



PENINSULA TOWNSHIP

13235 Center Road, Traverse City MI 49686

Ph: 231.223.7322 Fax: 231.223.7117

www.peninsulatownship.com

PENINSULA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA SPECIAL MEETING

July 10, 2025

7:00 p.m.

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Pledge**
3. **Roll Call**
4. **Approve Agenda**
5. **Brief Citizen Comments (For Items not on the Agenda)**
6. **Conflict of Interest**
7. **Approve Meeting Minutes**
 - a. Approval of Meeting Minutes: Township Board, Planning Commission, and Parks Committee Joint Special Meeting with Old Mission Peninsula Historical Society, Peter Dougherty Society, and Mission Point Lighthouse Keepers Association, May 27, 2025
 - b. Approval of Meeting Minutes: Planning Commission Regular Meeting, June 3, 2025
8. **Planner Report**
9. **Communications**
10. **Business**
 - a. Planning Commission Terms Expiring August 31, 2025
 - b. Seven Hills Special Use Permit Discussion
 - c. Zoning Rewrite Project Plan Discussion
 - d. Shoreline Zoning Amendment Discussion
11. **Reports and Updates - Verbal**
 - a. Agricultural Advisory Committee (Beard)
 - b. Township Board (Alexander)
12. **Public Comments**
13. **Other Matters or Comments by Planning Commission Members**
14. **Adjournment**

Peninsula Township has several portable hearing devices available for audience members. If you would like to use one, please ask the clerk.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes
May 27, 2025 Joint Special Meeting
of Township Board, Planning
Commission, and Parks Commission**

PENINSULA TOWNSHIP

13235 Center Road, Traverse City
MI 49686

www.peninsulatownship.com

**Township Board, Planning Commission, and Parks Committee
Joint Special Meeting with Old Mission Peninsula Historical Society, Peter
Dougherty Society, and Mission Point Lighthouse Keepers Association**

May 27, 2025, 3:00 p.m.

Township Hall

Minutes

1. **Township Board Meeting Called to Order** by Sanders at 3:02 p.m.
Planning Commission Meeting Called to Order by Beard at 3:02 p.m
2. **Pledge**
3. **Roll Call**
Town board roll call:
Present: Sanders, Clark, Milliken, Alexander, Wunsch, Sanger, Chown
Planning commission roll call:
Present: Beard, Hornberger, Hall, Alexander
Absent: Shanafelt, Shipman, Dloski
Parks committee roll call:
Present: D. Murphy, C. Murphy, Chown (Milliken arrived late)
Absent: Dahl, Caviston, Zebell
Peter Dougherty Society: Chris Rieser
Old Mission Peninsula Historical Society: Tom Dalluge
Mission Point Lighthouse Keepers Association: Brit Eaton
4. **Citizen Comments:** none
5. **Governmental Updates:**
Dave Murphy gave a brief update on the citizen survey committee. It has met twice; not all members were present. Next meeting scheduled in a week.
6. **Approve Agenda**
Alexander moved to approve the agenda as presented with a second by Chown. Motion passed by consensus
Hornberger moved to approve the agenda as presented with a second by Hall. Motion passed by consensus
7. **Conflict of Interest**
Chown has a conflict of interest with item C under business.
Chown sits on both the town board and the parks committee.
Alexander is [former] co-president of the Old Mission Peninsula Historical Society and sits on the planning commission and town board.

8. Consent Agenda:

- A. Peninsula Community Library May 2025 Director's Report
- B. Correspondence:
 - Rachel Plum
 - Louis Santucci
 - TJ Andrews
 - Gordon Hodges
 - Laurie Miholer and Garry Zachritz
- C. Friends of Peninsula Community Library Used Book Sale and Annual Art Sale Signage Request
- D. Minutes from May 13, 2025, Township Board Regular Meeting

Clark moved to approve the agenda as presented with a second by Chown. Motion passed by consensus

8. Business:

- A. Selection of Agricultural Advisory Committee Alternate Member (Sanders)

Sanger: I'm in favor of Garret Coggon, a young farmer in the community.

Wunsch: I also endorse Garret.

Sanger moved to appoint Garret Coggon as the alternate to the agricultural advisory committee with a second by Milliken. Motion passed by consensus

- B. Discussion on Upcoming Grand Traverse County Road Commission (GTCRC) Vote on Abandoning the Road Ends at Old Mission Road, Swaney Road, and Wilson Road and the Township Assuming Responsibility for Them (Sanders)

Sanders: board would need to send a formal letter saying we will assume responsibility for those roads and road ends, then the road commission will vote if they are willing to abandon them. We've already done survey work to ensure emergency responders can make a full turnaround.

Alexander: what would be the financial responsibility?

Sanders: depending on what we want to do with them, at a minimum, maintenance to keep it clear for fire department water access. Maximum, we would put signage up enforcing what's allowed.

Chown: and it would be up to the township to determine what is allowed and not allowed.

Sanger: the Old Mission Road road end consists of easements on private land. What happens if the road commission releases the easements?

Sanders: I can run that by road commission's legal counsel.

Wunsch: would like to hear about this from our legal at a meeting.

Sanders: let's table this for now.

- C. Renewal of Purchase of Development Rights Contract between Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy and Peninsula Township with Action Expected (Sanders)

Sanders moved to recuse Chown with a second by Clark. Motion passed by consensus

Sanders: information is in the packet addition. This is just an update.

Wunsch moved to approve the renewal of the Purchase of Development Rights contract with the Grand Traverse Regional Land Conservancy with a second by Alexander.

Roll call vote: yes – Sanders, Clark, Milliken, Alexander, Wunsch, Sanger

Passed unan

Sanders moved to return Chown to the board with a second by Wunsch.

Motion passed by

consensus

- D. Discussion on Formalizing Expectations between Peninsula Township, the Parks Committee, and the three 501(C)(3) Organizations That Oversee Historic Structures in the Township: Mission Point Lighthouse Keepers Association, Peter Dougherty Society, and Old Mission Peninsula Historical Society (Sanders) with Topics to Included:
1. Current Structure, Roles, and Responsibilities, Including the Role of the Township in Setting Policy and Staffing Decisions
 2. Coordination with Township Representatives and the Designation of a Township Representative as a Liaison for 501(C)(3) Organizations
 3. Components of the Ideal Structure, Including Defined Roles and Responsibilities, Revenue Sharing, Reporting, Insurance, Waivers, Donations/ Contributions, and Public/Non-profit Expense Sharing
 4. Long-term Financial Needs (Maintenance, Infrastructure, and Improvement Costs) and How to Fund Them, Including the Role of Township Funds
 5. Creating Memorandums of Understanding between Each Non-profit and Peninsula Township to Formalize Expectations

Sanders: all the 501(C)(3) organizations have a similar structure. All fundraise and keep volunteers.

