

PENINSULA TOWNSHIP
13235 Center Road, Traverse City MI 49686
Ph: 231.223.7322
Planning Commission Regular Meeting

May 16, 2022 7:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order: 7:00 p.m. by Hall

2. Pledge

3. Roll Call: Present: Wunsch, Alexander, Hall, Hornberger, Couture, Dloski; absent: Shipman; also present: Planner Jenn Cram, Attorney Greg Meihn via phone, Township Zoning Administrator, Christina Deeren, and Recording Secretary, Beth Chan

4. Approve agenda:

Hall: recommends a change for agenda item number five, which currently reads *for public comment for agenda items only*; the change is *to items not on the agenda* according to the bylaws section 2.8.

Moved by Dloski to modify item five on the agenda moving forward to agenda items not on the agenda, seconded by Alexander

approved by consensus

Cram: makes two changes: first add item d. to 8. Reports for an update on the Seven Hills development and add an item to Other Matters or Comments by Planning Commission Members at the end of the meeting for future dates and training.

Moved by Dloski to approve agenda, as amended, seconded by Wunsch

approved by consensus

5. Brief Citizen Comments: (for agenda items only)

Discussion and clarification of citizen comments change

Nancy Heller, 3091 Blue Water Road: commented on the change for public comment and wanted to clarify that any items on the agenda can be commented on by the audience in the beginning. Seeing a big difficulty in what was just presented.

Couture: clarified that public comment (on agenda items) will take place after the business section of the meeting.

Cram: summarized meeting procedure, the only change is reducing duplication of public comments on agenda items.

Hall: this is important, directed audience to ask questions about the meeting procedure

Lou Santucci, 12602 Center Road: asked for clarification on commenting on several items in a group and asked if he can speak to each one of the items separately. This is hard to do in a three-minute time frame. Asked for the items to be separated.

Hall: There is a lot on the agenda, it is a goal to keep public comments to three minutes, but more flexibility will be offered.

Dave Edmondson, 12414 Center Road: Asked about reports and updates in the packet and when did they change to a verbal presentation? Will minutes be taken?

Cram: minutes will be taken

Edmondson: one of my farmer, agriculture counterparts (Tabone) is being harassed by the zoning department, he has the right to sell products from other growers. This is a disservice to the community. We need support, not aggravation. We need to embrace the right to farm act.

6. Review for Conflict of Interest: None

7. Consent Agenda:

Moved by Hornberger to approve consent agenda, as presented, seconded by Alexander

approved by consensus

8. Reports and Updates:

a. PDR Ordinance Re-write (Cram)

Cram: that will be heard before the township board on June 14th and a revised red-line version will be posted online. Technical changes are being made related to accounting processes.

May 16, 2022

Beth Chan, Recording Secretary

b. Bella Vue SUP #137 (Cram)

Cram: this application has been pending for over two years. The township board allowed the applicant to move through the PUD process instead of the standard land division. It does not meet the requirement of having a minimum of twenty acres, so it did require board approval to move through the planning commission process. Trees were removed from the property and the application was looked into. It was found that six units were requested on 4.5 acres which exceeds the zoning ordinance; the most they could request is four units. It is more realistic to have three units. A complete application needs to be submitted, and it needs to be determined if the applicant wants to move forward with the PUD process or a standard land division and withdraw the application.

c. New B & B application at 550 Camino Maria Drive (Cram)

Cram: There is a new B and B application, review has begun; suggested an introduction and public hearing for June. In the future, would like to streamline the process and have the introduction and public hearing in the same meeting

d. Seven Hills update (Cram)

Cram: there are two plans, an original and an updated plan. The applicant has reduced the footprint, and all of the uses are consistent with what was approved. The maximum capacity of thirty-two patrons remains in effect. The original approval did not allow for outdoor uses. Will take minor modification to the Township Board for approval on June 14, 2022.

9. Business:

a. Zoning Ordinance Re-write-Proposed Modifications to November 16, 2021, Draft-Public Hearing

Cram: gave a historical summary of the zoning ordinance rewrite for the last six years found in the May 11, 2022 memo found in the packet.

Board discussion on the flow of the public hearing

Cram: summarized the proposed modifications to the zoning ordinance noted in the May 11, 2022 memo found in the packet. For the most part the language that is in the current rewrite will be removed from certain Sections as noted and will be replaced with the original language in the 1972 existing zoning ordinance. In addition, a few words have been deleted to clarify intent. Items one through six were covered in the last meeting. Then the floor will be opened for public comment.

