

Becky Chown

From: Douglas Endicott <douglas_endicott@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, October 11, 2025 12:55 PM
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; Maura Sanders;
jp.peninsulatrustee@gmail.com; dave.peninsulatrustee@gmail.com; Wunschis23
@gmail.com; Becky Chown
Subject: Comments on Shoreline Regulation
Attachments: Endicott-Walworth letter 10.11.2025.docx

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am submitting the attached comments regarding the issue of shoreline regulation, which I understand is a topic to be discussed at the upcoming Planning and Township Board Meetings. My apology for emailing you individually; I could find no group email address for the Commission or Board.

Thank you,
Doug Endicott
Traverse City, Michigan

To whom it may concern,

We are writing as homeowners living in the Bayside Woods subdivision. Our 30-member association shares 330 feet of frontage on West Grand Traverse Bay. We have lived in this home since 1999. In those years our association has seasonally deployed 8 to 14 motorboat hoists (“shore stations”) along a T-shaped dock, with the shore stations aligned parallel to the shoreline. In recent years, the number of hoists has been closer to 14. This year, the dock was 150 feet wide.

There was a Township subcommittee that generated a draft regulation for allowable numbers of hoists that was disbanded around the end of 2024. That draft regulation called for 3 hoists per 50 feet which would allow Bayside Woods to have 18 hoists. Assuming an average width of 12 feet per hoist (this includes space for mechanical/electrical equipment to raise and lower boats on hoists), a dock to accommodate this number of hoists would be 216 feet wide or roughly two-thirds of the association’s shared frontage. Forecasting is uncertain, but I believe it is reasonable to expect that demand for access to the bay from motorboaters in our Association will increase both the dock width and number of hoists.

As non-motorboaters, the presence and increasing number of shore stations (both our Association’s as well as generally along the Peninsula shoreline) has negative impacts on our riparian access to the bay and our ability to enjoy other water recreation activities. For example:

1. We currently have both a sailboat and kayaks, which we frequently use from the beach in summer. With the dock and line of hoists effectively blocking about a half of the immediate waterfront, it makes navigating non-motorized vessels out to open water very challenging, particularly the sailboat. Not only must we navigate around the normal obstacles of shallow water, large rocks, etc. but must also negotiate an oftentimes narrow passage around an “aluminum wall” of docks and shore stations.

This is not a trivial issue. We suffered the total loss of a beach catamaran in a squall a number of years ago because we could not safely reach shore, in part due to the presence of dock/hoist obstacles along the shoreline.

2. Deep water for swimming and swim rafts lies beyond the docks and hoists. Swimmers in this area are in the direct path of motorboaters departing or returning to their hoist. The dock and long line of shore stations makes it difficult to see the swimmer even if they are wearing a bright colored swim cap and/or using a safety float. It is also difficult to spot someone from shore, a situation that could delay help if a swimmer is in trouble.

To summarize, we find the expanse of docks and hoists along the shoreline of Grand Traverse Bay to be a nuisance. That nuisance is also cumulative, and grows progressively greater as the number and density of docks and hoists increases. As the Township contemplates updating the

rules and regulations regarding our shoreline, we urge that sensible rules be developed to protect the rights of all riparian uses, not just those of motorboaters. A common legal definition of riparian rights is: the rights of landowners whose properties connect to a running body of water, such as a river or stream. They include the right to use the water for swimming, boating, fishing, or other reasonable purposes¹.

The other disturbing trend we've noticed along the shoreline of the Township is the removal of trees and native shoreline vegetation from the waterfront. It is being replaced with vegetation-free sand, lawn, decks, etc. by riparian owners. This situation, coupled with the increasing frequency of severe storms and water level changes, leads to more erosion of the shoreline. It is our understanding that a mix of woody and fibrous roots is necessary to stabilize the shoreline soils. We have already experienced erosion that has caused several road failures in Peninsula Township. The Township should address maintaining trees and native shoreline vegetation that prevent erosion as part of managing shoreline development.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Doug Endicott and Andrea Walworth
1058 Bayside Drive

¹ If property is connected to a body of water that is not flowing, such as a pond or lake, then that landowner has what are called "littoral rights" (<https://legaldictionary.net/riparian-rights/>). For purposes of discussion, I consider the two terms to be synonymous.

