PENINSULA TOWNSHIP

13235 Center Road, Traverse City MI 49686
Phone: 231.223.7322 Fax: 231.223.7117
www.peninsulatownship.com

AGRICULTURAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Regular Meeting Minutes
June 16, 2026
2:00 p.m.

1. **Call to Order** by Kroupa at 2:02 p.m.
2. **Pledge**
3. **Roll Call**

Present: Kroupa, Heller, Baldyga, Johnson, Edmonson, Coggon, Braemer
Also Present: Maura Sanders, Kevin Beard
Absent: Gomez, Hemming

4. **Brief Citizen Comments (for agenda items only):** None
5. **Approve Agenda**

Motion by Baldyga to approve as written with a second by Heller. **Motion Passes**

6. **Conflict of Interest:** None
7. **Consent Agenda**
   - **A. Approve meeting minutes:**
     - **Agricultural Advisory Committee Regular Meeting May 19, 2026**.
   - **B. Correspondence:** Questions from Garry Manor

Motion by Heller to approve consent agenda with second by Baldyga. **Motion Passes**

8. **Business:**
   - **A. Planning Commission Updates**
     - **Sign Ordinance**

Beard provides an update on revisions to the proposed sign ordinance. Discussion includes limiting seasonal signage to March 1 through January 31, reducing the maximum allowable flag area from 100 square feet to 60 square feet, and establishing sign area standards intended to balance advertising needs with reducing visual clutter. Members question how the proposed standards would apply to permanent freestanding signs.
Discussion occurs regarding the definition of wall signage. Members agree that signs painted or mounted on a building constitute wall signs but request clarification on whether artistic murals should be exempt from sign regulations. Members also discuss how permanent, temporary, and seasonal sign area allowances interact and request additional clarification on the proposed standards. Discussion occurs regarding seasonal sign restrictions. Beard explains that limiting seasonal signage is intended to improve enforcement and reduce visual clutter while still allowing temporary signage as needed. Discussion occurs regarding removal requirements for temporary and seasonal signage, with members questioning the necessity, scope, and enforceability of the proposed standards. Beard explains that the existing sign ordinance is currently unenforceable and must be comprehensively revised to comply with recent legal decisions. Discussion concludes with notice that the proposed ordinance is expected to proceed to public hearing, and staff invites additional comments prior to final consideration.
Discussion occurs regarding standards for off-premises signage, sign counts, and square footage allowances, with members requesting additional clarification on the proposed limits.

Members also discuss the prohibition on signs displayed on parked vehicles. Beard explains that the restriction is intended to address vehicles parked primarily for advertising purposes and would not apply to vehicles being used for their intended operational purpose. Discussion notes that enforcement would occur primarily on a complaint basis.

- **Small Processor**

Beard provides an update on the Planning Commission's review of proposed small processor regulations and requests additional information from the Agricultural Advisory Committee regarding operational needs and previously discussed standards, including setbacks, building requirements, and processing activities.
Members discuss examples of small processing operations and emphasize the importance of accommodating value-added agricultural uses while ensuring the regulations are workable for a variety of agricultural operations. Discussion notes that existing ordinance provisions do not currently allow processing on parcels under 40 acres, creating a need for new standards. Discussion also occurs regarding limitations identified in the Township Attorney's guidance. Members agree that topics such as restaurants, large gatherings, and certain MLCC-related activities may need to be excluded from current discussions in order to continue advancing small processor regulations. Discussion occurs regarding the distinction between small-scale processing activities and restaurant uses. Members note that educational demonstrations, product tastings, and farm-to-table events differ from traditional restaurant operations and should be considered separately.
Members discuss the need for additional standards to support on-site agricultural processing on parcels under 40 acres. Emphasizes creating scalable regulations based on acreage that allow processing facilities to expand as agricultural operations grow. Members stress the importance of developing flexible standards that accommodate a variety of value-added agricultural operations while avoiding overly restrictive or impractical requirements. Discussion supports establishing a chart or similar framework outlining allowable processing facility sizes by acreage, while relying on existing regulations and permits to address issues such as noise, odors, waste management, and operational impacts.
Member clarifies that previous recommendations regarding farm stays were removed from the small processor proposal and confirms that additional revisions may be needed to the remaining standards.
Review continues regarding building size standards for small processing facilities. Members express support for flexible, scalable regulations that accommodate a variety of value-added agricultural operations while minimizing impacts on neighboring properties. Consensus emerges around using a 4,000-square-foot processing facility on a five-acre parcel as an initial starting point, with allowable facility size increasing as parcel acreage increases and an eventual maximum cap established. Questions are raised regarding storage needs, setbacks, and long-term expansion opportunities for agricultural operations. Members support developing a chart and visual examples illustrating allowable facility sizes by acreage to assist future PC review.