1. Section 1.05-Conflicting Regulations (Page 1-2)
2. Section 2.02-Definitions (Pages 2-1--2-17)
3. Section 6.15-Hotels and Motels (Pages 6-9--6-10)
4. Section 6.24-Rental of Dwellings (Page 6-19)
5. Section 6.25- Roadside Stands (Page 6-19)
6. Winery-Chateaus 6.34 (Page 6-32)
7. Section 3.13-Great Lakes Shoreline Regulations (pages 3-11--3-19)
8. Section 8.04-Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control and Protection of Steep Slopes

Wunsch: will the requirement for a roadside stand to have fifty percent of the product be grown on the farm?

Cram: future policy direction includes the fifty percent requirement as is consistent with the Right to farm GAAMPS for Farm Markets.

Hornberger: wanted clarification that this is going back to the original language.

Dloski: will the new language be available in June for roadside stands?

Cram: policy direction from the Citizens' Agricultural Committee will be presented in June

Dloski: is the policy direction going to be consistent with the right to farm act?

Cram: yes

Dloski: Under the GAAMPS for farm markets, roadside stands are under the umbrella of farm markets

Cram: a roadside stand is a type of farm market

Moved by Dloski to close the regular meeting and open the public hearing on items 1-6, seconded by Wunsch

approved by consensus

Curt Peterson, 1356 Buchan Drive: provided a handout (attached) to planning commission members. Summarized handout on the difference between rental of dwelling (short-term rental) and Home Sharing.

Lou Santucci: commented on the short-term rental, glad to hear the different views will be vetted. One cannot state that they are banned in all of the zones. For owner-occupied short-term rentals, there has never been a problem; we are here to support

them. Cherry farms are missing and this would give agricultural operators a leg up. Agriculture is changing, tourism is here to stay.

Cram: the Citizens' Agricultural Advisory Committee is not addressing short-term rentals. Home sharing is a bed and breakfast.

Marc Santucci, 11789 Center Road: read comments included in an attachment to the minutes.

Lou Santucci: commented on the farm market, it is not just fifty percent of total sales; it includes fifty percent of the floor area or the business plan. An easy fix is that the township will follow the right to farm act and GAAMPS. The township is trying to enforce an ordinance that does not comply with GAAMPS. The language should be fixed. Cites a case in Leelanau County where a farmer had built a building and the judge told the township they could not enforce a setback because it conflicts with the GAAMPS. There is no size requirement in the GAAMPS, there is a setback requirement. Our township needs to take note of the GAAMPS and follow them.

Dave Edmondson: Concurs with Lou and Marc. The right to farm is important to the agricultural community and will make life easier for legitimate farmers. The wineries are preserving the land, we need to embrace the wine community.

Hall: should we move forward with seven and eight?

Dloski: questioned one through six, proposed revisions; we are going to the original language?

Cram: roadside stands will be addressed in the future. The Citizens' Agricultural Advisory Committee is reviewing and will provide policy direction; the other items will be vetted through the planning commission. The list will come back one at a time for discussion and at that time will allow for public comment. Once completed, the township attorney and I will draft the verbiage. Every planning commission agenda will likely have an item for consideration.

Hall: if the planning commission concurs with staff recommendation on the zoning ordinance rewrite, we will have a motion to approve the rewrite to be sent to the township board. We should talk about seven and eight and then consider all items.

Wunsch: explains the process at the township board level when recommendations are sent from the planning commission

Cram: summarized item seven found in the May 11, 2022, Memo Re: Zoning Ordinance Re-write-Proposed Modifications the November 16, 2021 Draft, Great Lakes Shoreline Regulations. Notes that this is a priority moving forward due to the value of the graphics. Dock placement is a discussion for the future.

Hall: was staff going to accept the new language removing the language on shoreline vegetation?

Cram: heard from citizens about this topic, but a past planning commission member had said that a public hearing had not been held on this topic, they recommended removing and replacing.

Discussion on procedure

Couture: inclined to stay with the plan to go back to the original language

Wunsch: concurs

Monnie Peters, 1425 Nehtawanta Road: it is much better to go back to the old version and take a look at the new version. McKenna helped with the diagrams and the drawings with the shoreline definition. We did not broach where you put the dock and how many hoists can be on the dock. We recognized at that point those were problematic. This section wasn't clear that those pages should be taken out. At this point, the old regulations are enforceable and pick up all of the shoreline regulations.

