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
August 18, 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
Also Present: Planner Sara Schroeder
Absent: Johnson

4. **Brief Citizen Comments (for agenda items only):**

Don Coe, 211 Midtown Dr: States July 13 public meeting regarding RTF and GAAMPs is helpful and encourages the committee to consider Ryan Coffee Hoag's recommendations along with existing 2011 ordinance, model ordinances, small-farm model report, public input, and Citizens Coalition ordinance prepared by Mansfield Associates. Speaker suggests incorporating elements from these resources into a revised ordinance to provide a clear and efficient path for agricultural tourism and related uses. Key points include recognizing agricultural tourism as important to Old Mission Peninsula's agricultural future, allowing appropriate agricultural tourism and on-site processing uses subject to applicable regulations, distinguishing farm-related activities from separate commercial enterprises, establishing clear definitions and scalability standards, and utilizing Township's PDR program to support agriculture while discouraging residential development.

Approve Agenda

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

5. **Conflict of Interest:** None
6. **Consent Agenda**
   - **A. Approve meeting minutes:**
     - Agricultural Advisory Committee Regular Meeting June 16, 2026.
   - **B. Correspondence:**
     - Don Coe
     - John Wunsch

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

7. **Business:**
   - **A. Resignation of Jen Bramer from AAC on 8-14-26**

Members thank Jen Bramer for her time serving on the Agricultural Advisory Committee and expresses disappointment regarding her resignation. Members concur, noting that Bramer has been a valuable committee member and that her concerns reflect broader frustration within the agricultural community regarding a perceived lack of response and support from the Township Board. Members express hope that Township leadership is aware of these concerns and recognize Bramer's efforts to support the community.

DRAFT

Discussion follows regarding committee membership changes. Garrett Goggon is expected to move into a full membership position, Nick Johnson is expected to become Alternate 1, and the TB will appoint a new Alternate 2, subject to the Supervisor's preference. Members discuss whether to submit recommendations for the new alternate and agree that suggestions may be forwarded to the Board, although there is some concern that previous recommendations were not considered.

Members discuss Jen Bramer's resignation and note that ongoing delays with agricultural ordinances may contribute to frustration within the community. It is noted that the Sign Ordinance has passed the PC and is moving forward to the TB. Members are encouraged to review the ordinance and attend the Board meeting if they have concerns. Appreciation is expressed for Jen's service to the committee.

B. Presentation of example ag ordinance from OM Citizens Coalition: Fred Swaffer & Doug Mansfield

Fred Swaffer, President of the Citizens Coalition Old Mission Peninsula, and Doug Mansfield of Mansfield Land Use Consultants present a draft agricultural ordinance prepared at the Coalition's expense. Fred states that the draft has been reviewed favorably by local farmers and MDARD representatives, as well as Ryan Coffee Hoag. Coalition supports adoption but welcomes further discussion and revisions through the Township's review process.

Doug Mansfield provides background on his extensive experience with township planning, special use permits, subdivisions, wineries, and agricultural tourism. He emphasizes that farming is a commercial and sometimes industrial activity that can involve inherent nuisances and states that regulations should be clear, objective, fair, and legally defensible. Mansfield expresses concern that existing and proposed ordinance language does not provide sufficient clarity regarding opportunities, restrictions, and expectations. He states that the ordinance should focus not only on sustaining existing farms but also on supporting future farmers and the long-term viability of agriculture on Old Mission Peninsula. Mansfield discusses historical and current traffic patterns and notes that growth has been modest. He emphasizes preserving and building upon Old Mission Peninsula's agricultural identity, heritage, and character to support its long-term viability. States that the special use permit process is lengthy and burdensome and is not well suited for agricultural uses. He emphasizes the need for clear and predictable standards, so farmers understand what is permitted and what is required. Mansfield explains that the proposed ordinance uses GAAMPs as a guide for development and mitigation while allowing qualifying agricultural uses through administrative approval rather than a special use permit. The proposal requires a bona fide farm and establishes standards for agricultural tourism and related uses, including processing, farm markets, farm stays, and other activities. Mansfield emphasizes using clear conditions and setbacks instead of special use permits to provide predictable standards while addressing potential impacts such as traffic, noise, and proximity to neighboring residences. Mansfield states that proposed standards are reviewed with farmers, users, and MDARD and include proportional farm-stay allowances, setbacks, parking, and compliance with applicable Township and agency regulations. He explains that properties unable to meet the standards could pursue a special use permit for mitigation. Mansfield emphasizes that the proposal is intended to support agricultural tourism while protecting surrounding properties and recommends allowing qualifying uses through administrative approval. He requests an opportunity for the Coalition to meet with Township planners to further review and refine the proposal.

