PENINSULA TOWNSHIP

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

ZONING REWRITE AD-HOC COMMITTEE
Regular Meeting Minutes
July 7, 2026
1:00 p.m.

1. **Call to Order** by Beard
2. **Pledge**
3. **Roll Call**

Present: Kevin Beard, Julie Alexander, Donna Hornberger
Also present: Planner Sara Schroeder, Ethan Senti and Chris Khorey with McKenna, via Zoom.
Absent: Jed Hemming

4. **Approve Agenda**

Motion by Alexander to approve as written with a second by Hornberger. **Motion Passes**

5. **Brief Citizen Comments:** None
6. **Communications:** None
7. **Conflict of Interest:** None
8. **Approve meeting minutes:**
    a. **June 2, 2026 Zoning Rewrite Ad-Hoc Committee Regular Meeting**

Motion to approve minutes as submitted by Hornberger with a second by Alexander. **Motion Passes**

9. **Business:**
    a. **Land Division Act** (moved from item b to item a)

Staff presents two memoranda for committee review. The first summarizes permitted uses in residential districts, including the A-1 District for comparison, and identifies recent ordinance amendments and revisions for committee consideration. Reviews recent amendments to the Michigan Land Division Act, explaining that state law increases the number of allowable land divisions, particularly on parcels under 10 acres, while emphasizing that local zoning requirements, including minimum lot sizes, continue to govern development. Staff notes that the Township may wish to require additional review, such as site plan review, for larger administrative land divisions now permitted under state law. Staff presents proposed revisions to the private road standards to address increased land divisions and the need for private road maintenance agreements. Explains that the changes are procedural rather than substantive and requests committee direction on whether additional review requirements should be incorporated into the draft ordinance.

Staff clarifies that the Michigan Land Division Act increases the number of allowable land divisions based on parcel size while emphasizing that local zoning regulations, including minimum lot sizes, continue to determine the number and size of permitted splits. Notes that split allowances are subject to a 10-year limitation.

Staff explains that the amended law creates a gap between simple administrative land divisions and the more complex plat or site condominium process. Staff identifies this as a procedural issue and notes that the Township may wish to require additional review for larger administrative land divisions.

Discussion clarifies that the Township must comply with the amended Michigan Land Division Act but is not required to permit land divisions that conflict with local zoning standards, including minimum lot sizes. Staff explains that the greatest impact will occur in districts with smaller minimum lot sizes, while the Agricultural

District will see limited change due to the five-acre minimum. Staff recommends one procedural ordinance amendment: requiring PC site plan review for land divisions creating five or more lots instead of administrative approval. Staff notes this would add oversight without requiring the full plat or site condominium process, while existing site plan submission requirements would generally provide sufficient information for review.
Staff raises broader policy questions about whether the Township's current zoning districts and density standards continue to meet long-term planning goals. Committee discussion notes that several districts are based on geographic features rather than density, and that the ordinance lacks provisions for multifamily housing and larger apartment-style developments. Members also discuss the potential for mixed-use development. Discussion concludes that the Township currently lacks the population density needed to support a viable mixed-use commercial center, though the topic may warrant future consideration as growth patterns evolve. Discussion addresses how the amended Land Division Act may affect properties under Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) easements. Staff explains that land divisions generally continue to be governed by the underlying zoning ordinance unless a specific PDR easement includes additional restrictions. Most PDR easements restrict dwelling sites rather than the number of land divisions, making it important to review each easement individually before approving or purchasing a property.

b. Residential Districts (moved from item a to item b)