Dloski: is the intent for the planning commission to review the shoreline regulations in their meetings or would a subcommittee work for discussion?

Cram: a planning commission subcommittee will work on this

Dloski: a subcommittee is set up for zoning issues

Cram: Donna, Randy, and Larry make up the subcommittee

Discussion of priorities

Cram: summarized item eight found in the May 11, 2022, Memo Re: Zoning Ordinance Re-write-Proposed Modifications the November 16, 2021 Draft, Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control and Protection of Steep Slopes.

Explained how the amendments were incorporated into the zoning ordinance.

Hall: asked for public comment on item eight

Hall closed the public hearing and opens the regular meeting

Hall: asked for a motion to approve the zoning ordinance rewrite with the amendments one through eight recommended by staff to approve this as amended to send to the township board for approval of the zoning ordinance rewrite

Moved by Couture to adopt the eight changes to the current recommended zoning ordinance revisions and the eight changes bringing back the current language and forward that to the township board, seconded by Alexander.

Discussion

Dloski: questioned that the roadside stand language is not enforceable

Hall: the statute quo on roadside stands may be inconsistent with the right to farm act and the GAAMPS

Meihn: ordinances that may have questionable issues on how they are thought of can be enforced in a manner that is compliant with GAAMPS.

Roll call:

approved unanimously

b. Policy Recommendations from the Citizen's Agricultural Advisory Committee on Winery-Chateau and Farm Processing regulations-Discussion and Recommendation to Township Board

Cram: the Citizens' Agricultural Advisory Committee was created by the township board in light of the winery lawsuit with the intent of understanding current ordinances and recommending possible modifications to mediations of points outlined in the lawsuit. The township board appointed ten citizens to the committee so far. The wineries have not participated in an official capacity, three seats remain open. The last official meeting of the Citizens' Agricultural Advisory Committee was on April 28, 2022. The committee was interested in continuing to discuss zoning issues. Three additional seats were requested and approved for agricultural operators to be heard. The intent is for parity across all agricultural operators. This committee will meet at 10:00 a.m. on the fourth Thursday of the month. Reviewed the memo to the planning commission included in the packet dated May 11, 2022, Re: Winery Chateau and Farm Processing Policy Recommendations from the Citizens' Agricultural Advisory Committee. Reviewed the policy direction from the memo.

Alexander: asked what happens to a winery chateau in existence?

Cram: any winery chateau with an SUP will be grandfathered in under what was approved. Moving forward if a modification is requested, they will have to come through an amendment process. In the coming months, all SUPs in the township will be examined by the planner and the zoning administrator.

Hall: are these policy recommendations final at this point? Will the planning commission approve these tonight?

Cram: the planning commission is approving the policy direction, not the exact language. Staff and the Township attorney will draft the language.

Hall: comment can be heard tonight and also when the language is drafted.

Dloski: how does this relate to the lawsuit?

Cram: The Citizens' Agricultural Advisory Committee was formed as a result of the lawsuit. When they started to talk about the zoning ordinance, we realized it would be beneficial to look at future recommendations to address the zoning ordinance that would provide clarity, these are not specific to the lawsuit.

Dloski: what good is this? This could be negated by a judge.

Cram: we needed to look at the current zoning ordinance and the Citizens' Agricultural Advisory Committee decided during this process- did they agree or did they want to look at something else. What a judge would rule on is specific to the lawsuit, not necessarily our entire zoning ordinance.

Dloski: not prepared to vote on this tonight

Cram: there is a moratorium that ends on July first, the Township Board would like to update the zoning ordinance before that date.

Discussion on the Policy Recommendations from the Citizens' Advisory Committee dates moving forward

Cram: recaps recommendations included in the packet dated May 11, 2022, Re: Winery Chateau and Farm Processing Policy Recommendations from the Citizens' Agricultural Advisory Committee

Hall closes the regular meeting and opens the public hearing

Marc Santucci: states he does not believe there is a member on the agricultural committee that is growing grapes. The three Protect The Peninsula members have publicly spoken against wineries. There are three citizens. These members have been picked by the township board. For the SUPs, all bets are off.