Swaffer states that declining crop diversity and age diversity threaten the future of agriculture on the Peninsula. He supports the proposed agricultural ordinance as a tool to help preserve farming and encourages advancing it through the review process, with direct collaboration between Mansfield and Township planners. Recommends that the AAC review and discuss the proposed agricultural ordinance before making a recommendation to the PC. He emphasizes that the committee was established to advocate for farming and that its recommendations should carry meaningful weight in the Township's decision-making process. Mansfield recommends that Township planners review the proposed ordinance with the Coalition to identify common ground before the AAC makes a recommendation. Mansfield discusses examples of agricultural ordinances from other Michigan

DRAFT

communities but notes that few directly address the unique agricultural conditions on Old Mission Peninsula. Swaffer suggests that Peninsula Township has an opportunity to develop a strong, practical agricultural ordinance that could serve as a model for other communities.
Heller asks for clarification on the proposed agricultural ordinance, particularly the definitions and two-page summary of key provisions. Discussion focuses on how the proposal relates to and amends the existing ordinance, with clarification that other existing uses remain unchanged. Heller requests a redlined version identifying specific changes to the current ordinance. Edmonson supports the proposed agricultural ordinance, describing it as practical and streamlined, and recommends that the Agricultural Advisory Committee move it forward due to the importance and urgency of supporting agriculture.
Gomez notes that much of the proposed ordinance is similar to the committee's previous draft and asks how the two proposals should be reconciled. Swaffer states that farmers who reviewed the proposal generally found it well thought out and appreciated its flexibility and concise format. Discussion supports comparing the two drafts, coordinating with Township planners, and seeking additional input from farmers before finalizing the ordinance.
Discussion focuses on how to move the proposed agricultural ordinance forward. Members recognize significant overlap with the committee's previous draft but identify provisions requiring further review. Members debate whether to conduct a detailed review before forwarding the ordinance or have Township planners and Mansfield work through the technical language first. Ultimately, members emphasize that the committee should retain input on the substance of the ordinance while allowing professionals to work through the technical and legal aspects, with regular updates to the committee.
Members discuss the proposed ordinance and agree that additional review is needed before taking action. Schroeder explains that a formal zoning ordinance amendment application should be submitted to initiate the PC review process, after which the AAC can provide feedback. Members agree to pursue the appropriate application process and request a side-by-side comparison of the proposed ordinance and the committee's previous draft for further discussion at the next meeting. Committee thanks Fred and Doug for the presentation.
Members identify next steps for the proposed agricultural ordinance, including reviewing the definitions and preparing a side-by-side comparison with the committee's previous draft. Members note the limited number of remaining meetings before committee terms expire and emphasize the need to make progress before the end of the year. Discussion also addresses whether previously submitted agricultural ordinance language has been reviewed by Township staff and the PC.

C. Planning Commission Updates

- **Small Processor**

Schroeder states that PC has briefly discussed small processor provisions, completed a site visit to Jeff Kane's property, and is seeking additional legal guidance. PC is prioritizing review of the overall draft zoning ordinance, so further discussion of small processors may be delayed or incorporated into the larger rewrite. Members are encouraged to identify other small processing operations that could be visited for comparison.

- **Sign Ordinance**

Schroeder provides an update on the Sign Ordinance, stating that PC held the public hearing and forwarded it to the TB for consideration. Proposed changes include a maximum of 60 square feet of on-premise signage in the ag district and additional limitations on off-premise signage. Members are encouraged to review the ordinance and direct any comments to the TB during the upcoming review and public hearing.

D. Town Board Updates

Schroeder reports that Maura is unable to attend due to circumstances related to the recent fatal accident that took place on the peninsula. Also reports that the Township recently completed the purchase of a 100-acre PDR property for Mark Kelly, adding the property to the PDR program.