Rieser, Peter Dougherty Society (PDS): PDS organized as a nonprofit in 2005. There are legal requirements through the state. We report to several departments within the state. One is for state taxes, one for sales. We have certification requirements every year and are under a historical building easement through the Michigan Historic Preservation Network. Every year they come out and survey the buildings and grounds; we have to abide by their rules. That easement agreement is with the township, not the society. They manage the exterior of the building and the grounds. There are three or four structures [in Traverse City] under this organization.

Fundraising is primarily done once a year through a fall appeal letter that goes out to approximately 350 people who have donated previously or have expressed interest in being involved in some fashion. We don't directly solicit in any other way. We get a commission of \$5 for touring the grounds and the house plus a few grants from the Traverse Area Community Foundation or individuals who have donor designee funds. Usually, funds are given for the general purposes of maintaining the grounds and the house. There's no staff, other than in the summer, when we have two contract workers who provide some of the docent work.

David Taylor, 16616 Whispering Pines Trail: I am vice president of PDS and Old Mission Peninsula Historical Society (OMPHS). On an annual basis, 70–80 percent of PDS revenue comes from the annual letter, supplemented by grants from a couple of foundations. The amount charged for visitors during our tour season is a nominal part of the overall revenue. We have a number of volunteers who work on maintenance, docents, gardening, and who help apply for grants.

Sanger: is your group solely taking care of the Dougherty House?

Rieser: our work group helps out with Hessler and the Replica Log Church.

Sanders: but the funding stays at Dougherty.

Rieser answered more questions on details of PDS operations.

Chown: the purpose of this meeting is for Peninsula Township to begin to formalize the relationship between these organizations and the township. We need a memorandum of understanding in place with each nonprofit. We need to discuss how each functions and what they see coming down the pike for their organization. Our volunteer cohort is aging.

Another component is protection for the township. How do we set things up so that everybody's protected? We need to develop capital improvement plans. What are the needs today, in 10 years, and beyond? What is the optimal structure between Peninsula Township and these township-owned assets? We are getting more and more sophisticated as a community, but our basic operating structure with the nonprofits hasn't changed, and it needs to be updated.

Hall asked some clarifying financial questions.

Dalluge, OMPHS: we've been around since 1992. Started with trying to save the Hessler Log Cabin. We expanded our scope and also support the Replica Log Church. Preserving these structures is the basis of our work. We expanded the preservation model to ask residents to give us family documents. Had some damage; we've had a two-year preservation and remediation program. This peninsula is a sanctuary for the American chestnut. The Dougherty property has 19 of these technically extinct trees. We've been collecting the nuts, propagating, and growing these trees. Our memorial tree program has put 700 maple trees along the peninsula's scenic byways over the last 20 years. We would like to add the chestnut tree and make the seedlings available for purchase as a potential revenue stream. Part of our preservation program is keeping the established trees healthy. We have a program with the school where we have students visit the trees and take home seeds with instructions on how to grow them.

We had to grow our membership because our members were, on average, 74 years old. The chestnut program has allowed us to attract a lot of new people. Our membership is clustered in the north and our business model is a little different than PDS's. The board can spend up to \$250 before going to members for permission. Five years ago, we were in a precarious position financially. Today, we have a pretty solid financial position. Our business model is based on a few revenue streams: annual membership payments, visitors to Log Cabin Day, and donors. Our donors overlap heavily with the Dougherty Society.

Our board made the decision last year to set aside some of the money we raised for capital projects because we know there are some big projects in restoration coming up. Going to have to make some prioritizations on what we can and can't cover.

I have the same questions everybody else does. How is this going to work? How do we align allocations? Our budget cycle does not line up with your budget cycle.

Continued discussion on aging members and volunteer demographics, business models, continued revenue options, and benefit of combining to direct more visitors to Dougherty from the lighthouse as well as potential partnerships with Traverse City Tourism organizations.

Eaton, Mission Point Lighthouse Keepers Association: the 50,000 annual visitors [to the lighthouse] are only the people who go inside. That's a quarter of the people who actually visit. The keepers association performs two functions. One, individuals who want to donate to an organization, we turn that around into facilities that enhance the experience, such as the telescope viewer, which we deeded over to the township. We have a fundraising project with one of the local wine producers. For every purchase, \$5 comes back to the lighthouse. Those funds are separate from the funds that go back to the township. We collect \$8 for every tour of the lighthouse, plus we have the retail items we sell. There's no cross between those, other than donating to the improvements at the lighthouse. Our second function is to train, provide, recruit, and schedule the volunteers who come to the lighthouse.

The board is made up of diverse individuals, township representatives, community representatives, and guest keepers who have experience. Revenue is on a subscription basis. It's a small amount of income for us. The majority of the recruitment we do is to donate and to volunteer.

Another project we have coming up is for Sarah Lane, the only female keeper at the lighthouse, who is buried in Monroe, Michigan. She has no grave marker, so together with the Dougherty Society, we are purchasing a grave marker for her. Hopefully there will be a ceremony in September this year.

Ginger Schultz, Mission Point Lighthouse Manager, talked about aging demographics, need for volunteers, advertisements with Traverse City Tourism, and the importance of awareness of the lighthouse as a destination.

David Tucker, 16748 Wrightwood Trail: I am treasurer of the lighthouse keepers group. Can't get much simpler than we are. We raise money. We work with Ginger [Schultz] on needs at the lighthouse. Our only asset is a checkbook. We raise the money; we spend it on what Ginger wants.

Sanders: good synopsis of these organizations. Let's discuss how we want to pull all this together. Recommendation in previous years has been to have a historical commission in the township. Greater opportunity for the township to look at grant opportunities. The Michigan Economic Development Corporation is a certified local government program that works for larger grant opportunities within the state. Exclusive grant funding opportunities through the National Park Service, something the township could go after instead of having each individual historical asset try themselves.

Milliken: I have the impression that the township is basically maintaining [these historic assets], then these groups are running and keeping them going? Electrical bill, leak in the roof, the township takes care of that?

Sanders: it's part of what we have to figure out.

David Taylor: if there's a maintenance issue, we'll call the township and put in a work order for repair. A lot of the routine maintenance that comes up is handled by volunteers. At Dougherty, the Tuesday work group has a punch list. They keep the place up. Larger projects with more liability are passed to the township.

Sanders: these assets need to have a capital improvement plan in place. We need to work on that to know what is needed from the township to manage these assets.

Dave Murphy spoke on the parks committee's reliance on fundraising, volunteers, and partnership with the conservancy to manage projects.