- **Farm Stay request for permission to discuss**

Beard reports that the PC supports discussing farm stays but emphasizes the need to distinguish them from prohibited short-term rentals and ensure they remain connected to active agricultural operations. Members discuss allowing farm stays, rural camping, and glamping as additional revenue sources for farmers while preserving agricultural land. Discussion identifies setbacks, buffering, trespass prevention, and proof of active farm use as key considerations. Member notes that the Leelanau Township rural camping ordinance may provide a useful framework for future regulations. Consensus supports further exploration of farm stay regulations tailored to agricultural properties.
Members express concern with requiring primary farm income as a qualification for farm stays, noting that agricultural income can fluctuate significantly and may not accurately reflect active farming operations. Alternatives such as acreage under cultivation or evidence of active agricultural use are suggested.
Discussion supports requiring an owner or manager to be present on-site during farm stay operations.
Agreement to circulate Leelanau Township's farm stay ordinance and supporting guidance documents for reference. Members emphasize that any farm stay ordinance must preserve Peninsula Township's rural character

through appropriate buffering, screening, and operational standards. Discussion notes that not all agricultural parcels may be suitable for farm stay uses and stresses the importance of addressing potential concerns early in the ordinance development process.
Members note that bed and breakfast operations may affect homestead tax exemptions and emphasize the importance of informing property owners of this impact. Discussion supports expanding farm stay opportunities on agricultural properties through additional guest rooms, adaptive reuse of existing agricultural structures, and scalable standards based on parcel size. Members recognize that existing farm labor housing and other agricultural structures may provide opportunities for overnight accommodations, subject to applicable building and occupancy requirements.
Discussion addresses how farm stays could apply to properties subject to PDR easements or PA 116 agreements. Members note that eligibility would depend on the specific terms and restrictions contained within individual easements or contracts, which vary by property. Members acknowledge that some PDR agreements may permit uses allowed under agricultural zoning, while others may impose additional restrictions. Consensus supports developing farm stay regulations for non-restricted agricultural land first, with any future approvals on restricted properties remaining subject to applicable easement or contract provisions.

B. Town Board Update

Sanders thanks those who attended the anti-harassment training and reminds members to complete and confirm completion. Reports that PC member Randy Hall has resigned, effective following the July 9 PC meeting, and announces that applications for the vacancy will be solicited. Discussion emphasizes the value of maintaining a diverse PC membership representing a variety of backgrounds and interests, including the agricultural community. Sanders announces that MDARD representative Ryan Coffey Hoag will attend a joint PC and TB meeting on July 13 from noon to 3:00 p.m. for a question-and-answer session regarding agricultural issues and ordinance topics.

C. Possible Discussion of farm stay language

Discussion occurred under Farm Stay request for permission to discuss

9. Citizen Comments

Molly Stretten, 2822 Devil's Dive Rd: Clarifies that the original small processor proposal submitted by the subcommittee differed from the version included in the meeting packet and notes that provisions tying retail square footage to parcel acreage had previously been removed. References discussions with MDARD staff supporting an acreage-based approach for processing facilities, noting that it allows operations to scale proportionally with farm size and avoids creating inequities among farms. Consideration is encouraged for tying processing and related building sizes to parcel acreage.

Fred Woodruff, 4822 Forest Ave: Questions whether excluding MLCC-licensed activities from the small processor discussion could create a two-tier system among agricultural operations. Concern is expressed that limiting consideration to non-MLCC uses may raise legal or constitutional issues related to the uniform application of zoning regulations. Encourages the committee to carefully consider the implications of not pursuing MLCC-related uses. Questions the committee's role and authority moving forward, noting that the committee was appointed by the TB and suggesting that the committee further define its purpose and responsibilities as the ordinance rewrite process continues.
Kroupa response: Acknowledged concerns regarding legal guidance related to MLCC-related uses. While legal counsel advised caution, direction from township leadership has been interpreted as not pursuing those topics at this time.
Edmonson response: Expresses concern that the committee may be limiting its ability to recommend uses that could benefit the agricultural community based on direction from township leadership or legal counsel. States that the committee should be able to forward recommendations it believes are appropriate.

10. Board Comments

Heller: Notes that the committee's time and resources are limited and emphasizes the importance of focusing on topics that can be productively advanced at this time. Indicates that certain issues may be deferred until pending legal matters are resolved in order to prioritize achievable ordinance work.

Adjournment

Motion by Baldyga to adjourn, seconded by Kroupa. **Motion Passes**

Meeting adjourned at 3:46 p.m.