Cram: All SUPs are grandfathered with original approvals.

Marc Santucci: Disagrees with the change in the rules where the grapes and cherries come from, under these rules, you are limited to a twenty percent limit. Disagrees with the additional land requirement. For the rules on food, what reason for the prepared versus made from scratch food? Can't use the vegetables grown on-site because it has to be prepared and can be heated but not cooked. This is NIMBY. The wineries will go to the state to get the rules changed. There are two proposed wineries that want to come in and the township is blocking them from coming in on the existing rules. Disagrees with the committee makeup and was not allowed to participate, because he was not in Traverse City at the time. The members of the wineries were not allowed to participate.

Lou Santucci: Challenges the planning commission in passing the policy recommendations. Feels they will trap a future winery. An existing winery with a change to their SUP will be subject to the new rules. He did not have input and two days is not enough to consider these recommendations. Feels the process was not transparent. Challenges the committee and the results of the committee. Recommends that this is tabled.

Chris Baldyga, 9707 Montague Road: echoes the comments on the makeup of the committee. Feels like it was not a balanced group. The first recommendation made was to sunset the winery chateau ordinance and the remote tasting room ordinance. Questions the invalidation of the work put into these ordinances in the past. Commented on the farm processing language: it doubles it to from forty to eighty acres with sixty-five percent of acreage covered in crops. The size of the parcel doubles and is five times the amount of acreage required. There are no incentives mentioned, instead more restrictions for small farms. The language holds back Old Mission agriculture.

Dave Edmondson: concurs with his counterparts. He participated in this committee. There were three agriculture operators and they were outvoted. Most of these items the agriculture participants did not want. Need more participation from agriculture. Need all sides and feels it does not represent this. The township needs to work for the agricultural community.

Todd Oosterhouse, 7700 Peninsula Drive: appreciates the re-write as it was time, it was non-ag-centered people. Why rush something so important to the community. Gives examples that he feels do not represent parity. Feels it is limiting the growth of a winery, once the land is maxed at eighty percent, that is as high as it can go.

Cram: what is proposed is more flexible

Todd Oosterhouse: it says from your own land. Make the committee top-heavy on the agriculture side.

Nancy Heller, 3091 Blue Water Road: asks that when going through the policy recommendations, how realistic was placement? Asks about do-ability because of the unique shape of these properties. Mentions that comments tonight about staff were not fair. Feels haste makes waste.

Curt Peterson: there are unintended consequences with not serving meals. Right now, groups go through the wineries sampling the wine. By not allowing meals, unwanted activity remains. Cited an example of restaurants in New Zealand wine county.

Law Siebold, 3195 Cherry Hill Road: not all farmers agree with one another and farms are very different. It is not only grapes and cherries. Need something general enough for each farm's intention. He is a member of the committee; there has been good discussion. There are different interests, good general input brings clear ideas to move forward. Cooperation is needed. Unsure of the future, but appeals to all to look at this objectively to make the peninsula the best place to live.

Dennis Arouca, 850 Nehtawanta Road: commented about economic development and serves on the board of directors of GTEDC, Grand Traverse Economic Development Corporation. On a personal level, Old Mission is rural and agricultural, a key tenant is to enhance the assets we already have. In this case, it is the rural and agricultural character. Another is balance. Do not destroy the assets for growth. The Citizens' Agricultural Advisory Committee seems to be moving in the right direction, a reset of appropriate balance among the competing interests that preserves what makes our peninsula great and allows for enhanced economic development in the agricultural community.

Rudy Rudolf, 4784 Forest Avenue: serves on the agricultural committee. Clarified that the grape growers chose not to serve on the committee, however, they were in the audience and had the opportunity to comment. Early in the process, heard from agricultural operators (not from wineries) who felt they did not have the same footing on the peninsula and felt the zoning ordinance favored wineries. As a result, one of the first actions was the winery chateau ordinance was sunsetted to put energy back into making a good farm processing ordinance that benefitted all operators. Winery operations are more intense than regular agriculture. That is why a scaled approach was recommended for farm processing. Regular agriculture is not dead, there are many acres planted with new trees: 300 acres of orchards in the last few years. Concerned about the request by the wineries to bring in outside juice to process from outside the area. Agriculturally zoned land is for agricultural purposes. Unlimited amounts of juice being brought in should be on industrial zoned land. The same for commercial establishments. Finally, mentioned provisions due to a problem due to climate, additional materials can be brought in and are on the books.