Sanders proposed combining into a committee with each commissioner being a representative of an organization. Would like to streamline assets for optimized functioning. A member of the board would be a representative commissioner to improve communication between the organizations and township. Maintain the separate needs of the groups independently. Grant funding would be easier to obtain with township involvement, with more efficient and wider reaching fundraising opportunities. It would improve transparency and budget process and formalize financial responsibilities between the township and these organizations.

Continued group discussion on optimal organization compared to how these organizations formed and operated. Some opposition that an additional committee introduces more work, less efficiency, budget interference, and redundancy. Some alternative organizational changes were offered to improve the current structure, such as folding in communication with these organizations through the parks committee. Parks committee expressed its need for more support,

such as a parks manager position. Concern for long-term effectiveness of current structure and need for memorandums of understanding.

9. **Citizen Comments:** none

10. **Board Comments:** none

11. **Adjournment**

Hornburger moved to adjourn the planning commission meeting at 4:59 with a second by Hall.

Motion passed by consensus

Sanders moved to adjourn the township meeting at 5:49 with a second by Wunsch. Motion passed by consensus

Parks committee convened to review the need for volunteers for seed planting and to discuss articles for the newsletter.

Christine Murphy moved to approve \$200 for the purchase of a webbed tire swing for the south end playground with a second by Chown. Motion passed by consensus

Christine Murphy moved to adjourn the parks meeting at 5:05 with a second by Milliken.

Motion passed by consensus

Approval of Meeting Minutes June 3, 2025 Regular Meeting

PENINSULA TOWNSHIP

13235 Center Road, Traverse City MI
49686 www.peninsulatownship.com

Planning Commission Regular Meeting June 3, 2025, 7:00 p.m. Township Hall Minutes

1. Call to Order by Beard at 7:00 p.m.
2. Pledge
3. Roll Call – Present: Alexander, Beard, Dloski, Hall, Hornberger; Excused/Absent: Shanafelt, Shipman;
Township Planner: Elise Loud
4. Approve Agenda

Motion by Hornberger to approve the agenda as written, seconded by Dloski.

Motion Passes

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

Sally Erickson, 2228 Kaukauna Court: informs the Commission that she has formally requested that the permit granted to the Hidden Ridge PUD be rescinded by the Army Corps of Engineers.

6. Conflict of Interest: none
7. Approve Meeting Minutes

Motion by Dloski to approve Planning Commission Regular Meeting May 6, 2025 regular meeting minutes, seconded by Hall.

Motion Passes

8. Planner Report

Loud: Sara Kopriva has been added to the zoning staff in a contracted capacity, allowing for enhanced service to the township. The Zoning Ordinance (ZO) rewrite is now officially under contract with McKenna. The zoning map is currently being digitized. Staff are developing an online permitting process. Acknowledges additional correspondence: June 2 letter from the Army Corps of Engineers to Hidden Ridge citing noncompliance with permit conditions, May 29 letter to Seven Hills noting noncompliance with their Special Use Permit (SUP), minutes from a recent library board meeting, where a proposed amendment was discussed, and notes from Armen – none of which are directed to the Planning Commission but included for supplemental context.

9. Communications

- a. Letter from Laurie Miholer and Garry Zachritz regarding dark night sky/dock lighting.

10. Business

- a. Public Hearing: Zoning Ordinance Section 8.10 Hotel, Motel, Tourist Courts Amendment

Discussion noted inconsistencies between elevation allowances and other ZO height regulations.

Beard opens public hearing. No public comments heard. Beard closes public hearing and resumes regular meeting. Commission clarifies that stated building height maximum does not include rooftop mechanical.

Motion by Hornberger to remove Section 8.10.2(6) (maximum building height) from Section 8.10, seconded by Hall.

Roll Call Vote: Hornberger: yes, Beard: yes, Alexander: yes, Dloski: yes, Hall: yes.

Motion Passes Unanimously

b. **Introduction of SUP #128 Amendment #1 for Peninsula Community Library**

PCL seeks additional storage space to support its largest fundraiser: the annual book sale. **Discussion** focuses on this request prompting further consideration of major versus minor amendments to the SUP process. Librarian, Vicki Shurly shares background and rationale. Planning Commission votes to opt out of an optional public hearing and recommends forwarding the request directly to the Township Board, which is required to hold a public hearing.

Motion by Alexander to recommend that the Township Board approve SUP #128 Amendment #1, seconded by Dloski.

Roll Call Vote: Hornberger: yes, Beard: yes, Alexander: yes, Dloski: yes, Hall: yes.

Motion Passes Unanimously

c. **Introduction of SUP #143 Walnut Grove Planned Unit Development (PUD)**

Staff introduces application. Commission Feedback/Requests: Concern over the open space allotment/overlap with land under easement. Requests more details on forest and tree preservation. Submit a grading plan and easement documentation. Consider removing the north curb cut. Conduct a lot-by-lot tree inventory (potential condition of approval).

Item not scheduled for formal action at the July meeting; no action taken.

d. **Introduction of Special Use Permit Zoning Recommendations**

Background: Difficulty in determining what qualifies as a “substantial improvement” when dealing with proposed amendments to an SUP prompted review. Research: A subcommittee (Hall, Beard, Shipman) examined practices in other municipalities. Draft Proposal Includes: Clear examples of major vs. minor amendments. Defined levels of review and approval. Pathways for administrative approval of technical changes.

Next Steps: Planner Loud to prepare: a list of conditions (excluding “substantial improvement” language) for review as well as two distinct pathways for treating technical amendments under the SUP process.

11. Reports and Updates - Verbal

a. **Agricultural Advisory Committee**

Maura Sanders, Township Supervisor: Working on a definition for agritourism to guide local policy. Exploring grant funding for farmers market feasibility study. Continuing legal review of signage issues related to agriculture and agritourism.

b. **Township Board**

Alexander: TB hosted a joint meeting with the Historic District Commission, Parks Committee, and Lighthouse Advisory group. Township is considering formation of a Historic Commission. The Survey Committee is actively refining questions and continues to seek community input.

12. Public Comment

Dave Murphy, 6943 East Shore Road: Encourages the Planning Commission to provide input on the township survey. Shares appreciation for the ongoing discussion on dock lighting, noting even downward-facing, compliant lights may cause visual impact when overused. Urges collaboration with the Parks Committee on any open space/public park discussions in developments like Walnut Grove.

Steve Brown, 336 Knollwood Drive: offers gratitude and insight from his past service as a former township official in another municipality.

Erickson: requests that the Planning Commission advocate for immediate compliance from Hidden Ridge with township ordinances to prevent setting a precedent for other associations. Inquires into new study group to handle shoreline regulation.