DRAFT

E. Discussion of steep slope and tree removal ordinance

Schroeder provides an update on initial PC discussions regarding potential steep slope and tree removal regulations. She notes that agricultural uses are not intended to be restricted and may be exempted from the proposed regulations. Discussion also considers how to prevent agricultural exemptions from being used to clear property for future residential development while allowing flexibility when legitimate farming plans change.

Hemming notes that Grand Traverse County already regulates steep slopes and suggests relying on the existing county ordinance rather than creating additional Township regulations. Concern is expressed that a more restrictive Township slope standard could significantly limit development on the Peninsula. Regarding tree preservation, Hemming recommends education on proper tree care and disease prevention rather than additional regulation. Schroeder encourages these comments to be shared with the PC.

Schroeder explains that Soil Erosion permits or waivers from Grand Traverse County are required before a Township Land Use Permit is issued. County Soil Erosion oversees active construction, while the Township regulates stormwater after permits close. Discussion notes recent concerns with steep slopes and stormwater runoff and emphasizes the Township's review of long-term stormwater management to prevent impacts to neighboring properties.

Edmonson questions the need for additional Township land-clearing regulations, stating that County Soil Erosion professionals are better equipped to address these issues. Raises concerns regarding a major washout near Center Road and suggests that the Township take action to stabilize the area before further storm events create additional hazards. Schroeder states that the road issue may involve MDOT and recommends discussing it with Maura, who is more familiar with the situation. Discussion notes that the washout is a stormwater issue rather than a soil erosion issue.

Mansfield provides comments on the proposed steep slope and tree-clearing regulations, expressing concern that the standards could unnecessarily restrict development and reduce property value. He states that slope regulations should account for soil type, engineering, and site-specific conditions rather than prohibit development based solely on a percentage of slope. Mansfield also raises concerns that broad tree-clearing regulations could be subjective and difficult to enforce and may encourage property owners to misrepresent agricultural intentions. He recommends that the Township reconsider the proposed regulations and rely on appropriate engineering and professional standards rather than overly restrictive requirements.

Members discuss the potential impact of proposed steep slope and tree-clearing regulations on agricultural and other property owners. Members express concern that the regulations could restrict agricultural activities, reduce property value, and create unintended consequences, while Schroeder clarifies that the proposal is still in development and is not intended to regulate routine tree removal or legitimate agricultural activities. Discussion also considers exemptions for agricultural, forestry, and PDR properties and the need to account for site-specific conditions and existing County regulations. Members agree that the AAC should communicate its concerns to the PC during development of the ordinance.

Mansfield discusses his experience with PDR projects and states that proposed development restrictions on steep slopes and wooded areas could significantly reduce the development potential and value of agricultural properties. He notes that these restrictions would also affect appraisals and the value of properties considered for the PDR program.

Members agree to provide a formal statement to the PC regarding the proposed steep slope and tree-clearing regulations. The committee supports expressing serious concerns about impacts to agricultural properties and requesting an exemption for agricultural uses. Members also acknowledge potential concerns for residential properties. Coggon agrees to draft a brief statement and circulate it to the committee for review before forwarding it to the PC.

DRAFT

F. Continued discussion of farm stay language

Members discuss the proposed agricultural ordinance and agree that further consideration may be appropriate given the PC's current workload and the lack of urgency. Members question whether there is sufficient demand from local farmers for uses such as farm stays and glamping and note that small-scale processing appears to be a higher priority. Discussion also considers the economic feasibility and regulatory burden of farm stays. Members suggest that allowing lodging or B&B-type uses in agricultural areas could provide additional income opportunities while reducing impacts on neighboring properties and potentially encouraging visitors to remain on the Peninsula longer. Members discuss Ryan Coffee Hoag's recommendation to consider a tourism overlay within the ag district to allow additional agricultural tourism opportunities, including B&Bs, campgrounds, and other businesses. Discussion notes that similar overlay concepts have been used in other townships and could provide designated areas for agricultural processing and tourism activities.

Motion by Heller to table further discussion until September meeting with second by Gomez **Motion Passes**

8. Citizen Comments

Fred Swaffer, 1045 Gray Rd: Expresses appreciation for Jen Bramer's service and contributions to the community and emphasizes the importance of Township-appointed committees having their recommendations and citizen input meaningfully considered by the TB. Reiterates concerns regarding the proposed steep slope regulations, noting that agricultural activities could be permitted on steep areas while similar grading for residential development could be restricted, and encourages the PC to consider practical implications when developing the regulations.

