \$73,797 annually with a second by Clark.

Roll call vote: yes – Sanders, Clark, Alexander, Wunsch, Sanger; Chown abstained **Passed by majority**

Chown moved to approve Resolution 2026-03-24 #12 authorizing the township treasurer to receive a three percent cost of living adjustment to \$70,271 annually with a second by Alexander.

Roll call vote: yes – Alexander, Wunsch, Sanger, Chown, Sanders; Clark abstained **Passed by majority**

Chown moved to approve Resolution 2026-03-24 #13 authorizing the township trustees to receive a three percent cost of living adjustment to \$8,111.25 annually with a second by Clark.

Roll call vote: yes – Alexander, Wunsch, Sanger, Chown, Sanders, Clark **Passed unan**

4. Introduction to Shoreline Amendment (Sanders)

Sanders: planning commission [PC] recommended moving shoreline amendment #206 to the town board. Next step would be a public hearing if the board wishes.

Sanger: reviewed the decision to increase the number of allowed hoists from one on 50 feet of waterfront to three. An informal survey found three on 50 puts most of the shared waterfront in compliance. Discussed possibility of utilizing sheriff's department in zoning code enforcement.

Chown: thanked the PC for the immense work behind this amendment. Requested more information on the change from a 15-foot to 30-foot setback. Noted that this is an issue for some parcels.

Clark: administrative waiver can be used.

Sanders: get this to the next public hearing.

Sanger: people will want to know by May 1 if they can put in a hoist.

Sanger moved to schedule the public hearing for the proposed ordinance at the next regular meeting, April 14, with a second by Wunsch.

Wunsch: it would helpful if, ahead of the public hearing, we have the people involved explain how the ordinance was developed.

Sanger: requested a summary of what led to the ordinance update.

Alexander: I was on the committee and PC. Use is more intense on shared waterfront. With concerns about safety, a 30-foot setback felt warranted. The administrative process option is to allow specific cases to be addressed if needed.

Sanders: legal counsel will be present for the public hearing.

Motion passed by consensus

Board discussed scheduling a second meeting in April with a tentative date of April 28 at 6 p.m.

5. Planning and Zoning Update and Discussion (Sanders)

Sanders: requested the memo in the packet summarizing PC updates, including the subcommittees of the PC. Specifically, the agricultural advisory committee [AAC] has given recommendations to the PC that are being worked through. A subcommittee of the AAC working on small farm processing

brought an agricultural zoning draft rewrite. Board may want to help give direction for where they should focus attention. Sara, our planner, requested the board review the flow chart.

Wunsch: is concerned about having a majority of members of the AAC not in active farming and that the zoning rewrite that's been brought forward is not in line with the master plan.

Board reviewed the flow chart of recommendations to ensure efficiency and reduce time spent on work that is not in line with the master plan. Agreed the AAC will report to the PC before coming to the township board. Discussed the importance of having a full-time planner and the exorbitant financial and time commitment a zoning rewrite requires. Amendment 201 was approved by Judge Maloney and is not a priority for rewrite. Board consensus that no Amendment 201 rewrite will be considered until the WOMP lawsuit is resolved.

6. Updated Proposal for Facilitation of Non-motorized Community Planning Community Engagement Session (Sanders)

Chown: reviewed the recommendation to hire Elise Loud to facilitate the April 28 community engagement session. Explained that the cost is covered in the existing budget obtained from grants for this project.

Chown moved to approve the contract with Elise Loud to help coordinate and facilitate the upcoming community engagement session with a second by Sanders.

Roll call vote: yes – Clark, Alexander, Wunsch, Sanger, Chown, Sanders

Passed unan

9. **Citizen Comments:**

Pierre Ingold, 1151 Londolyn Terrace: isn't the day you chose for the second shoreline meeting the day of the non-motorized meeting?

Chown thanked Ingold. The board rescheduled the meeting in April to April 23 at 6 p.m.

Randy Hall, 2610 Twin Eagles Drive: to Isaiah's [Wunsch] point about working farmers on the peninsula, you would like to hear from the farming community, not just owners of farms but people who are engaged in farming and what they need. You want to hear what the specific problems are. In my law practice, I've had occasion to represent owners of ag property who have received the current form of proposed conservation easement under the PDR program. Representing property owners, the form is overly restrictive. That's my opinion, but I think it relates to what Isaiah is saying. We need to understand, for purposes of amending our zoning ordinance and also for administering the PDR program, what do our working farms need to be successful? It's an easy question to ask but not so easy to answer. It involves current needs but also thinking about flexibility for the future.