Becky Chown

From: Maura Sanders
Sent: Tuesday, October 14, 2025 11:24 AM
To: Becky Chown; Elise Loud
Subject: Fw: Shoreline Changes

Maura Sanders, Supervisor
Peninsula Township
13235 Center Road
Traverse City, MI 49686
(231) 223-7323

From: markschoeny@aol.com <markschoeny@aol.com>
Sent: Thursday, October 9, 2025 8:01:02 PM
To: Maura Sanders <supervisor@peninsulatownship.com>
Subject: Shoreline Changes

October 9, 2025

Dear Shoreline Planning Board,

My name is Mark Schoeny and I own a home at 13238 N Queen Ann for sixteen years. Our neighborhood enjoys a boat dock system on our shared 200-foot beach for forty years. We have had no trouble of any kind with our 2-3 docks per 50 ft. for all of these years.

We require 3 per 50 ft. to accommodate the neighbors with boats. Our beach has a natural tree line blocking the view of the docks so you can only see them from our beach.

Most of my neighbors purchased their homes with boating from our beach in mind. If you try to reduce the count to less than 3 per 50 ft, it will cause havoc among neighbors that have lived peacefully and with longtime friendships. We have all talked about this less than 3 problem the township has brought upon us, and our solution will be to fight with any legal means available. It has been our belief that the township has no legal rights beyond the high-water mark of the federal waterways.

Reducing the 3 per 50 ft. will also greatly reduce the property values of our homes. This will not be met without legal actions from all of us. If you have some bad actors on East Bay who have more than 3 boats per 50 foot, get that corrected. Do not try to punish the vast majority of conscientious homeowners that have been excellent stewards of the beauty and care of our shorelines.

It is also my opinion that some misguided people may think that raising the count from 1 to 3 per 50 ft. will have an increase of boats, is wrong when there has been no enforcement of 1 per 50 ft. since 1972. All of the boats are already in the water.

We all purchased our homes near the water to use for boating and related sports. Do not try to take this away from us; the community does not need more legal troubles to deal with.

Sincerely,

Mark Schoeny

513-260-2189

Becky Chown

From: Katharine Pike <katatlanta@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2025 7:46 AM
To: Planning & Zoning Administrator; enforcement.peninsulazoning@gmail.com; Wunschis23@gmail.com; dave.peninsulatrustee@gmail.com; jp.peninsulatrustee@gmail.com; jualexanptpc@gmail.com; Robin Noval; Becky Chown; Maura Sanders
Subject: specific zoning concerns regarding shoreline

Increasing the density of boats on Mission Peninsula decreases safety and decreases rural character.

Dangerous to Swim

Swimming in a body of water is the most simple, natural human interaction a human being can have with a body of water. This year it was not safe to swim at our beach.

To come and go from their slips, many of the boats from the marina at Hidden Ridge had to back into our water space with propellers running due to their dock placement. Try to imagine trying to swim in the water and having a boat motor backing into your face. That's a hazard. It's not safe. It should be safe and feel safe to swim in front of your own beach.

Pollution

Recreational boats can and do leak oil and gas due to oily bilge water, overfilling fuel tanks, leaky hoses and worn out motors, which pollutes the water and pollutes the shoreline. Pollution in the water compromises swim safety and is damaging to beauty and rural character.

Enforcement Minimal and Ineffective

My understanding is that Hidden Ridge was issued a fine for exceeding the limit on boats and that the fine was about what it costs for a modest meal for 2 at the Boathouse. I am told there was a cease and desist order. Yet they neither ceased nor desisted. Why is the fine not levied on a daily basis until the violation is corrected? Why is there not a police officer enforcing a cease the desist order? Without clear enforceable rules that are enforced, it creates a wild west environment, pitting neighbor against neighbor. Better to have residents angry with one township enforcer than having numerous neighbors in conflict with their neighbors. Enforcement should be effective and fines should be levied until violations are corrected.

Future Possibility of Beaches as Businesses

The proposed changes to the number of allowable boats makes the peninsula vulnerable to high density boat use and people renting out slips on their dock as a business venture. People who currently do not have a dock might soon see the viability/profitability of buying a dock and renting out slips. Beaches can become businesses, with slips even being rented to houseboats which offer short term accommodation. A shoreline dense with docks and boats compromises rural character.