10. Board Comments

Hemming: Questions the Township's use of permissive zoning, stating that it is not mandatory under Michigan law and expressing concern that the approach unnecessarily limits property rights. Members discuss the history of the issue and note that, although permissive zoning has been used as an interpretation for many years, it was not formally included in the ordinance.

Baldyga: Recalls that Jen Cram stated at a 2021 agricultural tourism conference that Peninsula Township operates under permissive zoning, noting that although she considered the approach undesirable, it was how the Township operated. Notes that many customary accessory uses are not specifically listed in the ordinance but are generally understood to be permitted, such as recreational activities and gatherings on residential property.

Hemming: Member states that permissive zoning requires the Township to specifically determine what activities are allowed, creating opportunities for increasing regulation. Recalls a past example involving a proposed basketball court in a barn that was denied because it was not specifically permitted. Member expresses concern that this approach can lead to gradual overreach and unnecessary restrictions on private property.

Adjournment

Motion by Heller to adjourn, seconded by Hemming. **Motion Passes**

Meeting adjourned at 4:24 p.m.

DRAFT

From: **Kevin Beard** duneclimber55@yahoo.com
Subject: Re: AAC communication to PC
Date: August 26, 2026 at 4:04 PM
To: John Kroupa john@peninsulacellars.com
Cc: Planning & Zoning Administrator zoning@peninsulatownship.com, Maura Sanders supervisor@peninsulatownship.com

KB

John,
I apologize for the delay in responding. I was out of state and when I returned was preparing for the PC meeting. The AAC's correspondence regarding steep slopes and tree removal was in the PC packet at our August 24 meeting. I wish to be clear that the PC, in it's initial discussion around these subjects, agreed that land zoned for agriculture use should be exempt from most and maybe potential requirements.

As to your request to have the AAC discuss the presentation you received on August 18, the PC agreed that the AAC can review this, but do so in the context of the draft language the AAC has already forwarded to the PC on the same subjects and potential uses, with an eye toward reconciling the presentation with the AAC's previous work.

Please also keep in mind the cautions made by the Township attorney. If I recall correctly areas to avoid discussion include gatherings large and small, food service, amplification, and alcohol.

I hope this satisfactorily responds to your request.

Thanks,
Kevin

On Friday, August 21, 2026 at 03:13:34 PM EDT, John Kroupa <john@peninsulacellars.com> wrote:

Hi Kevin-

Here are a couple things for your next meeting from the AAC.

One is the AACs position on the early concept work you've started on the steep slope and tree cutting ordinance. We would like this on record early in the process, as it is of great concern to all of us.

Second, I am making a formal request to continue discussion of an example Ag Ordinance, that was created and presented by the Mansfield group at our last meeting on the 18th. I have attached a copy of the presentation, for your reference. The last 2 pages are the ordinance itself, which we would like to discuss in depth.

If you have any questions, let me know. Have a great weekend.

Thanks,

John

From: **Chris Baldyga** chris@2lwinery.com
Subject: Leelanau Twp Farm stay guidance doc and Amendment language
Date: June 17, 2026 at 4:06 PM
To: john@peninsulacellars.com, Jed Hemming janddhemming@hotmail.com, Agrivine agrivine@charter.net, Dave Edmondson edmondson1954@gmail.com, Nancy Heller nancyrheller@gmail.com, Raul Gomez graul40@gmail.com
Cc: Garrett Scott Coggon gcoggon@gmail.com, nicholasljohns@gmail.com

CB

CAUTION – DO NOT 'REPLY TO ALL' IN THIS EMAIL THREAD!!!

Greetings-
I've attached the two documents from the Leelanau Township Farm stay ordinance. The first is the guidelines document they used to outline intent, goals and structure AND the second is the final amendment language with all the provisions and restrictions as well.

They do have a few minimums and topics we should define for Pen Twp though I think this a nicely conservative ordinance that we might use largely in the current form.