Second, there was a comment made earlier about the policy background regarding the number of permitted hoists. I disagree with the characterization of it. I was the chairman of the PC starting around January of 2024. We formed a shoreline study group that was actively attended. Thank you, Becky [Chown], for your comments recognizing the work put in by members of the PC and the shoreline study group. It was a long, difficult process. It is controversial. There were a number of issues we compromised on. To the point about the hoists, I want to remind how we divided the process. When Jenn [Cram, a former township planner] was here, we had a board and posted yellow notes about things we wanted to be relevant to the shoreline discussion. [Sanders gave one-minute warning] The hoist ratio was not arbitrary, and it was not based on shared waterfront projects. We divided the project into single ownership, shared waterfront, and the third, which we deferred, was the development of shoreline property.

We recognized that personal watercraft ownership has developed since 1972. People own more personal watercrafts now than 50 years ago. That's where the three hoists came from. Is it a magic number? No, it could have been two. It could have been four. It was noted when we got to the shared waterfront that by selecting three hoists, it did bring a lot of the shared waterfront projects into compliance. That was noted as a policy benefit. It wasn't, in my opinion, the genesis.

My last comment relates to the board's next meeting. I understand the concern that this is a complex zoning ordinance amendment. Many policy discussions underlie this. Having legal counsel present is the best way to deal with it. Legal counsel was present, not in the shoreline study group, but for most of the PC meetings. They're going to be the best source of the policy concerns. I'd be happy to be there, but I can't speak on behalf of the PC. I think Sarah [the new planner] is another source of information about the legislative history. I don't know if she has time to put together the summary you'd like. I imagine that document would take time to produce. Thank you.

Sally Erickson, 2228 Kaukauna Court: I absolutely acknowledge all the hard work that was done. I did serve on the committee for the study group until it shifted into the daytime when I needed to work. Unfortunately, I couldn't attend those meetings. I do think this is a big issue. What I would like to acknowledge is that, for the year, we are under the current rules and regulations, and those are the rules and regulations that need to be enforced as we roll into the boating season. That's not comfortable, but it's the truth. Those rules are centered docks and setbacks. Being cognizant of letting families use beaches is a good thing. We're upping the frontage to a higher frontage so that your pocket parks are going to be less. For example, we can have 21 families. The Hidden Ridge development, which is right next door, has enough frontage for all their families. That's a wonderful thing. Our issue has been with the overuse of boats and safety. I do think that non-motorized users of the beach should receive equal respect to boating users. I love boating. It's one of the coolest things we do on our lakes. It's not my issue. Swimming, paddle boats, kayaks, sailboats, little people, those are my issues. Thank you.

10. Board Comments:

Sanger: requested an ARPA fund explanation as an agenda item for next meeting. Police fund is expiring. Do we put it on the 2026 ballot?

Clark: police expired last year. We are done collecting it.

Discussion on the specific language in the police millage, the years the millage was collected and expired, and the resolution passed by the board to spend the ARPA funds on payroll, then take the same amount of money and set it aside for the Kelley Park boat launch project.

Wunsch: Members of the public who've been questioning us about the ARPA funds came to that meeting and accused us of fraud for doing what the federal government required. We would have had to return the funds if we hadn't done that. The federal government made a decision that we were allowed to spend the money on current operating, and because we're good stewards of our funds and didn't want to waste the money on operations, we set it aside to be spent on Kelley Park. Mr. Fred Swaffer stood up at that meeting and accused us of fraud after we made the decision.

Chown: the federal government had set this money aside for covid relief, and it didn't want to claw it back. It gave municipalities an out. Marge [Acorn, previous township treasurer] did a ton of research. She determined that she could take the money and use it for payroll, but then we set the corresponding sum aside. The money's been spent.

Sanger: the question has been raised by a resident; he's a CPA. I talked to Marge. She couldn't

remember.

Clark: why didn't you tell him to call me? I am the active treasurer in the office with the ARPA file. I did all of the reporting. Why not me?

Sanders: Marge is retired. Those questions should be directed to Katie [Clark].

Sanger: I'll ask Katie to supply that information to me. Many of us ran on transparency.

Clark: we are one hundred percent transparent all the time.

Wunsch: we talked about it at a public meeting.

Clark: it was a resolution.

Wunsch: I appreciate the concern that has been expressed to us. We made that decision publicly. We explained the mechanics, the legality of the decision that we were making.

