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
September 15, 2026
2:00 p.m.

1. **Call to Order** by Kroupa at 2:00 p.m.
2. **Pledge**
3. **Roll Call**

Present: Kroupa, Heller, Baldyga, Edmonson, Coggon, Gomez, Hemming, Johnson
Also Present: PC Chair Kevin Beard, Supervisor Maura Sanders

4. **Brief Citizen Comments:** None
5. **Approve Agenda**

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

6. **Conflict of Interest:** None
7. **Consent Agenda**
   - **A. Approve meeting minutes:**
     - Agricultural Advisory Committee Regular Meeting August 18, 2026.
   - **B. Correspondence:** None

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

8. **Business:**
   - **A. New member appointment – Jeff Kane**
   - **B. Planning Commission Updates**
     - **Directive for Ag ordinance discussion**

Beard reports that the PC continued their discussion of potential ADUs, including support for providing additional housing for family members and concerns regarding possible short-term rental use. No decision has been reached, and the topic will return at the PC's next meeting on September 28. PC also began reviewing steep slopes and tree clearing, with discussion focused primarily on residentially developed land while avoiding impacts to active agricultural operations. No specific slope, tree-clearing, or erosion standards have been established. The ordinance rewrite remains under review, incorporating existing provisions, 2019 recommendations, recently adopted amendments, and rewrite committee recommendations. PC members are reviewing the color-coded draft by topic rather than line-by-line and are deferring broader issues such as fencing, slopes, erosion, and grading for separate future consideration.

Members question why the 24-foot minimum width for principal residences applies in residential districts but not the Agricultural District, particularly given potential impacts on tiny homes and mobile homes. Staff will research the history and purpose of the requirement before members consider whether it should be maintained, reduced, or extended to the Agricultural District.

Discussion revisits the Township Board's request to explore regulations for steep slopes and tree clearing, particularly on heavily wooded residential properties. Sanders notes limitations of existing County soil erosion regulations and whether additional Township review could address grading, retaining walls, and hillside stability earlier in the development process. Concerns are raised by members about duplicating County requirements and

adding costs or regulatory burdens. The discussion identifies the need to further consider properties affected by conservation agreements or reserved development rights, where slope restrictions could conflict with existing commitments. No specific regulations are established, and the issue will require further review.

C. Town Board Updates

Sanders states that the September 22 Township Board agenda will include Planning Commission recommendations regarding signs, chickens, lighting, and an expedited SUP amendment process. Discussion briefly addresses the proposed allowance of backyard chickens in residential districts, which are currently not permitted, and whether such matters are better addressed through HOAs rather than Township regulation.

Discussion focuses on moving the small processing ordinance forward without delaying it to reconcile the separate Old Mission Citizens Coalition proposal. Beard identifies the need for additional detail on acreage, building size, setbacks, and facility scaling. Beard and Kroupa will coordinate a meeting with AAC members and the Township Planner to clarify these standards.

The Coalition may submit its proposal as a formal ordinance amendment, which the Township Board would determine whether to pursue. Members agree the existing PC work should continue independently and the Coalition proposal can be reviewed if formally referred to the Commission.

D. Continued discussion of farm stay language

Members review the proposed farm stay language, including accommodations such as cabins, yurts, and park model units, along with setbacks, buffering, and pet control. Discussion considers the viability of farm stays as an additional revenue source for working farms and their potential contribution to agritourism.

Further discussion focuses on maintaining a clear connection to agriculture, including the proposed 50% tillage requirement and how wooded or fallow areas should be treated. Members consider whether an educational component is necessary and how to distinguish farm stays from a small campground or B&B on agricultural land. The primary use would remain agricultural, with farm stays serving as an accessory use.

Members compare the proposed farm stay use with existing B&B regulations and discuss whether farm stays should include limits based on acreage and number of sites. Discussion emphasizes tying the use to an active farming operation and limiting the scale so it remains an accessory use rather than becoming a standalone lodging business. Members also note that farm stays on larger agricultural properties could provide lodging with less impact on neighboring properties than B&Bs in residential areas, particularly with increased setbacks and buffering. The group recognizes that health, fire, soil erosion, and other regulatory agencies would also review such uses. Members agree to review the proposed farm stay language in detail and identify provisions requiring clarification or revision. Discussion centers on whether an educational component should be required or whether operating as a working farm is sufficient to establish the agricultural connection.