Key differences vs. what we discussed:

- Lee Twp considers a farm stay camp setup as a Special Use Permit not use by right with administrative review/approval as we have mostly discussed
- I think we should endeavor to keep this as admin approval and shorter timelines and lower fees so it doesn't become a slow and expensive public process for a farmer looking to do this on their parcel
- They consider it an accessory use on a parcel whose primary use is a *farming operation as defined by RTF Act definition*. I think this is the piece I misremembered as "primary income from the parcel had to be the farming activity and not the camping".

Things we didn't necessarily discuss but should as we parse thought the final language:

- relatively large 30 acre parcel minimum
- they define and provide allowances for cabins, hard-sided tents, yurts etc that are provided on the site by the owner (essentially "glamping" locations)
    - perhaps this points to what Nick mentioned for existing labor housing that might be renovated to be seasonal cabins as well?
- I think the "operational limitations" portion is well done

Looking forward to hearing any of your thoughts or feedback here-

Chris Baldyga
Founder
2Lads Winery

2024 Lee Twp Farmstay Amd Guidelines.pdf

2024 Lee Twp Farmstay Amd language.pdf

LEELANAU TOWNSHIP
LEELANAU COUNTY

AMENDMENT TO LEELANAU TOWNSHIP ZONING ORDINANCE

An ordinance to amend or inform Article 4, AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT by adding:

SECTION 4.6 Agritourism Farmstays

1. **Intent, Goals, Purposes, and Limits:**
   a) **Definitions**
      1) **Agritourism**: the practice of visiting an agricultural operation for the purposes of purchase, recreation, education, and/or active involvement in the operation; not as a contractor or employee of the operation.
      2) **Farmstay**: A building or place that provides temporary or short-term accommodation to paying guests on a Working Farm as a secondary business to primary production.
      3) **Working Farm**: A parcel(s) actively devoted to agricultural use, on which an owner, farm manager and/or operator is engaged in the growing, raising and producing of farm products on more than fifty percent (50%) of the farm's tillable acreage. The working nature of the farm must be demonstrated such that the township agrees it is satisfactory.

   b) **Intent**
      The intent of this zoning provision is to support the economic sustainability and resiliency of local farming by allowing flexibility for a farmer to meet changes in market, social and environmental conditions through agricultural tourism and accessory uses compatible with the rural character of the township. Agricultural tourism means the practice of visiting an agricultural operation for the purposes of purchase, recreation, education, and/or active involvement in the operation; not as a contractor or employee of the operation. For farms that are actively growing products for sale, agricultural tourism can provide improved sales, marketing and additional income opportunities to supplement the agricultural income derived from the farm.
   c) **Goals**
      The goals of these provisions are:
      1) To maintain and promote agriculture and related activities.
      2) To preserve open space and farmland.
      3) To maintain the township's agricultural heritage and rural character.
      4) To increase community benefits by having fresh, local agricultural products for sale and working classrooms to educate school children and other residents and tourists about agriculture and related activities.
      5) To increase agriculturally related businesses that contribute to the general economic condition of the area and region.

d) **Purpose**

The purposes of these provisions are:

1) To provide standard definitions related to agritourism and farmstays.
2) To provide a list of permitted agritourism uses associated with farmstays
3) To provide for a clear understanding of the expectations for agricultural tourism uses for farm operators, local residents, other businesses and local officials.

e) **Limits**

The limits of these provisions are:

1) Agricultural tourism uses are allowed only on Working Farms.
2) A farm's size must be adequate to accommodate any agricultural tourism use so as not to create a nuisance or a hazard. Issues affected by farm size include, but are not limited to, setbacks for noise abatement, adequate off road space, and adequate parking areas.
3) Agricultural tourism uses must meet all township zoning ordinances plus all health, building, road, safety and all other applicable local, state and federal regulations and codes.
4) Agricultural operations whose gross revenues solely or primarily derived from alcoholic products are not included under these provisions. This Section does not expand uses permitted for production, processing, or sale of alcoholic products or otherwise reduce the restrictions applicable under state or local laws.
5) Documentation that an agricultural tourism use is operating within these limits must be made available to the township upon request.