John Wunsch, 17881 Center Road: is on the committee. The planner did not feed the committee information. The attacks on the planner's process are unfounded. There is a myth that orchards are not viable, 300 acres were planted in the last five years. Commented on imbalance, when restaurants raise the price of land value. A balance should be made. Scaling allows smaller agricultural operations to get going. Thinks that make it easier for all farmers. The lawsuit allowed for reexamination. If the balance is tipping to large operations that are not farming, then it is time for a reset. Wineries are not bad, but there were over a thousand complaints against wineries in the last year. Commented that bringing in juice does not support agriculture. Move forward with the policy recommendations.

Cram: the Citizens' Agricultural Advisory Committee was created for balance. When they first started meeting, the recommendation came out to sunset the winery chateau ordinance. Took the group through an exercise to compare the winery chateau to farm processing for pros and cons. For fifty acres in ownership and seventy-five percent must be planted, there are acres preserved in agriculture. The other growers wanted what they perceived the wineries had. Looked at what should a true farm processing operation as a use by right look like. Requested three more agricultural operators to bring back policy that promotes agriculture. For a farm market, it allows for limited processing. This is a part of the puzzle that has been elevated as a result of the lawsuit. This committee is not a decision-making body. The meetings were open and comments were accepted in writing. It was an open process.

Planning Commission Regular Meeting

May 16, 2022

Beth Chan, Recording Secretary

Michelle Zebel, 2616 Bowers Harbor Road: observed that farmers are critical and will become more important in the future. Having local experts is critical. The farmers and farmland are precious and they have a passion.

Hall closes the public hearing and opens the regular meeting.

Dloski: not comfortable making a recommendation on a policy statement not in the form of an ordinance; wants to review it more thoroughly.

Cram: the goal was to see if it is headed in the right direction

Hall: does not have the background of the discussion

Dloski: table it to the next meeting

Meihn: can call a special meeting, the planning commission does not have to be pushed to make a decision

Wunsch: committee put in over thirty hours to develop these recommendations. Should direct the planner to start draft language for discussion

Discussion of a special meeting

Motion by Dloski to table the discussion of the Winery Chateau and Farm Processing Recommendations from the Citizens' Agricultural Advisory Committee to Monday, May 23, 2022, special planning commission meeting, seconded by Wunsch.

Roll Call approved unanimously

c. Future dates (Cram)

Cram: meet with Greg Meihn on the process and protocol and look at the by-laws. There should be training and onboarding for new planning commission members. Secondly, would like to streamline the process for the applicant

10. Public Comments:

Marc Santucci: Commented on the December mediation, Protect the Peninsula discussion. Wanted to participate in the Citizens' Agricultural Advisory Committee but it was not open to everyone. For the 300 acres of planted trees, in 2001, 850,000 2021, 130,000 took out trees because it was not profitable. His pick your own business is profitable. Spoke about buying land for a vineyard or winery. Spoke of the costs to plant a vineyard, a multi-million investment.

Lou Santucci: wanted to participate via YouTube for the Citizens' Agricultural Advisory Committee but was not allowed. This was not an open process.

Todd Oosterhouse: why are we taking things away, why can't cherry farmers do what wineries do?

Dave Edmondson: the committee voted for YouTube, but the clerk said it was unavailable.

11. Other Matters or Comments by Planning Commission Members:

Wunsch: stated his actions have been mischaracterized. The decision to not use YouTube was consistent with other subcommittee actions, felt it was an open process.

12. Adjournment:

Moved by Dloski to adjourn, seconded by Wunsch approved by consensus

Adjournment at 10:05 p.m.

Curt Peterson, 1356 Buchan Drive

Considerations for 5-16-2022 Planning Commission of Peninsula Twp. Regarding rental of dwellings.

The difference between rental of dwelling (Short-term rental) and Home Sharing

Short-term Rental (STR)

from Pen Twp zoning ordinance: no definition

from Blacks Law dictionary: no definition

from Merriam and Webster: no definition

from Michigan Legislature (proposed legislation only at this point):

Edit of HB 4722

(b) "Short-term rental" means the rental of a single-family residence, a dwelling unit in a 1-to-4-family house, or any unit or group of units in a condominium, for terms of not more than 30 consecutive days.