13. Other Matters or Comments by Planning Commission Members

Hall: clarifies that no new committee is being formed regarding shoreline—two members will revise the group's suggestions for PC review. Requests that Planner Loud review the Short-Term Rental (STR) ordinance to determine whether Planning Commission input is needed, acknowledges letter from resident, Marty Lagina, which was published in the Old Mission Gazette.

Alexander: notes that a draft STR ordinance from April 2022 was never finalized; emphasized former planner, Jenn Cram's, position that STRs are not allowed in any zoning district. Highlights ongoing noncompliance at Seven Hills. Confirms enforcement actions are moving forward regarding Hidden Ridge, supported by both the Township and Army Corps correspondence.

14. Adjournment

Motion by Dloski to adjourn this regular meeting of the Planning Commission, seconded by Hall.

Motion passed.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:37 p.m.

Communications

**PUBLIC INPUT TO THE PENINSULA TOWNSHIP BOARD RE: REGULATION OF
RESIDENTS' USE OF PORTABLE SEASONAL DOCKS AND BOAT HOISTS
6/24/2025**

Traverse City is and always has been a boating community. The marine industry is a pillar of our local and state economies. Boating is part of our lifestyle and it's a foundation of many longstanding family traditions for those who have lived on Old Mission Peninsula long enough to raise families and retire here.

Our boating season is short, spanning only three to four months. The local demand for public and private dockage continues to far exceed the supply. The temporary seasonal use of portable docks and hoists by Great Lakes waterfront property owners is and always has been a minimally invasive means of supplementing the seasonal supply shortage of dockage and it substantially reduces the need for construction of additional boat launching facilities and public marina capacity in ours and other adjoining Great Lakes coastal townships. A public safety purpose is also served by minimizing daily boat hauling traffic on Peninsula streets and highways, as well as limiting added congestion in our already over-crowded public launch sites.

Peninsula Township enacted an ordinance in the early 1970's that was intended to, among other things, limit the number of boat hoists which may be temporarily placed offshore of shared ownership waterfront property. The ordinance limitations were promulgated and supported by single ownership waterfront property owners to prevent boundary infringement and to preserve the exclusivity of their single ownership waterfront properties. The ordinance arbitrarily limits the number of hoists to one per 50 ft. of shared ownership frontage, regardless of the amount of frontage owned. Understandably, the Township has not enforced that ordinance since its enactment approximately 50 years ago.

As a shared waterfront property owner and boating resident of Peninsula Township for nearly 50 years, I've witnessed a revolving door parade of successive Township Supervisors, planning administrators, and Board members, most of whom brought with them their own personal views on a wide array of issues. As to the issue at hand, they've generally expressed varied levels of interest in regulating the use of temporary portable docks and hoists by waterfront property owners. However, most seemed to recognize that we are a boating community and there are other more pressing issues centered on land which need to be addressed. Over those decades, the Township has been able to facilitate the resolution of differences among neighbors relating to boating matters and to resolve residents' complaints without pursuing enforcement action under the now outdated dock and hoist ordinance. That is actually an example of continuity having been maintained from one leadership administration to the next.

Certainly, the 50-year-old ordinance should be updated to be relevant. Any update must accommodate the impact of the significant growth in the Township's population and residential housing developments over the last 50 years, particularly in or near coastal waterfront areas. In 2024, the Township's Director of Planning (with oversight of the then Township Planning Commission Chairman) completed an over year-long shoreline study, with monthly assistance and input from the Shoreline Regulation Study Group, comprised of public and private sector participants. The study included an analysis of the Township's demographics, shoreline

residential development; property owners' use of seasonal docks and hoists; and a review of commonly encountered property owner issues and disputes related to seasonal dock and hoist use which are directed to the Township for resolution. A collaborative effort between the public and private sectors resulted in a comprehensive policy framework for regulating seasonal dock and hoist use by shoreline property owners. In November 2024, the Planning Director received approval to begin drafting revised regulations for submission to the Planning Commission for review.

Unfortunately, that Planning Director's resignation occurred before she was able to draft language for the new regulations. The then Planning Commission Chairman announced that the Shoreline Regulation Study Group would not be reconvened. Instead, he with a few others, including the part-time Planner, will move forward with draft language from the Policy Framework created by the Study Group. My concern is the Policy Framework formalized last Fall by the Planning Director with the Planning Commission Chairman and the Study Group may be disregarded, discounted, and/or not referenced to in the upcoming draft language to be presented to the Township Board. **This piece of work involved hours upon hours of discussion, deliberations, and consensus building with many community members, Township officials and other officials. Pushing this framework aside would be disregarding the enormous time and efforts of so many that came together in agreement.**

Board leadership comments at the June 10, 2025, Township Board meeting, suggests that the Board's leadership now intends to prioritize regulatory enforcement in several areas, for the sake of enforcement in general and without considering if the age-old regulations in question are still needed or if they require revision.

In the case of regulating the use of docks and hoists by shared waterfront owners, the needed regulation changes have already been methodically identified, vetted, and proposed in detail by predecessors of the new township leadership administration. And yet, the new Board leadership has apparently chosen to begin enforcing the provisions of a 50-year-old outdated ordinance, ahead of the recent proposed revisions, irrespective of the adverse consequences to many impacted property owners, their families and their neighborhoods. Having lived on the Peninsula for nearly 50 years, it will be very difficult for me and many others to tell our children and grandchildren, that, after all these years, this may be our last summer of boating together from our homes on the Peninsula.... because we've got a new group of Township regulators in office who choose to ignore the unnecessary and painful consequences of their decision to begin enforcing a 50-year-old ordinance that most residents view as overreach and no longer relevant in its current form.

The Township's new ordinance enforcement initiative will, in this case, be directed at an area where, for all intents and purposes, no regulation has previously existed. For good reason, the existing ordinance hasn't been enforced since it was enacted. The exercise of common courtesy amongst neighbors cannot be legislated. Penalizing a large segment of Peninsula Township's boating population for the actions of a few is unjustified and ill advised. Hopefully the new Board leadership will act with informed objectivity and use foresight in adopting updated regulatory revisions that have already been painstakingly developed by the former Planning Director, working with the then Chairman of the Planning Commission and the Shoreline

Regulation Study Group. Those proposed revisions reflect the well-reasoned accommodation of the significant demographic and other changes that have taken place on the Peninsula and throughout our region over the last 50 years.

Some on the Board get it, but others may need to be reminded that collaboration with constituents, consensus building, and the exercise of civility are foundational to sound governance. In my opinion, the Board should do everything in its power to fully restore credibility, objectivity, and civility to our township's discourse and governance. Doing so may serve to reduce the current level of distrust of Peninsula Township government and limit the potential for even more unnecessary litigation which has already needlessly cost township taxpayers far too much.