2. Farmstay uses, within the limits set above, permitted by right for Working Farms in the Agricultural District.

a) Activities associated with Farmstays which would be permitted:

1) Lodging per defined temporary structures in Section 3a 6)
2) Purchase of firewood, food items produced by local farms and camping ancillary items.
3) Value-added processing of products that are grown on the farm
4) Horse rides
5) U-Pick operations
6) Petting farm and/or animal displays
7) Educational-uses such as tours of the site, exhibits, classes, workshops, cooking demonstrations, lectures, seminars, etc.
8) Nature trails
9) Open air or covered picnic area with restroom(s) and adequate trash receptacles

3. Other agricultural tourism use(s) accessory to a Working Farm's operation may be approved subject to site plan review

Potential uses covered under this section are ancillary to the farm on which they are located, but utilize the rural character of the farm and the township as an asset for the business. Uses

envisioned under this section include: Farmstays and farm experiences including lodging. The intent of this section is to provide guidelines for ideas for such ancillary uses so that the uses can financially benefit the farmer, and still preserve the rural character of the farm's neighborhood and the township.

a) Uses proposed under this Section require a Site Plan Review approved by the Planning Commission. Information and allowable conditions required in the Site Plan includes but are not limited to:
    1) Description of Farmstays
    2) Number of people staying at a Farmstay
    3) Structures to be utilized
    4) The operation is on a single parcel of 40 acres or greater, with only one Farmstay operation allowed on a parcel.
    5) Maximum of four (4) camp sites or rooms per property. Maximum occupancy of two (2) adults per room or site, excluding dependent children.
    6) Acceptable accommodations on Farmstay camp sites includes:
        a. tents defined as a collapsible shelter of canvas or other fabric stretched and sustained by poles and used for camping outdoors, or
        b. vehicular-type structures, primarily designed as temporary living quarters for recreational, camping, or travel use, which either has its own motive power or is mounted on or drawn by another vehicle which is self-powered is permitted on camp sites, or
        c. a hard-sided tent or shelter, that is less than 400 square feet in area
    7) An eighty foot (80') open set back buffer shall be provided on all sides of the property not abutting a roadway. Where feasible, crops or wood lots shall remain within the buffer to maintain the agricultural character of the parcel.
    8) Parking plans: may be located on a grass or gravel area and must be clearly designated. Parking shall not be in the designated set back buffer.
    9) Any place for recreational fires must be noted and be contained within fire vessels of smokeless design to minimize smoke.
    10) Lighting plans in compliance with existing ordinances and rural character.
    11) Noise control plans in compliance with existing ordinances and rural character.
    12) Quiet hours are to be enforced, 10 p.m. to 7 a.m.
    13) The septic system must be adequate to accommodate additional occupancy (part of the health department approval).
    14) A site or room may not be occupied by a party for more than 30 days.
    15) The parcel owner, and or farm manager/operator, must reside or be available on the property 24/7 and is responsible to enforce all conditions above.

b) A Land Use Permit shall only be granted if the Planning Commission determines the applicant has submitted evidence demonstrating the following standards are met:
    1) The farm is a Working Farm
    2) The use is compatible with adjacent uses of land, the natural environment, the capacities of public services and facilities affected by the land use and will maintain the agricultural character of the location and the visual rural character of the neighborhood.

3) The use will be buffered both visually and acoustically from neighbors.
4) The use meets other applicable township ordinances, including but not limited to signage and lighting.
5) Activity structures, locations and access routes have been reviewed and approved by the fire chief for safety and emergency access.
6) Structures will meet building codes as temporary structures that can be moved or removed if farmstays are no longer in operation.
7) A parcel owner shall provide a potable water supply in accordance with Act No. 399 of the Public Acts of 1976, as amended, being §325.1001 et seq. of the Michigan Compile Laws, and rules promulgated under the act, being R 325.10101 et seq. of the Michigan Administrative Code.
8) A parcel owner and person preparing plans shall comply with all applicable statutes and rules regulating the methods and facilities for the collection, treatment, and disposal of sewage and other wastewater. A parcel owner shall ensure that the nature, capacity, maintenance, and operation of the methods and facilities do not create unlawful pollution of the waters of the state, a nuisance condition or a menace to health or safety.
9) Disposal of garbage and refuse shall be in accordance with state and local law, ordinances, and rules. A sufficient number of containers shall be provided for the storage of garbage and other refuse. Garbage and refuse shall be collected and disposed of as often as necessary to prevent overflow, nuisance or odor, but not less than once each week. Containers shall be maintained in a clean and sanitary condition.
10) An electrical installation on a parcel shall comply with applicable codes and ordinances including, but not limited to, the state electrical code. Not more than 1 recreation unit shall be served by 1 electrical outlet.
11) Health department has reviewed and approved plans for water, food preparation, bathroom facilities and sanitation.