Chown: unanimously, we all voted for it.

Sanger: a respectable CPA has come forward and said, "Be sure you did it right because at the end of this year, if you haven't spent it, you lose it."

Chown: the money has been spent.

Sander: we've been going since 1:30. Thank you board. We have gotten a lot accomplished today.

11. Adjournment

Clark moved to adjourn at 5:03 p.m. with a second by Alexander.

Passed by consensus

Becky Chown

From: Kip Nickel <nickel.kip@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 12:15 PM
To: Maura Sanders; Becky Chown
Cc: Planner
Subject: Resident Input for the March 24th Twsp Board Meeting

First, I would like to acknowledge the Planning Commission's efforts in updating shoreline regulations and appreciate the inclusion of resident input throughout the process. The complexity of this undertaking is well recognized by those who have participated, me included, as I have attended most meetings of the Shoreline Regulation Study Group and relevant Planning Commission sessions over the past two plus years. During this period, I had the opportunity to provide input intended to enhance shoreline regulations for all stakeholders, but particularly for all waterfront property owners to maintain their quality of life on the Peninsula. The results generally reflect a positive advancement for the Peninsula community.

I am concerned about the recently proposed 30-foot setbacks proposed by the Planning Commission which apply only to shared waterfront properties. Throughout the last two years of discussions surrounding shoreline ordinance amendments, the standard setback in the water has consistently remained at 15 feet, a practice maintained for over five decades. This standard ensures a total 30-foot buffer between neighboring properties, supporting adequate space for swimming, navigation, and overall safety.

The introduction of a 30-foot requirement exclusively for shared waterfront neighborhoods was unexpected but I believe may have been driven by the persistent advocacy of two East Bay residents in support of their unique situation. I understand their concerns and that they have advocated for this change to help resolve their dispute with the Hidden Ridge HOA shared waterfront. Although this modification may in some way support resolution of this unique dispute, it will impose unnecessary burdens on many others who have long managed their waterfronts harmoniously. Given the unique characteristics of different shoreline areas, a tailored or mediated approach in this instance of peculiar shoreline and lake bottom conditions is required in place of broad changes that negatively affect many others that do not experience these issues. Based on this, I ask that the Township Board remove this change to 30 ft setbacks exclusively for shared waterfront properties and reinstate the long standing 15 ft setbacks for all waterfront neighborhoods. ✓

I appreciate the time the Township and the many residents that have supplied their time and expertise have invested in the matter. We all look forward to a continued positive quality of life on the Peninsula. Thank you for your consideration of this request for continued 15 ft setbacks to help us bring the shoreline regulation work to a positive conclusion.

Regards,
Kip Nickel
1015 Quaker Valley Drive, TC
231-735-3586

Becky Chown

From: Adam Covington <acovington0827@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 10:31 PM
To: Maura Sanders; Becky Chown; Planner
Subject: Shared Waterfront Setback

Good Evening Peninsula Township,

I hope that this is not too late to be part of the packet for the 3/24/26 Peninsula Township Board meeting.

I recently saw that change in the draft of the Shoreline Regulation Ordinance. First of all, thank you for your service to our community. I have served as Chair of a Downtown Development Authority in a community in the State of Michigan and I understand the challenges of trying to accommodate the majority of a community. The ability to be able to listen and understand and put policy in place for the greater good while not being drowned out by the loudest, most frequent voices is a challenge and I commend you for your efforts.

I have reviewed the draft and would like it to be recognized that I DO NOT support the current language that is in the draft. I can appreciate the efforts made to attempt to accommodate the majority of residents, however I believe this draft represents the loudest residents, not necessarily the majority.

Specifically, I am opposed to the language around the 30 ft set back for shared waterfront owners. I was surprised to see this change made in the final draft as it was not part of the dialogue and recommendation of the shoreline regulation sub committee. I have attempted to follow along with the updates, but it appears I may have missed this dialogue and the reason for this change. The setback in the water has consistently remained at 15 feet as long as I have been associated with Peninsula Township. This standard ensures a total 30-foot buffer between neighboring properties, supporting adequate space for swimming, navigation, and overall safety. As an avid boater and swimmer for forty plus years, I understand the importance of safety while also safely respecting your neighbors. The 15 foot setback accomplishes this, there is no good cause to change this.