Thank you for allowing me to share my thoughts with you.

Respectfully submitted,
George Weber
10846 Peninsula Dr. (georgeweber.tc@gmail.com)



Fwd: Final Policy Framework Single-Shared Water Frontage 8-21-24

From Kevin Beard <duneclimber55@yahoo.com>
Date Thu 6/26/2025 12:44 PM
To Elise Loud <planner@peninsulatownship.com>

 1 attachment (18 KB)
08.21.24 Policy Framework Single & Shared Waterfront Ownership (1).docx;

This should be shared won't the whole PC.

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Scott Duensing <designcraftthomestc@gmail.com>
Date: June 26, 2025 at 10:38:39 AM EDT
To: duneclimber55@yahoo.com
Subject: Final Policy Framework Single-Shared Water Frontage 8-21-24

Good morning Kevin,

We would like to thank our many community members, our Township officials, other Officials and Professionals, and of course and most importantly, those Citizens who took time to listen and help with public comment at each Study Group meeting.

All participated in hours upon hours of discussion, deliberation and consensus building, as we studied how to regulate the waterfront in a civil, thoughtful and common sense environment. In fact, we committed 9+ months to this positive experience in 2024.

The conclusive summary of this body of work is attached for your quick reference. Highlights are:

1. 3 hoists per 50 feet of shoreline.
2. 1 dock per parcel.
3. 15 foot side yard setbacks for docks and hoists.
4. Administrative Oversight with Registration to assist those close to conformance or with unique parking challenges.

All appreciate your interest in reading and studying this framework. It is something we are proud to create with the intent of helping your decision making. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Scott Duensing
1777 Buchan Drive
Traverse City, MI 49686
231-883-7468

Scott Duensing, CGB, CGR, CGP, CAPS
DesignCraft Homes and Duensing Construction
3501 Kirkland Court Suite E
Williamsburg, Michigan 49690
Cell: 231-883-7468
Email: designcraftthomestc@gmail.com

CGB Certified Graduate Builder
CGR Certified Graduate Remodeler
CGP Certified Green Professional
CAPS Certified Aging In Place Specialist



Fwd: Seven Hills Special Use Permit

From Kevin Beard <duneclimber55@yahoo.com>
Date Thu 6/26/2025 12:11 PM
To Elise Loud <planner@peninsulatownship.com>

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Shelly Houchins <dshouchins@icloud.com>
Date: June 24, 2025 at 11:12:38 am GMT-4
To: duneclimber55@yahoo.com, shipman.parks@gmail.com, lwdloski@gmail.com, rand.plancom@gmail.com, dsh_44@yahoo.com, Armen.planningcommission@gmail.com, jualexanptpc@gmail.com
Subject: Seven Hills Special Use Permit

Hello Planning Commission members,

I am contacting you concerning the issue of revoking the SUP for Seven Hills.

My husband and I are full time peninsula residents who LOVE Seven Hills Distillery and Mission Proper Cafe. They are fantastic businesses that have been a positive addition to our community since the day that they opened.

Both establishments are popular gathering places for local residents who enjoy the community feel that they provide. We have met many neighbors at events as well as when we were in for meals/coffee. Everyone that we know on the peninsula LOVES these businesses.

These businesses are always relaxing places to gather or just find a quiet corner to do some work.

I have NEVER seen rowdy behavior or loud parties there and we go there quite often. We have been there multiple times for live music and it was never super loud to where it would have been a problem for neighbors (I actually found it to be a little hard to hear at times).

To threaten good community businesses because they had one busy weekend, seems

insane and counterintuitive when everyone needs to cater to tourists in this area.

If you shut these businesses down, you are removing an important spot for our community and proving to everyone that our township government doesn't care about our community.

Instead of destroying businesses that we want, the focus should be on trying to stop the insane amount of subdivisions that are going in so that we can retain the charm and beauty of the peninsula that we all love.

I appreciate your consideration.

Michelle Houchins
13311 Bluff Rd

Planner Report

PLANNER REPORT

To: Peninsula Township Planning Commission

From: Elise Loud, Placecraft

Date: July 1, 2025

Re: Planning and Zoning Department Report/Update

PLANNING AND ZONING DEPARTMENT UPDATES

2025 Department Priorities

- Re-Launch Zoning Ordinance Rewrite—Project has begun! Project plan in packet for Planning Commission review.
- Digitize Township Zoning Map—in-process. Target for completion: TBD
- Explore EPIC-GT permitting platform to streamline & reduce administrative burdens for residents and staff—staff is training on the platform in July. Target for platform launch: Fall 2025

Meeting Business Preview

Tonight, July 10, 2025, the Planning Commission is conducting the following business:

- Commissioner Terms: Shipman and Shanafelt terms expiring on August 31.
- Discussion regarding Seven Hills Special Use Permit: At the June 9 board meeting, the Township Board directed the Planning Commission to review the Seven Hills special use permit in response to potential non-compliance issues. No formal decision will be taken by the Planning Commission tonight, but we will align our understanding of the issue, discuss our options moving forward, and set next steps.
- Zoning Rewrite Project Plan: Review and discuss a month-by-month plan to update key sections of the Zoning Ordinance, working from the 2018 draft prepared by McKenna.
- Shoreline Zoning Amendment Discussion: Review and discuss an updated policy document, continuing the work of the shoreline committee and incorporating continued public/ commission/staff feedback.

Business

Discussion – Seven Hills Special Use Permit

MEMO

To: Peninsula Township Planning Commission

From: Elise Loud, Placecraft

Date: July 1, 2025

Re: Seven Hills Special Use Permit Discussion at July 10 Meeting

Introduction

At the June 9 Township Board meeting, the Board requested via motion that the Planning Commission review Special Use Permit #35 for Seven Hills, LLC, in response to potential non-compliance issues.

At the July 10 Planning Commission meeting, we are going to align our understanding of the topic, review our options moving forward, and set a plan for next steps.

The Township attorney has prepared the enclosed memo which lays out the process and notice for potential SUP revocation, should the Planning Commission explore this action.

At a minimum, a next step must be gathering the information the Planning Commission needs to make an informed decision. This includes the formal special use permit language and conditions, a record of past violations, an update from our code enforcement officer on current conditions, and other information the Planning Commission needs to make an informed recommendation to the Township Board.