LEELANAU TOWNSHIP ORDINANCE
NO. 1 OF 2024 TO AMEND THE ZONING ORDINANCE

FARM STAY CAMPGROUNDS
IN THE AGRICULTURAL ZONING DISTRICT

LEELANAU TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

Adopted by Leelanau Township Board
October 8, 2024

I. AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 2 – DEFINITIONS

1. Add the following Definition of Farm Stay Campground:

FARM STAY CAMPGROUND: A small Campground that is considered as an agritourism accessory use to a primary farming operation (as defined by the Michigan Right-To-Farm Act) on a property or tract in the Agricultural Zoning District, and approved as a Special Land Use.

(Note Continue using the existing definition of Campground and Recreational Unit that was adopted by amendment in 2022.)

II. AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 3 – GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. SECTION 3.11 RECREATIONAL VEHICLE USE
   Replace Section 3.11.C in its entirety with the following:

   C. By definition, more than two (2) recreational units on a parcel of land shall constitute a Campground. The standards listed above in Sections 3.11.A and 3.11.B shall not apply to approved Campgrounds including Farm Stay Campgrounds.

III. AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 4 - AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT

1. Add Farm Stay Campgrounds to the Special Land Use Section 4.4G

Section 4.4.G Farm Stay Campgrounds: Add the following in its entirety:

A. **INTRODUCTION / INTENT**

Leelanau Township recognizes that Farm Stay Campgrounds, when conducted properly, can enhance and add value to an existing commercial farming operation. Farm Stay Campgrounds however, have the potential to disrupt residential areas and also neighboring farming operations by virtue of noise, traffic, dust, smoke, trespassing, and proximity to active farming operations.

Anyone who wishes to establish and operate a Farm Stay Campground in the Agricultural Zoning District shall first obtain a Special Land Use Permit from Leelanau Township.

It is the intent of Leelanau Township to limit the potential impacts of Farm Stay Campgrounds in the Agricultural Zoning District by considering potential impacts on the area such as noise, traffic, topography, and proximity to farming operations during the review of each Application. Among other factors, the township will consider the location and parcel size of the proposed property and the surrounding land uses.

B. MINIMUM LOCATION STANDARDS

1. Farm Stay Campgrounds shall be considered a use accessory and subordinate to a primary farming operation, as defined in the Right-To-Farm Act, and shall be located on the same parcel or tract as the primary farming operation. If Leelanau Township needs to verify if a particular farming operation meets the Right-To-Farm Act definition, they may ask the Applicant to provide a determination from the Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development (or their successor).

2. There shall be only one Farm Stay Campground allowed per parcel or tract of land under the same ownership.

3. The owner or manager of the Farm Stay Campground shall reside in a dwelling on the parcel or tract.

4. Only Recreational Units, as defined in this ordinance, shall be allowed on a Farm Stay Campsite.

5. The minimum gross parcel or tract size shall be 30 Acres, however, the size of the parcel, topography, and surrounding land uses will be factors in determining if an application qualifies for a Special Use Permit, as well as the number of allowable campsites.

6. Maximum number of allowable individual campsites to be active at one time in a Farm Stay Campground:
   The Planning Commission, during review, will determine the maximum number of allowable campsites that can be active (rented out) at one time based upon topography, access, and the surrounding existing land uses, however, the maximum number of active campsites in a Farm Stay Campground shall not exceed the maximum number listed below. The Planning Commission may allow for flexibility of campsite options by allowing additional campsites, however, the maximum number of active campsites at one time shall not exceed the following:

Parcel or Tract Size (Gross Acreage)	Maximum Number of Active Sites	Maximum Number of Total Sites (Active & Inactive)	Maximum Number of Cabins*
30.00 - 30.99 acres	3	4	3
40.00 acres and more, (or ¼ of ¼ Section of land)	4	5	4

*For purposes of this section, “cabins” includes a hard-sided tent, camping cabin, and park model units.

7. Road access must be approved by the Leelanau County Road Commission and/or Michigan Department of Transportation for the proposed use.

8. Adequate area for off-street parking on stable ground shall be provided. No parking will be allowed on public or private roads.