More boats means less safety and less rural character.

I support the allowable density of boats remaining at the current level and being effectively enforced.

Best regards,

Katharine Pike
6095 Red Fox Fun404-731-6628

Becky Chown

From: Howard Pike <rhowardpike@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2025 7:53 AM
To: Planning & Zoning Administrator; enforcement.peninsulazoning@gmail.com; Wunschis23@gmail.com; dave.peninsulatrustee@gmail.com; jp.peninsulatrustee@gmail.com; jualexanptpc@gmail.com; Robin Noval; Becky Chown; Maura Sanders
Subject: Use of Old Mission Peninsula shoreline

Regarding the use and regulation of the Old Mission Peninsula shoreline, there are reasons why people invest in waterfront shoreline access.

Those reasons may be many and varied, but all boil down to having access to an experience not available further inland.

In the non-commercial realm, one owner's rights to preserve their desired experience should not encroach or dampen adjacent property owner's experiences. I think this statement is not only accurate and appropriate, but also common sense, neighborly, and just plain polite.

That said, one owner's use of their shoreline should not block ingress and egress to deeper waters and should not threaten safety and well being/health of adjacent land owners. And should not obstruct or impose upon a neighbor's view.

How could this be managed in an environment absent riparian rights to the water?

1. Use of the water by placement of water craft, docks, and/or boat slips must originate from a point on the owner's shoreline no less than 15 feet from said owner's lot line.
2. Any extension of docks and boat slips from the shoreline must remain wholly within boundaries in the water that are a co-linear extension of that owner's waterfront lot lines. Said another way, standing at the property boundaries and imagining that those property boundaries extend infinitely out into the water, docks, docked boats and slips should remain within the space defined by these extensions of the lot line boundaries.
3. Boats coming and going from their slips should not encroach on the area in front of their neighbor's shoreline. That is to say, propellers from a neighbor's boat should not threaten a neighbor who is swimming in front of their shoreline.

Sincerely,

Howard Pike
6095 Red Fox Run

Becky Chown

To: Maura Sanders
Subject: RE: Shoreline regulations for shared waterfront neighborhoods

pm and closed Friday – Sunday and Holidays.

From: Malissa Burke <burke.malissa@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, October 17, 2025 9:18 PM
To: duneclimber55@yahoo.com <duneclimber55@yahoo.com>
Cc: Elise Loud <planner@peninsulatownship.com>; Kip Nickel <nickel.kip@gmail.com>; Maura Sanders <supervisor@peninsulatownship.com>
Subject: Shoreline regulations for shared waterfront neighborhoods

Dear Peninsula Township Planning Commission Members c/o Kevin Beard, Chair:

We are writing to you regarding your contemplation of a new regulation framework that could reduce our rights to water access that we have enjoyed for several decades. We are members of a shared waterfront community that currently has three boat hoists per 50 ft of frontage, which we responsibly self-manage within our neighborhood every year. If you vote to reduce this allowance, we see clear implications for our neighbors:

-Some boat owner neighbors that currently enjoy boat access to the bay from our docks could be asked to now forgo this right.

-Reductions in boat access now and in the future will have significantly negative impacts on our current and future property values.

-Residents who have purchased property recently and are waiting their turn to have access may have many years to wait to have this opportunity.

What we are asking you to do is the following:

1. Respect the resident/township collaboration through the Shoreline Regulation Study Group (SRSG) including their recommendation of three hoists per 50 ft of frontage.
2. Cooperate with the neighborhoods to manage the shoreline responsibly as defined in the latest SRSG recommendations. We urge you to adopt these SRSG recommendations as these were the result of many months of collaborative township/community dialog. Rejection of their recommendations will discourage any future cooperation from residents. We all need to continue to work together to support the rights and privileges of residents. Working together can avoid conflict and benefit all. Thanks for listening and we appreciate all of you and your volunteer service to our community.