Home Sharing

From a group formed to fight residential Short Term Rental (STR) in ~~Scottsdale~~ ^{Sedona}, Arizona:

Neighbors not Nightmares (<https://neighborsnotnightmares.com/>)

Home Sharing vs Short Term Rental (STR)

HOME SHARING vs SHORT TERM RENTALS

Home Sharing is when the actual resident of a residential property offers it for lodging to paying guests. After all, if it's not your actual home it's not sharing, it's just an investment property. Home Sharing is often a "Mom & Pop" situation that offers spare rooms in a home while the resident is present, or the "whole house" for less than 183 days per year (otherwise it would not be the actual residence of the operator).

We support Home Sharing as it provides "supplemental income" to the resident and has a minor impact on the surrounding area since:

- (1) There is an actual resident associated with the property;
- (2) The resident is actually present in the home to supervise guests, or;
- (3) The resident is fairly particular about guests as they will be staying in their actual home,
- (4) The resident is unlikely to "pack the house" with a large number of guests, and;
- (5) The rental activity is offered on a part-time or occasional basis to guests.

HOME SHARING IS COMPATIBLE WITH RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOODS.

**STRs ARE COMMERCIAL OPERATIONS THAT BELONG IN
COMMERCIAL AREAS.**

Comparisons of existing vs. two proposed drafts

Existing ordinance

Section 6.2 R-1A Districts: Rural and Hillside Residential:

6.2.2e of R1A zoning code:

- (a) Rental of Non-owner Occupied Dwelling: (REVISED BY AMENDMENT 182)
- a.1. Intent -This is a clarifying amendment that confirms the determination by the Zoning Board of Appeals on September 9, 1999, that the minimum length of time that a dwelling may be rented and be in conformance with the intent of the ordinance is one month and reaffirmed by the Zoning Board of Appeals on September 11, 2008 as 30 days. This is also to distinguish between rental of a "non-owner occupied dwelling" and "Bed and Breakfast" which is rental of a owner occupied dwelling.
 - a.2. A property owner may rent a non-owner occupied dwelling, provided that the minimum length of time that the dwelling may be rented is 30 days.

Draft Nov. 2021

Rental of Dwellings (currently Section 6. 2. 2(2) (e))

Except in the A-1 Zoning District, the minimum length of time that a dwelling may be rented, in conformance with the intent of the ordinance, is 30 days. This does not include the rental of units within a bed and breakfast or guest rooms at a winery-chateau. [LM166]

Proposed change to draft 04-2022

Rental of Dwellings (currently Section 6. 2. 2(2) (e))

~~Except in the A-1 Zoning District,~~ the minimum length of time that a dwelling may be rented, in conformance with the intent of the ordinance, is 30 days. This does not include the rental of units within a bed and breakfast or guest rooms at a winery-chateau. (3-9-22 JC)

Analysis of the versions: Existing acknowledges rental of a owner-occupied dwelling. The others do not. Changing to the proposed would be a substantive change from the existing which is not the stated purpose of the zoning rewrite. Substantive changes should be reviewed in the future.

Why are we micromanaging our agricultural and agricultural processing industry and as a community where will it lead us to. I could spend an hour going over the reasons why what you are doing and trying to do make no sense, but I will limit myself to a few observations in the hope I can get you to listen and then utilize your critical thinking skills before you accept some of what you have been presented by the Township Planner.

Our current zoning ordinance states and I quote:

It is the intent of this subsection to promote a thriving local agricultural production industry and preserve rural character by allowing construction and use of a winery/farm processing facility.

Nice intent but I contend the actual regulations do just the opposite. The people behind these and proposed new regulations appear to have no understanding of the law of unintended consequences and also appear to lack common sense.

The existing zoning regulations require that 85% of the fruit used for processing come from farms in Peninsula Township with the majority of the fruit coming from the processor's own farm. The so called Agricultural Committee ups that majority to 80%. What was the reasoning behind this? My guess is that the staff and Board felt that such restrictions would limit the number of wineries and those that survived would "preserve" farmland. As to how this would financially benefit the wineries or farmers, I doubt that was a consideration. In fact I have heard more than once that the owners of the wineries were just greedy bees.