A 30 foot set back in the water will cause shared waterfront owners to have to reconfigure docks in a way that will become more dangerous in order to accomplish the 30ft. The idea to limit swimming and boating areas just for shared waterfront owners, seems to be targeted and not in good spirit of equal and fair use of our waterways and shoreline. I respectfully ask that the Township Board remove this change of 30 ft setbacks for shared waterfront properties and change it to 15 ft setbacks for all waterfront neighborhoods and single owners.

I have heard rumors that the 30ft set back was established to accomodate 1-2 neighborhoods that have very irregular shoreline that causes a lot of consternation regarding setback and number of boats and hoists. (And, they seem like they may be the loudest voice). I respect their opinion. However, I respectfully ask the Commision to really look at the Peninsula as a whole and ALL Neighborhood Associations and have a consistent set back of 15 ft for ALL types of waterfront ownership.

I appreciate the time the planning commision and so many residents that have supplied their time and expertise have invested in the matter. Thank you for your time! In the spirit of safety, while balancing the

quality of life, I hope you update the draft ordinance to be 15 ft set back for ALL waterfront owners and not a different set back for shared waterfront owners.

Regards,

Adam, Katy, Sophie (15) Henry (13) Covington
13372 Hedeem

Becky Chown

From: Maura Sanders
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2026 9:14 AM
To: Becky Chown
Subject: Fw: 3-34-26 meeting; 30' dock setbacks

Becky,

This can be included in the meeting minutes as it was received too late for the packet.

All Trustees are Bcc for awareness.

Maura Sanders 🍒

Peninsula Township Supervisor

13235 Center Road

Traverse City MI 49686

phone - 231-223-7323

fax - 231-223-7117

supervisor@peninsulatownship.com

Office Hours: Mondays 7:30 am to 6:30 pm, Tuesdays – Thursdays 7:30 am to 5 pm and closed Friday – Sunday and Holidays.

From: Peter Dee <deepeterc@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 24, 2026 9:07 AM
To: Maura Sanders <supervisor@peninsulatownship.com>; Planner <planner@peninsulatownship.com>
Subject: 3-34-26 meeting; 30' dock setbacks

Dear Members of the Peninsula Township Board,

I write to second the concerns raised by Marc Gall in his letter to the Board to be considered in the 3-24-26 meeting packet. I have pasted his letter below.

30' setbacks for docks will pose a major issue for many associations who have peacefully and safely maintained their 15' setbacks for many years. Unnecessary litigation over the township's authority to regulate this issue would likely ensue.

Best regards,
Peter Dee

Adopting Marc Gall's letter:

I am writing to share my thoughts regarding Ordinance #206 – Shoreline Regulations.

First, I would like to express my support for the majority of the proposed revisions. I appreciate the Planning Commission's hard work on this matter and commend them for taking action based on resident input. It is clear that a great deal of time and consideration has gone into developing these updates.

However, I do have a concern regarding the proposed water-side 30-foot setbacks for Shared Waterfront docks.

For the past two-plus years during which this shoreline ordinance has been discussed, setbacks in the water have consistently been presented as 15 feet. This standard provides a reasonable 30-foot buffer between neighboring docks, which offers ample space for swimming, navigation, and safety.

The newly proposed requirement of 30-foot setbacks would effectively create a 60-foot separation between neighboring docks. This represents a significant change from prior discussions and expectations. What is particularly concerning is that this increased setback appears to apply only to Shared Waterfront property owners, while non-shared waterfront owners would continue to be subject to a 15-foot setback.

While I agree that a 30-foot setback at the shoreline may promote safety, the same standard does not translate well into the water. Most dock configurations are T-shaped, and applying a full 30-foot water-side setback significantly limits the practical and functional use of those docks. In many cases, a 15-foot setback in the water has proven to be an effective way for Shared Waterfront owners to maintain safe, usable, and properly configured dock systems. If concerns have arisen in specific situations, those should be addressed individually rather than applying a broad, more restrictive requirement to all properties.

Additionally, this proposed change may unintentionally create hardship for many existing property owners by rendering current dock configurations nonconforming. It could also lead to inefficient use of waterfront space without a clear safety benefit.

In my opinion, this creates an uneven and unnecessary burden on Shared Waterfront owners.

I respectfully ask the Board to reconsider this portion of the ordinance and retain the 15-foot water-side setback for all properties, including Shared Waterfront. This standard has provided a balance of safety, fairness, and reasonable use for many years while still preserving the intent of shoreline protections.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Peter Dee
2332 Harbor Reach Dr
Traverse City, MI 49686