Respectfully Submitted,
Name: Malissa Burke and Tempie Brown

Becky Chown

To: Maura Sanders
Subject: RE: Shoreline Study Group 3/50 Hoist Support

From: Marc Gall <mrg0557@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 19, 2025 1:22 PM
To: duneclimber55@yahoo.com <duneclimber55@yahoo.com>; Maura Sanders <supervisor@peninsulatownship.com>;
Elise Loud <planner@peninsulatownship.com>
Cc: Kip Nichel <nichel.kip@gmail.com>
Subject: Shoreline Study Group 3/50 Hoist Support

Dear Peninsula Township Planning Commission Members c/o Kevin Beard, Chair:

I'm writing in support of 3 Hoists per 50' on shared frontage. After many extensive meetings the original shoreline study group supported this number. I'm not sure how we lost track of the outcome from those meetings? However, I truly believe that if every homeowner on the Peninsula understood the "Home Value" dynamics of this issue: you would be totally inundated with impute and letters of support for 3 Hoist per 50' of Frontage. Home values and your fellow residents happiness is in your hands, please don't make the decision to decrease home values and take the joy out of boating from your freinds and neighbors on Old Mission Peninsula.

I believe the passion for boating is as equally important to your fellow residents as the Lawsuit is to the Wineries. This 3/50 topic has the potential to run the same course as the WOMP Lawsuit. Your support of 3/50' will go a long way towards easing these tensions and show a willingness's to work with your neighbors.

Since 1982 our original HOA (Harbor Reach) Rules stated that anyone who wants a boat hoist in the water could have one. We realized this was unrealistic and revised our HOA rules in 2022 to a maximum of 3 hoists per 50' with proper setbacks. All HOA members voted and agreed this was a safe balance for all. Boaters, non-boaters and swimmers had impute and are all satisfied with 3 per 50. For over 42 years your fellow residents in the Harbor Reach HOA (and most boaters on the Peninsula) have come to expect the option of keeping a boat on Hoist in the water. That is a 42 year tradition of enjoying our Waters and making unforgettable family memories. Please don't take these family memories away from your fellow neighbors.

Restricting our ability to have boats on hoists would reduce property values in Shared Waterfront HOA's. As a result; reduce taxes and potentially further reduce income for the township. What about compensation for our lost property values? Please don't decrease our home values.

You also may want to consider people employed to install/remove, maintain, and sell docks and hoists? This could hurt a lot of small businesses or maybe even bankrupt some. Please don't put your neighborhood small business "out of business".

I'm very concerned this is going to create an unsafe Public Boat Launch and Parking problem at our 3 launches. People that had a hoist in the water are now going to overcrowd our Boat Launch facilities. There is not nearly enough boat launch parking to accommodate everyone who's going to lose hoist space on the water. The process to launch a boat can be time consuming, we could potentially see vehicles with trailers lined up at boat launches for hours; causing back ups onto public roads and causing dangerous traffic jams. There is also a chance of Boat Launch Rage; similar to Road Rage. Also, people who can't find parking spaces will park their vehicles (with trailers) on the side of the road. The Bowers Harbor Launch could potentially have vehicles with trailers using Neatawanda for parking. Then there's the launch on Center Rd with very limited parking as well. This Launch could be extra dangerous if people park on the opposite side of M-37 and try to work their way back across the highway to the launch. You could create deadly a situation with people trying to cross that busy road. People will be excited to get on their boat and could dart out from between parked vehicles and trailers to get to the launch. The new launch at Haserot/Kelly could be overrun as well. I believe the current Haserot/Kelly plan only has 25 vehicle/trailer parking places. Then there's the concern with emergency vehicles trying to navigate around parked vehicles at Launches. Please don't cause neighborhood consternation with parking or put your fellow residents and neighbors in harms way. Someone cold get killed trying cross these busy roads.

Our Local Sheriffs Deputies could be overwhelmed writing parking tickets. Taking precious time away from their other more important duties. Some people may consider the cost of a parking ticket as the added price of boating and just park anywhere they can find a spot. Please don't burden our awesome Sheriff's Department with unnecessary paperwork.

Boats are expensive, many feel they're an investment to be protected. Currently, many boaters have covered boat hoists to keep their boat protected from bird droppings, sun damage and rain. You could potentially be forcing them to build extra garages, pole buildings or makeshift covered areas to keep their boats dry and out of the elements. Your office could see an increase in permits and requests for building exceptions. Please don't exchange hoists on the water for unsightly eyesore buildings on land. You will be forcing hoists out of the water in exchange for trees removed and concrete poured to build shelters. Please don't promote the removal of trees and earth to be replaced with more unsightly structures.