Action Recommended

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission discuss this topic and align our shared understanding, options moving forward, information needed, and next steps.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Peninsula Township Planning Commission
13235 Center Road
Traverse City, MI 49686

FROM: Christopher Patterson, Fahey Schultz Burzych Rhodes

DATE: June 25, 2025

RE: Process and Notice for Potential SUP Revocation

INTRODUCTION

Our understanding, in consultation with the Township, is that at the Township Board's June 9th, 2025 meeting, the Township Board made a motion to initiate the planning commission's review of all three amendments to Special Use Permit ("SUP") #35 for Seven Hills, LLC, in response to potential non-compliance issues.

The following memorandum outlines the process that the Township would follow in considering the potential revocation of an SUP, and the standards that would guide the Board's and Planning Commission's decisions. The process for SUP revocation is intended to closely mirror the process for SUP approval, guided by the standards initially approved as compared to the existing site conditions of the property. The following is intended to outline the proper process and procedure if Township decisionmakers pursued potential revocation of a development's SUP.

SUP REVOCATION UNDER THE ZONING ORDINANCE & SUP TERMS

If a development authorized by an SUP is potentially out of compliance with its terms of approval, pursuing SUP revocation with proper notice and process is one option available to the Township.¹ Revocation is authorized by Peninsula Township's zoning ordinance and by the SUP's text.

¹ See also *Systematic Recycling, LLC v. City of Detroit*, No. 09-11430, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 27781 (E.D. Mich. Jan. 24, 2013); *Grace Cmty. Church v. Lenox Twp.*, 544 F.3d 609 (6th Cir. 2008).



Peninsula Township Zoning Ordinance, Section 8.1.3(2) states: “The Town Board may impose such additional conditions and safeguards deemed necessary for the general welfare, for the protection of individual property rights, and for ensuring that the intent and objectives of this Ordinance will be observed. **The breach of any condition, safeguard or requirement shall automatically invalidate the permit granted.**”

On February 9th, 1993, the initial SUP for the property now occupied by Seven Hills, LLC was approved. Within the site plan approval’s conditions, condition number 10, “Violations and Notice Requirements,” states that violation may be grounds for revocation:

Any violation of these conditions shall serve as grounds for revocation of this Special Use Permit by the Township Board. In the event of any such violation, the Township shall give written notice to the Applicant at the last address furnished to the Township by the Applicant. The notice shall state that unless the violation is corrected or resolved to the satisfaction of the Township Board within 30 days from the date of the notice, then the Township Board may revoke this Special Use Permit after hearing. In the event the hearing becomes necessary, the Township Board shall establish the notice requirements and such other conditions with respect to the hearing as the Township Board may deem appropriate. After the hearing, if the Township Board revokes this Special Use Permit, then enforcement of the revocation may be made by application for appropriate relief in Grand Traverse County Circuit Court and the Township may recover all of the costs, including attorney fees, associated with or resulting from such violation or noncompliance.

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

The following section describes the recommended steps in the process of consideration of an SUP for potential revocation, providing proper notice of violation and opportunities for compliance.

- The proceedings will be as consistent as possible with the notification process identified in the SUP – in this case, the process identified in SUP #35. The Township will provide written notice of violations of the development’s SUP, identifying the specific standards of the SUP in violation and providing documentation of the potential violations, and ordering the operators to come into compliance. While the SUP indicates a violation invalidates the permit, we recommend that the Township provide due process to the SUP holder to determine and find that a violation of the SUP does exist prior to relying on the automatic revocation process set forth in the SUP.

- The written notice of violation will note that unless the violation is corrected or resolved to the satisfaction of the Township Board within 30 days of the notice, the Township Board may revoke the SUP after a public hearing.
- If compliance is not met, and the Board has referred the SUP to the Planning Commission, the Commission will need to send notice of the public hearing date, time, and the identified violations that were sent in the notice of violation by the Township.
- At the public hearing, the Commission will make findings and a recommendation to the Township Board based on the standards and available actions identified in this memorandum.
- Upon receipt of the Commission's recommendation, the Township may proceed and find that the development has successfully reached compliance and that revocation of the SUP will not be necessary, or that compliance has not been achieved and revoke the SUP.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

If, after 30 days have passed since the written notice of violation, the Township still believes that a development is in non-compliance, legal counsel will prepare a proper public notice of the time, date, and location of a public hearing to potentially revoke the SUP. This notice will list all special use permits and amendments subject to consideration (for example, SUP #35 and all three amendments).

The notice would identify all alleged violations of the SUP conditions as issues addressed by the public hearing. The notice would provide a method for submission of written comments prior to the public hearing. The Michigan Zoning Enabling Act, MCL 125.3103, requires that notice of a public hearing occur "not less than 15 days before the date of the hearing." Notice must also be delivered to "the owners of property that is the subject of the request," and to the owners of land and occupants of structures within 300 feet of the subject property.

PUBLIC HEARING

At the public hearing, the planning commission would examine evidence of potential non-compliance and recommend the appropriate solution for compliance. The Township would also coordinate with the operators of the development to ensure clear expectations and understanding of the questions and information before the planning commission.

At a public hearing, the Township should have staff reports provided that would describe specific alleged violations of the development's SUP, and the planning commission would determine whether there is sufficient proof of violation to take action such as a recommendation of revocation of the

SUP. Prior to the public hearing, staff would compile relevant documents for the planning commission's examination. The planning commission should review the following documents in advance for familiarity prior to the public hearing:

- All SUP and approval language, including the initial resolutions to approve the development;
- Staff reports regarding documented violations and zoning enforcement communications, documenting known information about the development's alleged violations over time.

Staff would also present reports to the planning commission regarding the documented violations – including findings of fact regarding which permit requirements have been or have not been in compliance, and a code enforcement report. The staff report would also identify the options for the planning commission's potential recommendations. This presentation would primarily be done by the Township Planner and Ordinance Enforcement Officer, with assistance from the Zoning Administrator. Legal counsel could be present for any questions.

The public hearing would also provide an opportunity for public comment. The owners and operators of Seven Hills, LLC should be provided an opportunity to present any evidence that supports their position of no violation. The public would also be provided with an opportunity to speak.

STANDARDS FOR DELIBERATION

After the public hearing, the planning commission may deliberate on the appropriate option for compliance, or to postpone to a subsequent meeting if they feel they do not have sufficient information. The planning commission should review documentation of violations, and the testimony at the public hearing, to determine whether they are sufficiently convinced of the violations to take remedial action. To find that the development has been in violation of a permit condition, the planning commission should find by a "preponderance of the evidence," meaning that it is more likely than not, that a violation of the permit condition exists. The planning commission would examine the Approval Conditions and Safeguards for SUP #35 and its three amendments, and the Zoning Ordinance, and adopt findings of fact regarding whether the development's operations are in compliance.