Now let's look at the likely outcome of these restrictions. First, anyone who knows anything about growing fruit crops in Northwest Michigan knows that there is significant fluctuations in production quantity and quality from year to year. So does the winemaker set his production and bottling capacity at the high end or the low end of his harvest. If he sets it at the high end and is not allowed to bring in grapes or juice when the harvest is at the lower end of the curve he is paying for equipment that he is not allowed to fully utilize. If he sets it at the low end then when the harvest is big he does not have the ability to process all of his product.

Now lets look at how this affects the farmer. First, for years I have been telling the board that the days of the tart cherry farmer in Peninsula Township are limited. The cost of both PDR and developable land are too high for anyone to successfully get into the business. At the same time the average price paid to the farmer for tart cherries has been in decline for a long time. Productivity enhancements have not overcome that price decline. In the 30 years I have been growing cherries the number of processors has been in decline. My original buyer, Fruit Belt, is now out of the cherry business. My second buyer Cherry Growers Inc. is now bankrupt and out of business. My third and current buyer is Peterson Farms and I just received a letter from them stating that they no longer consider themselves a cherry processor but are now an apple processor. They cannot compete with imported processed cherries. It is only a matter of time before they no longer take my cherries.

So the best alternative is grapes to the extent they can be grown on the land where tart cherries are grown. Given the current 49% limitation on the use of grapes produced on the Peninsula and not by the winery and soon to be 20% limitation please tell me who is the soon to be grape farmer going to sell his grapes to. I guess he could be like Rob Manigold and sell them to Left Foot Charlies. But Left Foot Charlies can only buy so many.

If the processor were allowed to bring in grapes or juice without artificial restrictions then he could more efficiently operate and be in a stronger position to grow and to buy grapes from both local farmers and out of area farmers.

This Township has become a playground for the wealthy and for all intents and purposes is turning into a gated community. That can be a good thing or a bad thing depending on your vantage point. However, as your regulations make it harder for a farmer to make money and as more people want to enjoy what the Peninsula offers the value of the land will continue to increase making it more attractive to the farmer to sell his land to a developer. We have seen it happen in the past and I believe the trend will only accelerate as zoning is tailored to those who want to limit the ability of the agricultural sector to thrive. Then you will have your gated community, without farms except where the development rights have been purchased. See what kind of traffic problems you have then during rush hour.

Zoning

From: Marty Lagina <Marty@RockMI.com>
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2022 6:53 PM
To: zoning@peninsulatownship.com
Cc: Rob Manigold; Alex Lagina
Subject: Tonight's meeting

Christina:

I had thought I was going to be able to make the meeting tonight but I'm running late and still out of town. I talked to Rob and he assured me that the following comments would be put on the record from me:

Any and ALL new definitions should be pulled from the new version of the ordinance. There have been multiple comments about the unnecessary and illogical change of how building height is determined for instance. That definition should be pulled for sure. However any definition change is substantive by its very nature. All new definitions should be pulled from the new version until they can be discussed rationally and vetted by the public.

Also I disagree strongly with the procedure you're using to ban short term rentals in the Ag district. I can elaborate on that later but I believe what you're doing is not proper and not legally binding

There are lots of other things in the proposed ordinance that shouldn't be passed at this time because they still aren't properly thought out.

The concept of "We need to get something past even though it's badly flawed" is not proper nor logical

Those are my comments, Christina
sorry about how late this email is
please make sure they get into the record.

Finally please advise whether the revised master plan has been formally adopted

Thanks

Marty Lagina

Sent from my iPhone

Peninsula Township Planning

From: Alex Lagina <alex@marivineyards.com>
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2022 1:59 PM
To: planner@peninsulatownship.com
Subject: Peninsula Township Draft Ordinance for 05-16-22 meeting

Jennifer,

I would like this email to be read into the record at tonight's Planning Commission meeting and included in the minutes.

The revised ordinances do not appear to be well thought out. As they stand, they would make bumper stickers illegal given that portable signs on vehicles would be prohibited. I assume this was not the intent of the Township. Any trades companies called in to maintain homes or infrastructure on Old Mission Peninsula would also be guilty of violating the ordinance if their vehicles have any identifying information. This is just one of many examples of problems that still exist in the ordinance. I suggest the Township pause and rethink these ordinances and their unintended consequences.

--

Alex Lagina

General Manager

MARI VINEYARDS
8175 Center Rd.
Traverse City, MI 49686
 [\(231\) 938-6116](tel:(231)938-6116) x 102
marivineyards.com