People are not going to stop boating, you're going to see these boats parked somewhere. If not on hoists, then in roads, driveways, moored on the water or new buildings. Many HOA's prohibit boats and trailers from parking in yards and driveways. This could potentially cause issues with neighbors and our township enforcement officers. Please don't stir up discourse between neighbors and add additional enforcement/permitting issues with our Peninsula Township Staff.

Traffic will greatly increase with people towing boats in and out of the water. It's not just one car or truck, but a large vehicle towing a boat with a trailer. It's like a double traffic increase and they move much slower than normal traffic. Please don't create additional traffic issues for our already crowded Peninsula roads.

If you restrict the number of hoists residents can have in the Water; there is going to be unneeded dock sections, Boats and hoists "For Sale" lined all up and down our Peninsula. It will take years for people to sell off their inventory. Talk about eye pollution, not to mention the junk ordnance. Based on supply and demand, most people will have to sell at a loss. Will you be providing some sort of compensation for our losses? Please don't put this financial burden and eye sore on your fellow neighbors shoulders.

Everyone knows that the occasional drink happens while boating. Now you're creating a situation where people will have to get in a vehicle (with a trailer) drive home and park their boat, versus just floating onto a hoist and walking home.

Have you considered that if you restrict the number of hoists HOA's can have that people will just start mooring their boats out in the water? That has the potential to be a real unorganized eye sore. An even bigger problem could arise when a storm rolls in and blows them all off Anchor. Loose boats in a storm can cause significant damage to other boats, hoists, docks, property and the shoreline. If a boat is moored in the water, it would be rather difficult to contact the owner in the event of a issue. Please don't create a dangerous situation where we have boats haphazardly moored offshore.

The majority of HOA's love and respect our access to the Bays. We go to great lengths to protect and preserve our cherished waterfront. The majority have peacefully maintained and lovingly cared for our beaches for years. This feels like a situation where a few bad apples are spoiling the enjoyment for everyone else; please don't punish the good HOA's.

Respectfully,

Marc Gall

2366 Harbor Reach Dr

Traverse City, MI. 49686

Becky Chown

To: Maura Sanders
Subject: RE: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

From: Lisa Niemi <lniemi05@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 19, 2025 5:35 PM
To: duneclimber55@yahoo.com <duneclimber55@yahoo.com>
Cc: Maura Sanders <supervisor@peninsulatownship.com>; Elise Loud <planner@peninsulatownship.com>
Subject: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

Dear Peninsula Township Planning Commission Members c/o Kevin Beard, Chair:

We are writing to you regarding your contemplation of a new regulation framework that could reduce our rights to water access that we have enjoyed for several decades. We are members of a shared waterfront community that currently has three boat hoists per 50 ft of frontage, which we responsibly self-manage within our neighborhood every year. If you vote to reduce this allowance, we see clear implications for our neighbors:

- Some boat owner neighbors that currently enjoy boat access to the bay from our docks could be asked to now forgo this right.
- Reductions in boat access now and in the future will have significantly negative impacts on our current and future property values.
- Residents who have purchased property recently and are waiting their turn to have access may have many years to wait to have this opportunity.

What we are asking you to do is the following:

1. Respect the resident/township collaboration through the Shoreline Regulation Study Group (SRSG) including their recommendation of three hoists per 50 ft of frontage.
2. Cooperate with the neighborhoods to manage the shoreline responsibly as defined in the latest SRSG recommendations.

We urge you to adopt these SRSG recommendations as these were the result of many months of collaborative township/community dialog. Rejection of their recommendations will discourage any future cooperation from residents. We all need to continue to work together to support the rights and privileges of residents. Working together can avoid conflict and benefit all. Thanks for listening and we appreciate all of you and your volunteer service to our community.

