

Packet Addition
April 9, 2026
Planning Commission Meeting



FW: 40 acre rec from ag comm

From Planner <planner@peninsulatownship.com>
Date Tue 3/24/2026 11:15 AM
To PZA Admin <PZAAdmin@peninsulatownship.com>

Jenna,

Please save pdf of this email in the April 9 PC Packet folder.

Sara

From: Kevin Beard <duneclimber55@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2026 8:37 AM
To: John Kroupa <john@peninsulacellars.com>
Cc: Planner <planner@peninsulatownship.com>; PZA Admin <PZAAdmin@peninsulatownship.com>
Subject: Re: 40 acre rec from ag comm

Morning John - I'll ask Sara to include this attachment in our packet along with your email which provides the rationale. It provides more context than we have had to date.

Regarding signage - The public hearing is on April 9 (April 2 is cancelled due to the Easter Weekend). If you review the video of our 3/5 meeting immediately following our Shoreline discussion, you'll have our signage conversation. We did discuss eliminating the requirements for permits on seasonal and incidental signs, allowing one feather flag, allowing one ground/flag pole, and eliminating setbacks beyond keeping signs out of the ROW. Still up for discussion are number of flags allowed on buildings, A-frame/sandwich board signs, seasonal and temporary sign removal dates, lighting flag poles, and we may need a legal clarification on First Amendment issues around campaign signs, social justice signs, and other political speech signs.

Kevin

On Wednesday, March 18, 2026 at 04:09:38 PM EDT, John Kroupa <john@peninsulacellars.com> wrote:

Hi Kevin-

Since the Ag committee meeting was cancelled yesterday, I wanted to send over the attached pdf of the parcel requirements from the 139 ordinance. It was in the packet for yesterday's meeting, and this is a good basis for any discussion your group has, regarding the 60 to 40 acre recommendation, for 201 processors. When we first made the recommendation, part of why we went with 40 acres was because there was precedent from the 139 ordinance that would make our recommendation more palatable, since there was already a defined example that had worked for years. So I am hoping this will add depth to the conversation of what the AAC was intending, and give your group the ability to keep the ball rolling forward, since you have some discussion planned for the 5th.

In regards to the signage feedback- if you have specific sections or verbiage that you would like to send over, I can get our group to provide comments in time for your meeting on the 5th. I certainly don't want to derail the public hearing, and further delay this ordinance from making it to the next step.

Thanks,
John

On Mar 6, 2026, at 12:01 PM, Kevin Beard <duneclimber55@yahoo.com> wrote:

John - that is an important aspect to clarify. I think it can be discussed at the AAC meeting on the 17th. I also wondered about using separate, contiguous parcels that total 40 or more acres. Does the AAC see this as qualifying? Does 201 allow for this now?

Should probably also look at the requirements for how much acreage needs to be in cultivation. Our former planner Elise Loud flagged this suggesting the percentages, when applied to less than 60 acres, might not work as well, but I don't recall the specifics. I've copied Sara on this.

Looks like the PC will have more discussion on this topic at our April 5 meeting so this is timely.

Also - PC discussed signage last night and went thru the draft. I've asked that it be reviewed at the AAC on March 17. Changes were made to permits, setbacks, and ground poles. Still at issue is the seasonal signage and dates for removal. We're looking for an April 5 public hearing on this.

Kevin

On Thursday, March 5, 2026 at 04:34:02 PM EST, John Kroupa <john@peninsulacellars.com> wrote:

Hi Kevin-

I got some feedback regarding the 40 acre recommendation the ag committee made, and it made me think there was a misunderstanding, so I wanted to reach out to you. I know it's late and you're meeting tonight is soon.

So basically there was a thought that the recommendation that the 40 acres could be made up of smaller parcels would set up a situation where someone put together many small parcels all across the peninsula, that total 40, and they would qualify. So 8 five acre parcels all along OMP would total 40 and they would qualify- this is not the intent of the recommendation. The intent was to have the same or similar requirement of the 139 ordinance.

I hope this helps and if not, we can talk it through at the ag meeting in a couple weeks.

Thanks,

John



Fwd: Concerning the rezoning of 11-009-029-10

From robert eckstein <robteckstein1951@gmail.com>

Date Tue 4/7/2026 12:29 PM

To PZA Admin <PZAAdmin@peninsulatownship.com>; Kevin Beard <duneclimber55@yahoo.com>; Planner <planner@peninsulatownship.com>

Hi Jenna, as we discussed could you please include this in the packet to the Commissioners. Thanks

Concerning the rezoning of 11-009-029-10

Of the 3.32 total acres:

2.48 (75%) is zoned R1A and 0.84 (25%) is zoned R1C. If the desire is to consolidate the parcel's zoning, going with the predominant existing zoning, R1A, seems more logical on the face of it.

Particularly given that the Zoning Ordinance (6.2 R1A Districts: Section 6.2.1) states that the intent and purpose of this classification is to "protect fragile hillside areas". This clearly applies to the topographical realities of the site. In addition to the very steep escarpment running N-S on the east edge, there are considerable elevation changes throughout. As to the escarpment (which appears to be a rise of about 40 to 50 feet at 60-degree angle, (though the topo map provided us is inadequate), it appears this escarpment would largely fall in the rear setback requirement and be outside a building envelope.

The petitioner raised the point that the parcel is largely surrounded by R1C zoned parcels, which is true. However, these parcels are basically flat, on either Center or Bluff Rds. The parcel to the NE, is also very hilly, it is most similar to the parcel we are discussing, and it is zoned R1A. I believe this should be considered more than the simple count of the adjacent parcels with R1C zoning. We would be setting precedent by rezoning a hillside area in a way that potentially doubles the allowable building sites.

As far as the number of permissible homes: R1A allows 1 per acre, R1C one per 20,000 square feet. As currently zoned the parcel could have 4 buildings: 2 on the part zoned R1C and 2 on the R1A section. If entirely zoned R1C 6 homes could be built though the petitioner has agreed to limit that to 5. If zoned entirely R1A there could only be 3 sites. However, the petitioner also owns the adjacent parcel 11-009-035-55, a 0.9 acre parcel zoned R1C with adequate square footage ($43,560 \times 0.9 = 40,104$) for 2 homes, (just barely). Building one home is easy as it fronts Bluff Rd, but accessing the back of the parcel (above the escarpment) for a second house is really only possible if accessed through the parcel we are considering (and is shown on the tentative site plan from the petitioner). Considering both parcels together the petitioner has the possibility of building five homes even if we rezone the entity of parcel 11-009-029-10 R1A to protect the hillside nature of the parcel.

I suggest the entire parcel be zoned R1A on the basis of the considerable elevation changes present on the site, conforming to the similar adjacent parcel zoned R1A.

As an aside- It is disturbing the site was clear cut around the time the parcel was sold to the present owner. The petitioner has stated that all the trees cut were diseased, as determined by a forester. I might suggest the PC consider a natural features ordinance in the future, which among other things, set conditions for allowing clear-cutting, as this has also been an unfortunate activity elsewhere. Most recently further up Bluff Rd.

Robert Eckstein