The group generally supports proceeding with the concept while recognizing the need for appropriate standards. Members indicate that a Special Use Permit (SUP) would provide the necessary level of review for site-specific impacts, including neighboring properties, traffic, and site layout.

Members discuss scalability, including the proposed 30-acre minimum and stepped limits based on acreage. The current concept would allow three sites on 30–39.99 acres and four sites on 40 or more acres, with members generally supporting the proposed scale and cap.

Discussion also addresses owner or manager presence, including requirements to remain on-site or have a designated manager available, and the limitation on operating more than one farm stay within the Township. Members review parking, waste, water, septic, and restroom requirements and note that state or County licensing thresholds may determine the appropriate number of sites. Staff will verify the applicable health and campsite licensing requirements to ensure the proposed standards are workable locally.

DRAFT

Members review the proposed cabin definitions, including hard-sided tents, camping cabins, and park model units, and generally support allowing the range of accommodations. Discussion then focuses on operational requirements, including owner/manager presence, noise, and setbacks. Members question the proposed 100-foot setback from property lines and consider a greater setback from neighboring residences, while recognizing that the Planning Commission could require additional setbacks during site plan review and that existing buildings may warrant flexibility.

Further discussion addresses whether existing migrant housing could be used for farm stays and the related zoning, building code, licensing, and assessment implications. Members will research whether migrant housing could be used in this manner and consult with the Assessment Office regarding potential classification and tax implications. Members also discuss whether limited farm-stay lodging could instead be accommodated under existing B&B provisions. Discussion considers whether farm stays should accommodate occasional seasonal events rather than operate as year-round lodging. Members favor maintaining flexibility for farmers while avoiding unnecessary regulatory burdens. Members agree to a 100-foot property-line setback and 300-foot setback from neighboring residences, with flexibility for existing buildings and additional setbacks during site plan review. The maximum stay is reduced from three weeks to two weeks.

Members review the proposed per-campsite occupancy limits of four adults or two adults with children, with a maximum of 10 people. Discussion focuses on potential noise, wastewater, sanitation, and overall site impacts, particularly from additional visitors. Members agree to retain the limits for now and seek clarification on the reasoning behind the proposed numbers.

Members review the proposed per-campsite occupancy limits of four adults or two adults with children, with a maximum of 10 people. Kroupa and Baldyga both raise concerns regarding potential noise impacts, noting that the Township's noise ordinance would apply but that larger groups could increase the potential for noise and other impacts such as wastewater, sanitation, and overall site capacity. Members agree to retain the limits for now and seek clarification on the reasoning behind the proposed numbers. Members review lighting and fire provisions, noting that existing site plan requirements and the Township's Dark Sky Ordinance would address lighting. Discussion focuses on fire-pit requirements, with members favoring regulation of designated fire-pit locations and operator responsibility rather than prohibiting smoke from leaving the property.

The group also reviews prohibited activities, including fireworks, sky lanterns, concerts, motocross, and firearm ranges. Members consider whether additional activities should be identified based on recurring complaints or Township enforcement concerns. Members agree to remove offices, community rooms, and playgrounds from the permitted incidental uses to keep farm stays limited in scale. Restrooms, passive recreation, and firewood sales remain, with setbacks applying to applicable accessory structures.

Members review the proposed site plan and SUP submission requirements and find them generally comprehensive. Discussion also addresses adding specific language regarding control of pets by campers and their guests, particularly given potential impacts to livestock, neighboring properties, and other campers. Staff will revise the draft, research remaining questions, and provide any relevant information from existing farm stay operators for further review.

9. **Citizen Comments:** None
10. **Board Comments**

Sanders: Notes upcoming term expirations and note that Nancy's term expires in December. Dave and Jed are also identified as having terms expiring, with discussion indicating that the Chair and Vice Chair terms do not align.

Hemming: Suggests considering expanded B&B capacity for larger agricultural properties, noting that farms may have more space and on-site activities with less impact on neighboring properties. Discussion briefly considers whether a larger-scale B&B model could be appropriate based on acreage and number of bedrooms. No action is taken on the suggestion.

DRAFT

Heller: Would like the Township Attorney's guidance regarding gatherings and the need to distinguish between "small" and "large" gatherings. Staff will seek clarification from the Attorney on the intended thresholds and definitions before proceeding.

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

Meeting adjourned at 4:24 p.m.

DRAFT