Respectfully Submitted,

Gary and Lisa Niemi

2299 Montmorency Lane

Traverse City, MI 49686

Sent from my iPhone

Becky Chown

To: Maura Sanders
Subject: RE: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

From: Mary Dave Rybka <theyrbkas@icloud.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 19, 2025 8:14 PM
To: duneclimber55@yahoo.com <duneclimber55@yahoo.com>
Cc: Maura Sanders <supervisor@peninsulatownship.com>; Elise Loud <planner@peninsulatownship.com>;
nickel.kip@gmail.com <nickel.kip@gmail.com>
Subject: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

Dear Peninsula Township Planning Commission Members c/o Kevin Beard, Chair:

I'm writing in support of 3 Hoists per 50' on shared frontage. After many extensive meetings the original shoreline study group supported this number. I'm not sure how we lost track of the outcome from those meetings? However, I truly believe that if every homeowner on the Peninsula understood the "Home Value" dynamics of this issue: you would be totally inundated with impute and letters of support for 3 Hoist per 50' of Frontage. Home values and your fellow residents happiness is in your hands, please don't make the decision to decrease home values and take the joy out of boating from your freinds and neighbors on Old Mission Peninsula.

I believe the passion for boating is as equally important to your fellow residents as the Lawsuit is to the Wineries. This 3/50 topic has the potential to run the same course as the WOMP Lawsuit. Your support of 3/50' will go a long way towards easing these tensions and show a willingness's to work with your neighbors.

Since 1982 our original HOA (Harbor Reach) Rules stated that anyone who wants a boat hoist in the water could have one. We realized this was unrealistic and revised our HOA rules in 2022 to a maximum of 3 hoists per 50' with proper setbacks. All HOA members voted and agreed this was a safe balance for all. Boaters, non-boaters and swimmers had impute and are all satisfied with 3 per 50. For over 42 years your fellow residents in the Harbor Reach HOA (and most boaters on the Peninsula) have come to expect the option of keeping a boat on Hoist in the water. That is a 42 year tradition of enjoying our Waters and making unforgettable family memories. Please don't take these family memories away from your fellow neighbors.

Restricting our ability to have boats on hoists would reduce property values in Shared Waterfront HOA's. As a result; reduce taxes and potentially further reduce income for the township. What about compensation for our lost property values? Please don't decrease our home values.

You also may want to consider people employed to install/remove, maintain, and sell docks and hoists? This could hurt a lot of small businesses or maybe even bankrupt some. Please don't put your neighborhood small business "out of business".

I'm very concerned this is going to create an unsafe Public Boat Launch and Parking problem at our 3 launches. People that had a hoist in the water are now going to overcrowd our Boat Launch facilities. There is not nearly enough boat launch parking to accommodate everyone who's going to lose hoist space on the water. The process to launch a boat can be time consuming, we could potentially see vehicles with trailers lined up at boat launches for hours; causing back ups onto public roads and causing dangerous traffic jams. There is also a chance of Boat Launch Rage; similar to Road Rage. Also, people who can't find parking spaces will park their vehicles (with trailers) on the side of the road. The Bowers Harbor Launch could potentially have vehicles with trailers using Neatawanda for parking. Then there's the launch on Center Rd with very limited parking as well. This Launch could be extra dangerous if people park on the opposite side of M-37 and try to work their way back across the highway to the launch. You could create deadly a situation with people trying to cross that busy road. People will be excited to get on their boat and could dart out from between parked vehicles and trailers to get to the launch. The new launch at Haserot/Kelly could be overrun as well. I believe the current Haserot/Kelly plan only has 25 vehicle/trailer parking places. Then there's the concern with emergency vehicles trying to navigate around parked vehicles at Launches. Please don't cause neighborhood consternation with parking or put your fellow residents and neighbors in harms way. Someone cold get killed trying cross these busy roads.

Our Local Sheriffs Deputies could be overwhelmed writing parking tickets. Taking precious time away from their other more important duties. Some people may consider the cost of a parking ticket as the added price of boating and just park anywhere they can find a spot. Please don't burden our awesome Sheriff's Department with unnecessary paperwork.

Boats are expensive, many feel they're an investment to be protected. Currently, many boaters have covered boat hoists to keep their boat protected from bird droppings, sun damage and rain. You could potentially be forcing them to build extra garages, pole buildings or makeshift covered areas to keep their boats dry and out of the elements. Your office could see an increase in permits and requests for building exceptions. Please don't exchange hoists on the water for unsightly eyesore buildings on land. You will be forcing hoists out of the water in exchange for trees removed and concrete poured to build shelters. Please don't promote the removal of trees and earth to be replaced with more unsightly structures.