Members discuss adult foster care and small group home uses in residential districts. Discussion references a former adult foster care facility that was later converted to a bed and breakfast with neighborhood support. Members question the original approval process for the adult foster care use but conclude the details predate current staff and are unknown.
Members confirm that docks and patios should be permitted in all zoning districts where waterfront frontage exists. Discussion also confirms cemeteries remain permitted in the Agricultural District and should be included as a permitted use in the proposed Community Facilities District.
Members discuss whether multifamily housing should be categorized more specifically in the ordinance. Discussion suggests distinguishing duplexes, three- and four-unit buildings, and larger multifamily developments rather than grouping them under a single use category. Members discuss the definition of "essential services" and request clearer references within the ordinance. Staff explains that the term is defined in the ordinance and state law and generally includes public utility infrastructure, but excludes wireless telecommunications facilities. Staff agrees to improve cross-references or definitions in the use table and review whether the separate "utilities" category is necessary. Members confirm that indoor and outdoor event venues are intended for the Commercial District. Discussion concludes that golf courses and country clubs should remain in the Agricultural District rather than the proposed Community Facilities District, while institutional uses, public parks, recreation, and conservation areas are appropriate for the Community Facilities District.
Members also discuss recreational unit parks and camping. Staff explains that recreational unit parks (campgrounds/RV parks) are defined in the ordinance, while individual camping on private property is not currently permitted in the Township. Discussion notes that proposed agritourism and farm stay provisions may require clarification on whether limited farm camping should be allowed and how it would differ from traditional campgrounds.
Members confirm that sewage treatment and disposal installations are appropriate for the proposed Community Facilities District. Staff agrees to clarify the distinction between "utilities" and "essential services" within the ordinance. Discussion also recommends renaming "service institutions" to "personal services" to better reflect uses such as barber shops, salons, and clothing repair businesses. Staff agrees to update the terminology and corresponding definitions for consistency and clarity. Members determine that the undefined term "shoreline uses" is duplicative of the more specific shoreline use categories, including docks, dock patios, boat hoists, and related structures. Staff notes that shoreline regulations are already addressed elsewhere in the ordinance. Discussion supports removing the undefined term and relying on the more specific use categories and cross-references to the shoreline regulations.

DRAFT

Members confirm that small solar energy systems are permitted in all districts as proposed. Discussion also clarifies that "temporary buildings" refers only to temporary construction buildings or trailers used during active construction for up to one year or until project completion. Members recommend revising the use description to "temporary construction buildings" to avoid confusion with temporary sheds, tents, or similar structures. Members confirm that tenant houses are intended only for full-time farm employees in the Agricultural District. Discussion also distinguishes tenant houses from labor camps, noting that labor camps address seasonal or migrant agricultural workers. Members review residential district uses and identify no additional changes beyond separating multifamily housing into more specific categories. Discussion considers how multifamily density should be regulated but concludes that broader policy decisions regarding higher-density housing should be deferred to the PC after completion of the zoning ordinance rewrite. In the interim, members recommend listing multifamily uses as special uses until a comprehensive approach is developed.

c. Draft Zoning Ordinance- General Discussion

Beard reports meeting with McKenna Group to discuss the next phase of the zoning ordinance rewrite, noting the project is nearing the end of its original scope. Discussion supports using the draft ordinance's color-coding to help the PC focus on proposed changes rather than risk getting bogged down in unchanged ordinance language. Members review the purpose of each color designation: yellow identifies existing ordinance language, green identifies amendments adopted since the 2019 rewrite effort, mauve identifies draft language from the 2019 rewrite that was never adopted, and blue identifies revisions developed during the current rewrite process. Discussion supports organizing PC review around the mauve and blue sections, while recognizing some provisions contain both 2019 and current draft language that will require direct comparison and a decision on which version to advance. The approach is intended to make the review process more manageable and focused on substantive changes.

Staff confirms that McKenna Group will develop a review schedule grouping related ordinance sections into manageable topics for PC meetings. The proposed approach will focus review on the revised portions of the draft ordinance while providing the full draft for reference.

Members support reviewing a limited number of related chapters at each meeting rather than the entire document. Discussion notes that larger sections, such as zoning districts and permitted uses, may require additional time, while administrative chapters can be grouped together. Members also recommend including only the relevant sections in each meeting packet to streamline review and reduce unnecessary material

10. **Citizen Comments:** None
11. **Committee Comments:**

Alexander: Identifies the need for public education on permissive zoning following recent public comments and misconceptions about the ordinance rewrite. Discussion notes that permissive zoning is the most common approach used throughout Michigan and is supported by state case law, not a practice unique to Peninsula Township. Members reference the Township's winter newsletter, which explains permissive zoning and its legal basis. They also discuss preparing introductory materials for the public as the draft ordinance is released. Members support including an overview of zoning principles, permissive zoning, the relationship to the Master Plan, and the history and purpose of the ordinance rewrite to provide context during the public review process.

Adjournment

Motion by Hornberger to adjourn, with a second by Alexander. **Motion Passes**

Meeting adjourned at 2:12 p.m.

DRAFT