9. Farm Stay Campsites shall have adequate water and wastewater facilities, either permanent or temporary, approved by the local health department and/or Construction Code Office.

10. The Planning Commission, during Site Plan Review, may require landscaping, screening, or buffering in accordance with Article 17 of this ordinance in order to address any impacts on neighboring properties.

C. OPERATIONAL LIMITATIONS

1. The owner or manager of the Farm Stay Campground shall physically be on the subject parcel from 10:00 pm to 8:00 am during periods when a Farm Stay Campground is occupied.

2. At other times, a manager or owner shall be available within 30 minutes of the Farm Stay Campground when a campsite is occupied.

2. At all times, sound from the Farm Stay Campground, as measured at any property line shall be no greater than normal conversation levels which is 75 dBA.

4. Quiet Hours at the Farm Stay Campground shall be observed between 10:00 p.m. and 8:00 a.m. Noise during quiet hours must be limited to that which does not disturb the quiet, comfort, or repose of a reasonable person with normal sensitivities. Campsite activity must comply with the Leelanau Township Nuisance Ordinance in effect at the time.

5. Setbacks: At a minimum, all Farm Stay Campsites shall be a minimum of one-hundred (100) feet from a property line or property tract line. The Planning Commission, during Site Plan Review, may require greater setbacks based upon the location and potential impact.

6. The maximum length of stay for any camper shall be three (3) weeks.

7. The maximum number of campers on any individual campsite shall be as follows.
    a. Four (4) adults, or
    b. Two (2) adults and children, with the maximum number of persons on an individual campsite not exceeding ten (10) persons.

8. An emergency vehicle access lane shall be maintained to each campsite.

9. Any Outdoor Lighting shall be shown on the Site Plan and shall meet the requirements of the Leelanau Township Nuisance Ordinance in effect at the time.

10. Campfires shall only be allowed in fire pits as designated on the Site Plan. It shall be the responsibility of the Farm Stay Operator to locate and regulate fire pits to prevent smoke and fire from leaving the property to adjacent residences. All local, state, and federal rules, regulations, and statutes shall be followed in regards to campfires.

11. It is the responsibility of the Farm Stay Campground Operator to clearly mark the overall property boundaries, notify campers of the property boundaries, and to discourage trespassing on other properties.

12. Prohibited Activities for Farmstay Campground campers and guests:
    a. Firearm ranges
    b. Motocross
    c. Concerts or amplified sound of greater than 20 amps.
    d. Sky Lanterns – see twp. Ordinance
    e. Fireworks, except in conformance with township ordinances in effect.

13. Accessory/Incidental Uses/Structures to Farm Stay Campsites
    The following uses/structures are considered incidental and accessory to a Farm Stay Campsite:
    - Offices
    - Community Room
    - Playground / Passive Recreation
    - Sale of firewood
    - Restrooms
    - Other uses/structures considered incidental and/or accessory by the Planning Commission.

D. SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

In addition to those general items required for Site Plan Review and Special Land Use Permit review, the following items shall be submitted:

1. Site Plan showing where on the campsites will be located, parking areas, buildings, wells, septic areas, campfire pits and sensitive areas. The Planning Commission may request additional information from the Applicant on the Site Plan.

2. Vicinity map indicating neighboring structures and land uses. (may be on an aerial map)

3. If requested, a determination from the Michigan Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, or their successor, that their primary farming operation meets the definition in the Michigan Right-To-Farm Act.

4. Management Plan, which includes the following:

A. A general description of the Farm Stay Campsite Operation, including whether the site will be seasonal or year round.
B. Specific details of where sites will be located and type of campsite.
C. Type and number of restroom facilities.
D. Provisions for septic disposal.
E. Provisions for power supply.
F. Provisions for potable water supply.
G. Provisions for refuse management, including schedule for removal.
H. Contact information for on-site manager and owner.
I. Emergency Management Plans, including emergency access.
J. The established maximum occupancy for each building.
K. Anticipated measures to prevent guests from trespassing on neighboring properties.
L. Locations and regulations on campfires.
M. Accessory Uses / Structures

5. Agency Reviews, including the following as applicable.
    - Road Agency
    - Health Department
    - Fire Department
    - Soil Erosion/Drain Commissioner
    - ***Michigan EGLE*** if required