OPTIONS FOR ACTION

Although the Township Board will make the final determination regarding revocation of an SUP, this decision will be informed by the factual determinations of the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission may make the following recommendations:

- 1) Recommend revocation of the development's SUP in its entirety, based on the items out of compliance referenced in the findings of fact.
- 2) Recommend that the owner/operator amend their SUP to bring the business into compliance.
- 3) Postpone their decision for more information.
- 4) Postpone their decision for the development operators to reach compliance.
- 5) Recommend no revocation of the SUP based on findings of fact, and a decision that compliance has been or will be obtained based on the development owner/operator's submitted information.

CONCLUSION

The importance of a decision of potential revocation of an SUP leads to the need to fully understand the process, and to enter any decision-making with great intentionality. The input and questions of the planning commission, the operator of the development, and the community will be required to reach the most appropriate decision to bring a development into compliance.

This memorandum is intended to provide clear expectations about what the process would look like. If the planning commission needs any additional information to make a fully informed decision about the status of a development's SUP, any member should reach out to Township staff.

Discussion – Zoning Ordinance Rewrite Project Plan

**PENINSULA TOWNSHIP
ZONING ORDINANCE REWRITE COMMITTEE
PROJECT PLAN**

Committee Team

- Kevin Beard (Planning Commission Chair)
- Julie Alexander (Planning Commission and Township Board)
- Donna Hornberger (Planning Commission)
- Sara Kopriva (Zoning Administrator)
- Elise Loud (Planner)
- McKenna & Associates (Consulting Firm)

Project Process

The committee team will meet monthly to prepare draft recommendations for monthly Planning Commission discussion. The committee is an ad-hoc working group led by Township staff. All Planning Commission discussions will be open to the public and include public comment specific to the zoning language being discussed. The intent is to work through zoning topics in a methodical and predictable way, so that the public can anticipate what to expect next and how to share feedback along the way.

Generally, the Planning Commission will engage in the following monthly discussion:

1. What do you think of the recommendations proposed by the committee regarding: (current topic).
2. What guidance would you offer the committee as we consider: (next topic).
3. Repeat monthly.

Project Timeline

The project is anticipated to take 12-16 months to complete, from August 2025 through December 2026. New year (2027) new zoning ordinance, as they say.

Below is a monthly schedule for the Planning Commission. This details which zoning topics will be discussed at which Planning Commission meetings, to ensure the Planning Commission and public are prepared to participate.

July 2025

- Overview 2018 Zoning Ordinance Draft. What is it and how does it compare with our current ordinance?
- Overview project plan (this document).

August 2025

- Signage—overhaul Section 7.11 to be content-neutral as legally required. Incorporate suggestions from Agricultural Advisory Committee as best we can.
- Shoreline (Docks, Hoists, and Storage)—implement recommendations from shoreline advisory committee regarding dock location, increasing number of hoists, and storage locations.
- Short-term rentals—clarify that short-term rentals are not allowed in any non-commercial zoning district.

September 2025

- Agricultural buildings—clarify that agricultural buildings must be used for agricultural purposes.
- Begin land use standards. This is the big one! Review land uses by right, special land uses, and legally non-conforming land uses. Review uses, approval processes, and standards for all.

October 2025

- Continue with land use standards.

November 2025

- Finish land use standards.

December 2025

- Community facilities (& cookies). Create new zoning district for public land uses (Township hall, fire/EMS, library, schools, parks, boat launches) and define uses allowed and standards. Host “community facilities & cookies” to share holiday cheer while zoning.

January 2026

- Begin shoreline/floodplain. Post-holiday, dream about summertime and warm waters again. Tackle viewsheds, setbacks, landscaping, uses allowed within/along shoreline and floodplain.

February 2026

- Continue with shoreline/floodplain.

March 2026

- Finish shoreline/floodplain.
- Tackle loose ends—noise ordinance, backyard chickens, etc.

April 2026

- Begin Agricultural Advisory Committee (recommendations in progress). Review emerging recommendations regarding Ordinance 201 acreage minimums and agritourism. It's possible this item will shift UP, depending on AAC timeline.

May 2026

- Finish Agricultural Advisory Committee recommendations.
- Dark Night Sky. Consider necessary updates based on new lighting technology and uses.

June 2026

- Density. Review lot sizes in relation to public water and sewer. Consider urban services boundary to encourage relatively dense development towards the southern end of the peninsula.

July 2026

- Staff/consultant team codify ordinance text for review.
- Plan public input event for August.

August 2026

- Public input event to review draft ordinance.
- Planning Commission Public Hearing #1

September 2026

- Planning Commission Public Hearing #2 & Recommendation to Township Board
- Township Board Public Hearing #1 (& potential decision)

By December 2026

- Township Board Decision

January 2027

- Rewritten Township Zoning Ordinance?!

Discussion – Single Family and Shared Waterfront Ownership Policy Framework

MEMO

To: Peninsula Township Planning Commission

From: Elise Loud, Placecraft

Date: July 1, 2025

Re: Single Family and Shared Waterfront Ownership Policy Framework Update

Introduction

Enclosed is a draft update to the shoreline policy framework developed in 2024. This draft was compiled by Commissioners Shipman and Hall and the Township Planner and is based on public feedback from the April 24 shoreline education event, continued public feedback via public meetings and communications, and a desire to create pragmatic and enforceable land use regulations.

Summary of Changes

Edited or new content is noted in green highlight in the policy framework and summarized briefly below:

- Number of docks—allow separate properties to share a dock similar to how we allow shared fences.
- Keep dock lengths flexible.
- Clarify that dock lighting must comply with dark night sky standards.
- If allowing multiple docks per parcel, consider how # of hoists will be defined per dock/lineal feet.
- Clarify that hoist regulations also apply to standalone hoists.
- Don't modify existing parking regulations.
- Don't require shared waterfront registration.
- More discussion needed on location of docks/hoists.

Action Recommended

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission discuss and identify areas of alignment and/or disagreement, to inform a draft ordinance amendment.

7-1-25

Single and Shared Waterfront Ownership Policy Framework

Note: This updated document is based on two meetings with the Township Planner (Elise Loud) and two Planning Commissioners (Susie Shipman and Randy Hall) designated for this topic by the Planning Commission. New/edited recommendations are noted in **green highlight**. This will be shared with the Planning Commission on July 10, 2025.

THE WHY

Why does the Township have an interest in regulating the number and location of docks and hoists?

- Public Safety
- Natural Resource Protection (Water Quality, Flora and Fauna Habitat, Erosion Control, etc.)
- Conflict Resolution (Standards that support everyone being able to enjoy their waterfront)
- Green Space and View Corridor Preservation

What are the activities that take place on our waterfront?

