August 14, 2026

Dear Agricultural Advisory Committee, Planning Commission and Township Board Members,

Please accept this letter as my formal resignation from the Agricultural Advisory Committee, effective immediately.

I have appreciated the opportunity to serve on the committee and to contribute my time, experience, and perspective to issues affecting agriculture and our community. I believe the committee has an important role in bringing agricultural concerns and ideas forward to the township.

However, I have reached the point where I can no longer continue serving effectively under the current circumstances. My decision to resign is the result of continued frustration with the level of support and consideration the Agricultural Advisory Committee has received from the Township Board. Despite the committee's efforts to provide thoughtful recommendations and meaningful input, I have increasingly felt that our work has not received the support or attention necessary for the committee to be effective.

I am also deeply concerned about ongoing property tax issues and the impact they have on property owners, including those involved in agriculture. I believe these issues deserve greater attention and more meaningful consideration of their long-term effects on our community. My concerns regarding these matters have contributed significantly to my decision to step away from the committee.

I remain committed to the agricultural community and to the responsible stewardship and future of our township. My resignation should not be interpreted as a lack of interest in these issues, but rather as an acknowledgment that I no longer believe I can be effective in this role under the current circumstances.

I appreciate the opportunity to have served alongside the other members of the Agricultural Advisory Committee and thank those who have worked in good faith to advance its mission. I hope the township will continue to recognize the value of agricultural voices and give meaningful consideration to the issues affecting property owners and the agricultural community.

Sincerely,
Jennifer Bramer

Agricultural committee members,

I am writing to correct some misinformation in your previous April packet.

In that packet was a letter from Jed Hemming which misquoted me from a recent call I put into him to discuss committee recommendations regarding Winery ordinances.

1. I did not state any 5 acre proposed plans would “never pass”
2. I in no way stated my thoughts as originating from or representing Protect The Peninsula. I spoke purely representing my personal point of view and concern based on my 35 years of involvement in agricultural policy, 20 years of on the ground farming and 40 years of owning my own actively farmed agricultural land.
3. I encouraged continuing to pursue any five acre options, but independently of the 40 acre option.

Over many years of public involvement, I know well the importance of words and always plan carefully for any conversations or public statements. Therefore, I am certain of what I state and did not state in that conversation.

My call was prompted simply to support continuing with the amendment down to 40 acres for the top tier of 201 permissions as it currently stands, and to advise against attempting to change it while it was already in an advanced process at the Planning Commission.

After hearing enthusiastic statements from Jed and Chris Baldyga, that the 40 acre proposed adjustment really should allow that 40 acres for that use to be in multiple different parcels from around the township, I had concerned an effort might be made to pull the proposal back and re-draft it.

I fully support the 40 acre proposal as it currently stands and was sent up from the agricultural committee, and I believe that since it is already well in process it can move forward sooner than any newer proposals. Therefore, to halt it now for a re-drafting would cause significant delay to something that can be helpful to some current operators.

I additionally want to correct information in the following reference by Jed Hemmings from the same April Packett, where he stated in writing that:

“When the AAC discussed reducing minimum acreage requirements the committee received a

letter from PTP member John Wunsch stating a reduction in acreage was not

needed and unnecessary.”

I have attached the only 2 letters I have any record of submitting to the committee, neither of which states ***“reduction in acreage was not needed and unnecessary.”***

Key points in the February 2025 letter were:

1. That currently section 8.5 allows for processing on as small as 5 acres with no limitation of fruit sourcing, which I supported, and -

2. That historically there was no 10 acre winery allowance before 201, which was eliminated by 210.

Key points in the March 2025 letter were:

1. To encourage the committee to eventually add some home-based uses, such as processing kitchens or custom crush operations
2. To support use by right because it benefits to both the land owner and the community, pointing out that managing the form and scale of a use through clarity and specifics. can provide for more chances to turn concepts into “use by right” opportunities.
3. To remind anyone who wanted to pursue a custom crush or other processing business that they do have the current option of using 8.5 to proceed while the Agricultural committed continues to pursue ordnance amendments.

Thank you for your ongoing work on behalf of the community.

John A. Wunsch

3/16/2025

Advisory Committee Members,

In addition to taking on the large task of comparing 201 to 139, I hope you will keep in mind and eventually address adding some other home-based uses, such as processing kitchens or custom crush operations, that will likely be the less expensive and more accessible, and thereby the most likely points of entry for small farm operations. Much like fixing signage, they and similar uses such as farm tours etc. could be valuable low hanging fruit business opportunities. If clearly defined these should also be good candidates for "Use by Right" Opportunities.

I support use by right because it benefits to both the land owner and the community. It keeps the land owner from having to face the challenges of public hearings, and the high cost of an SUP, and if it is clearly enough defined, it relieves concerns in the community about what it *"might become"*, or what problems it "*might cause"*.

Amendment 139 is a perfect example. It provided an easy one-page form low-fee opportunity for a land owner, and it was acceptable as a use by right without public hearings to the community because of the very specific definitions regarding the facility and its uses. As one of the authors of 139, I saw firsthand how it resolved a very significant conflict regarding land use during a very contentious time in the community. That was possible due to its clarity and specifics.

Managing the form and scale of a use a can provide for more chances to turn concepts into "use by right" opportunities.

Specifically, as an example at this moment, we have the Devil's Dive Vineyard interested in opening what Molly Stretton has described as a custom crush non-direct retail operation for whole sale and web-based business. Personally, I support and encourage that. Under that

conceptual description, with more spelled out details, we could have a well-structured “use by right” section so that she, or others, could move forward easily. Granted such use by right ordinance sections will take time to establish, but it is potentially a good example of what I hope Peninsula Township will see in the future, multiple well-defined use by right opportunities.

Fortunately for Devils Dive Vinyard, in the meantime, as the new ideas of the agricultural committee take the necessary time to appropriately move through an orderly process to actualization, we do still have section 8.5. So should they choose to do so, there is a clear immediate path forward to opening Devils Dive Vinyard in peninsula township.

Respectfully

John Wunsch

17881 Center Rd

Traverse City, MI

49686

2/25/2025

Committee Members,

First, I want to commend you all for volunteering to serve and thank you for doing so.

With no intent to advocate for any particular path forward I want to provide 2 informational comments.

1. I agree with Jed Hemming's point regarding the value of processing operations that do not necessarily grow product or hold significant acreage. And fortunately, the 201 amendment did not remove that option. It still exists as SECTION 8.5 FOOD PROCESSING PLANTS IN A-1 DISTRICTS, which allows for processing on any agriculture parcel, with no requirement to grow products and no minimum acreage requirement.

2. Reference was made by a citizen comment that seemed to state one of the problems with amendment 201 was that it removed the small acreage option that was needed by and targeted by Devils Dive Vineyard so they could open a winery. Without knowledge or comment upon the intended business plan of the Devils Dive Vineyard, I think it is important for the public to know that before the 201 amendment a vineyard had to be on a 20-acre minimum size parcel and also had to own or control a total of 40 acres. Again, without knowing the relevance to Devils Dive Vineyard, the public should know that there was no option before 201 for a 10 acre vineyard.

Thank You for your attention.

John A. Wunsch

17881 Center Rd,

Traverse City, MI 49686