

**Packet Addition
April 14, 2026,
Township Board
Regular Meeting**

Correspondence

Becky Chown

From: George Weber <georgeweber.tc@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 9, 2026 9:25 PM
To: Becky Chown; Maura Sanders; Peninsula Townshiip Trustee Milliken; Peninsula Township Trustee; Peninsula Township Trustee Alexander; Peninsula Township Trustee Wunch; Katie Clark
Subject: Shoreline Ordinance amendment public input
Attachments: Public input Peninsula 4526.pdf

Peninsula Board Members,

I ask that you please consider the attached thoughts and observations concerning the shoreline ordinance amendment which you will be addressing at the upcoming April 14 Board meeting and public hearing.

Thank you.

George Weber

**PUBLIC INPUT TO THE PENINSULA TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES RE: SHORELINE
ORDINANCE AMENDMENT PERTAINING TO SHARED PROPERTY OWNERS' SEASONAL
INSTALLATION OF PORTABLE DOCKS AND HOISTS**

4/5/2026

An existing 50-year-old Peninsula Township shoreline ordinance arbitrarily limits the seasonal use of docks and boat hoists by shared frontage property owners to one hoist per fifty feet of frontage. The ordinance has never been enforced or even been widely acknowledged as existing since its enactment. Over the years, various Township officials have declared the ordinance to be unenforceable. For all intents and purposes, this ordinance doesn't exist. My family and I have been shared waterfront boating residents of Peninsula Township for over 45 years. Ours and other shared waterfront property owner associations have responsibly managed the seasonal installation and removal of their docks and hoists with self-imposed guidelines and limitations for decades, largely without objection. Occasional conflicts among neighbors have generally been resolved, sometimes with assistance by the Township....as a trade-off to attempting to legislate the exercise of common courtesy among neighbors.

The Township Planning Commission has now proposed a shoreline ordinance amendment for adoption by the Township Board. The amendment includes provisions to permit the seasonal installation by shared frontage owners of up to 3 hoists per 50 feet of shared frontage, along with designated set-back and other requirements. That new regulatory framework is based upon the results of over 2 years of exhaustive fact-finding deliberations, analyses, and public and private sector collaboration. The process included consideration of township demographics and housing development trends, infrastructure constraints, public safety and environmental concerns, township shoreline and bottomland topography, and extensive public and private sector input.

It is estimated that up to 90% conformance is already achieved with this ordinance amendment and more voluntary conformance is expected with its reasonable requirements. **Accordingly, the ordinance amendment is not expected to result in any increase in the number of boats and hoists which will be placed offshore by existing shared frontage owners, since the revised allowable number of boats and hoists have already been in place for many years. Moreover, the Township has regulatory control over the potential future creation of additional shared waterfront parcels by developers.**

A well-publicized conflict involving an East Bay shared frontage owners' association remains ongoing, largely because of site-specific conditions (including a unique shoreline configuration and bottomland topography) which have complicated resolution of the

conflict. Additionally, a vocal group of non-boaters, new residents, and certain Township Trustee(s) oppose any change to the Township's existing 50-year-old ordinance, on the pretense that boat traffic density in area Great Lakes waters is already excessive. Accordingly, Township Trustees are now considering a compromise that would arbitrarily reduce, by one third, the number of allowable hoists from the ordinance amendment provision for 3 per 50 feet of frontage to 2 per 50 feet of frontage, without any supporting justification. Realistically, that change would have no discernable impact on local boat traffic density, given the geography of our local navigable waters. Increases in boat traffic density in our area waters largely originate from the increasing use of nearby launch sites, growing nearby public and private marina facilities, nearby islands and offshore anchorages which attract a growing number of transient boaters, and growing adjacent coastal boating communities.

Attempting to enforce ordinance provisions that are more restrictive than those in the Planning Commission proposed amendment would needlessly infringe upon the property rights of Township shared waterfront property owners, impair their property values and place those of them who are boaters in an untenable position. Moreover, Peninsula Township would be confronted with a whole host of adverse public safety and legal consequences of no longer allowing resident boaters to continue to seasonally park their boats on hoists offshore of their property, as they have for decades.

Forcing these waterfront property owners to haul, launch and reload their boats for each use would overwhelm already overcrowded peninsula launch sites, increase summer traffic congestion on area streets and highways, and force unsightly summer storage of boats and trailers in the driveways of waterfront residential areas. It would also force these boaters to travel by water from launch sites to and from their waterfront properties to temporarily anchor offshore of their beaches...thus causing more boat traffic density.

Peninsula Township Trustees are encouraged to adopt the shoreline ordinance amendment proposed by the Planning Commission. In doing so, they will adhere to the well-founded recommendations of fellow township planning officials, residents, outside consultants and others who have collaborated and worked long and diligently to formulate and fully vet a well-balanced and supportable shoreline regulation amendment. The adoption of more restrictive regulatory provisions than those proposed would needlessly harm a multitude of township waterfront property owners, would not be in the best interest of our community, and would not go unchallenged by those collectively impacted property owners.

Respectfully submitted,

George Weber, Peninsula Township resident

Sign Code Enforcement Moratorium Extension

To: Maura Sanders, Peninsula Township Supervisor

From: Kevin Beard, Planning Commission Chair

Re: Sign Code Enforcement Moratorium Extension

April 10, 2026

At the April 9, 2026 meeting of the Peninsula Township Planning Commission, the Commission, by consensus, respectfully suggested that the Township Board extend the existing moratorium on enforcing the sign code.

As you are aware, the current code is virtually unenforceable due to the fact it does not conform to the Reed V. Town of Gilbert (2015) SCOTUS decision requiring content neutrality.

The Commission reviewed the most recent draft of amendments to the sign code and following a public hearing, made several minor changes. However, we are still one to two months away from making a recommendation to the Township Board.

Therefore, we believe that it is in the best interests of the Township to extend the moratorium as we expect farm stands and other enterprises will soon be looking to place signage near their operations.

If you or the Board have any questions or concerns please contact me or our Planner, Sara Kopriva.

Sincerely,
Kevin E Beard