- Walking the shoreline
- Swimming from shoreline and platforms
- Non-motorized watercrafts (paddleboards, kayaks, canoes, etc.)
- Motorized watercrafts (pontoon boats, jet skis, etc.)
- Fishing (from the shoreline, dock, or boat)
- Passive recreation such as sunbathing, picnics, star gazing, campfires, etc.
- Storage of docks, hoists, boats, lawn furniture, etc.

DOCKS

Number of Docks:

- One dock per parcel, including a “T” or “L” configuration (One point of contact with shoreline)
- Consider an administrative option for single ownership with larger waterfronts (300-600 feet) to allow another dock, especially if there are benefits to neighboring properties for dock and hoist configurations.
- **New:** Allow multiple property owners to share one dock, if desired. Treat this use similar to shared fences on property lines [Section 7.13(5)(d)] and clarify that this allowance shall not result in any more docks than would otherwise be allowed—meaning, two property owners cannot have one personal dock each, plus a shared dock.
- **Note:** Existing zoning ordinance allows one dock per parcel. See Sections 6.2.2(2)(c)1. and 7.4.2(4).

Size of Docks:

- Average = 3-4 feet wide
- Not to exceed eight (8) feet wide
- Length no greater than what is required to achieve a four (4) foot water depth. (Should there be an exception for larger boats?)

- **Edit:** Keep dock length flexible as currently allowed in the ordinance per Section 6.2.2(2)(c)(3): “No dock shall be...no longer than necessary to provide adequate water depth for the boat using the dock or boat hoist.”
- **Notes:**
 - The maximum width does not apply to swim platforms or dock patios. Average size of swim platforms and dock patios = 12' x 16'
 - The existing zoning ordinance limits the width to seven (7) feet. See Sections 6.2.2(2)(c)3. and 7.4.2(5).

Location of Docks and Hoists:

- No closer than fifteen (15) feet from the side property line. Project side property lines outwards into the lake. Setbacks are measured from the imaginary property line. (See sketch) Or, generally centered within the parcel (this applies to parcels less than 50 feet wide or with oddly shaped shoreline).
- **Request:** location of docks/hoists feels pretty important; this drives most shoreline zoning complaints. We know we want to encourage dock/hoist configurations to minimize conflicts with neighboring properties. We know an administrative review process may be needed for unique parcels (curvilinear shoreline, angled lot lines, etc.). We're not sure how to move forward; will be helpful to have Planning Commission input.
- **New:** Allow docks/hoists shared between multiple/separate properties to be placed within the side yard setback and/or on the property line, similar to how we treat fences in Section 7.13(5)(d)]
- **Note:** The existing zoning ordinance does not address the location of docks for single ownership. Shared ownership requires that docks be located as near as possible to the center of the parcel. See Section 7.4.2(4).

NEW: Dock Lighting

- Clarify that dock lighting shall comply with dark night sky regulations.

HOISTS

Hoist Size:

- Average = 11' x 14'
- Two (2) jet ski hoists equal one (1) boat hoist
- **Note:** Existing zoning ordinance does not distinguish between boats and jet skis.

Number of Hoists:

- Three hoists per fifty (50) lineal feet of shoreline (i.e., 100 feet of shoreline would allow 4 boat hoists and 4 jet ski hoists, 6 hoists total)
- **Note:** Existing zoning ordinance allows for one hoist per fifty lineal feet of shoreline. See Sections 6.2.2(2)(c) and 7.4.2(3) and (4).
- **New:** Include standalone hoists in this regulation (hoists without a dock); consider that if a parcel is allowed multiple docks, how to allow hoists per dock vs. linear shoreline.

SEASONAL STORAGE

- All items stored within property lines.

- All items seasonally stored four (4) lineal feet from where the water meets the land (allows the public to walk the shoreline)
- Nothing stored in the road right-of-way
- Avoid storage in the floodplain where possible
- Dock sections to be neatly stacked
- Boat hoists consolidated
- **Note:** Existing zoning ordinance requires that a fifteen (15) foot setback from side property lines be maintained. See Section 7.4.2(7).

Parking:

Edit: Parking seems to be working as-is, with minimal complaints. Leave as-is.

Single Ownership:

- Adequate parking provided outside of right-of-way within the driveway and garage.
- Consider minimum requirements for parcels that have single ownership where there is no dwelling and/or associated driveway/garage.
- **Note:** Existing zoning ordinance requires two (2) parking spaces outside of right-of-way for lots of insufficient width. Parking on other shoreline parcels not regulated. See Section 6.2.2(c)2.

Shared Waterfront Ownership:

- Recommend a minimum of one (1) space per three (3) hoists, or
- Allow homeowners association to manage adequate parking for access to dock and hoists. To be noted on the registration form with a disclaimer that the homeowners association is liable for resident and guest safety. Need to have legal review.
- Consider adequate parking for all beach usage not just per boat hoist.
- The goal is to promote public safety while minimizing parking on the shoreline.
- Adequate parking will continue to be addressed during the PUD process. Any existing PUD approvals require an amendment to the SUP/PUD. Could look at the number of lots that have access vs. number of hoists.
- Parking within the right of way is permitted per Grand Traverse County Road
- Commission (GTCRC) and Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) standards
- **Note:** Existing zoning ordinance requires one (1) parking space per hoist. See Section 7.4.2(3)(b).

SHARED WATERFRONT REGISTRATION (REMOVE)

New: Remove registration process [Section 7.4.2(2)]. If ordinance provisions are enforced, no need for registering this land use. All other shared waterfront regulations would remain as-is or as-updated, but no registration requirement. **Point of clarity:** the current ordinance requires a land use permit for shared waterfront use, but does not require annual registration.

- Annual registration
- Administrative process
- Easy checklist to complete (lineal feet of frontage, number of hoists, # of parking spaces, location for storage of docks and hoists, etc.)
- Consider an exemption from registration for shared waterfront with 4 or less families.
- Nominal fee to cover staff time.
- **Note:** Existing zoning ordinance requires an annual land use permit. See Section 7.4.2(2).

June 25, 2025

Recommendation for amendment to ordinance 201

It is the recommendation of the Agricultural Advisory Committee that zoning ordinance amendment 201 be amended in the following way-

Parcel Requirements for all farm processing operations regulated by amendment 201, should be 40 acres.

The operations designated as Wholesale, which currently requires 40 acres, Retail (Indoor seating), which currently requires 50 acres, and Retail (Outdoor seating), which currently requires 60 acres, should all have the same parcel requirement of 40 acres, allowing the farmer to choose how to operate, as they see fit.

On behalf of the AAC,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Kroupa", with a long, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

**John Kroupa
Chairman**