People are not going to stop boating, you're going to see these boats parked somewhere. If not on hoists, then in roads, driveways, moored on the water or new buildings. Many HOA's prohibit boats and trailers from parking in yards and driveways. This could potentially cause issues with neighbors and our township enforcement officers. Please don't stir up discourse between neighbors and add additional enforcement/permitting issues with our Peninsula Township Staff.

Traffic will greatly increase with people towing boats in and out of the water. It's not just one car or truck, but a large vehicle towing a boat with a trailer. It's like a double traffic increase and they move much slower than normal traffic. Please don't create additional traffic issues for our already crowded Peninsula roads.

If you restrict the number of hoists residents can have in the Water; there is going to be unneeded dock sections, Boats and hoists "For Sale" lined all up and down our Peninsula. It will take years for people to sell off their inventory. Talk about eye pollution, not to mention the junk ordinance. Based on supply and demand, most people will have to sell at a loss. Will you be providing some sort of compensation for our losses? Please don't put this financial burden and eye sore on your fellow neighbors shoulders.

Everyone knows that the occasional drink happens while boating. Now you're creating a situation where people will have to get in a vehicle (with a trailer) drive home and park their boat, versus just floating onto a hoist and walking home.

Have you considered that if you restrict the number of hoists HOA's can have that people will just start mooring their boats out in the water? That has the potential to be a real unorganized eye sore. An even bigger problem could arise when a storm rolls in and blows them all off Anchor. Loose boats in a storm can cause significant damage to other boats, hoists, docks, property and the shoreline. If a boat is moored in the water, it would be rather difficult to contact the owner in the event of a issue. Please don't create a dangerous situation where we have boats haphazardly moored offshore.

The majority of HOA's love and respect our access to the Bays. We go to great lengths to protect and preserve our cherished waterfront. The majority have peacefully maintained and lovingly cared for our beaches for years. This feels like a situation where a few bad apples are spoiling the enjoyment for everyone else; please don't punish the good HOA's.

Respectfully,

David & Mary Rybka

2277 Harbor Reach Dr

Tc, MI 49686

Becky Chown

To: Maura Sanders
Subject: RE: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

From: peter@northern-financial.com <peter@northern-financial.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:32 AM
To: Maura Sanders <supervisor@peninsulatownship.com>
Cc: Elise Loud <planner@peninsulatownship.com>; nickel.kip@gmail.com <nickel.kip@gmail.com>
Subject: RE: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

Dear Peninsula Township Planning Commission Members c/o Kevin Beard, Chair:

I'm writing in support of 3 Hoists per 50' on shared frontage. After many extensive meetings the original shoreline study group supported this number. I'm not sure how we lost track of the outcome from those meetings? However, I truly believe that if every homeowner on the Peninsula understood the "Home Value" dynamics of this issue: you would be totally inundated with impute and letters of support for 3 Hoist per 50' of Frontage. Home values and your fellow residents happiness is in your hands, please don't make the decision to decrease home values and take the joy out of boating from your freinds and neighbors on Old Mission Peninsula.

I believe the passion for boating is as equally important to your fellow residents as the Lawsuit is to the Wineries. This 3/50 topic has the potential to run the same course as the WOMP Lawsuit. Your support of 3/50' will go a long way towards easing these tensions and show a willingness's to work with your neighbors.

Since 1982 our original HOA (Harbor Reach) Rules stated that anyone who wants a boat hoist in the water could have one. We realized this was unrealistic and revised our HOA rules in 2022 to a maximum of 3 hoists per 50' with proper setbacks. All HOA members voted and agreed this was a safe balance for all. Boaters, non-boaters and swimmers had impute and are all satisfied with 3 per 50. For over 42 years your fellow residents in the Harbor Reach HOA (and most boaters on the Peninsula) have come to expect the option of keeping a boat on Hoist in the water. That is a 42 year tradition of enjoying our Waters and making unforgettable family memories. Please don't take these family memories away from your fellow neighbors.

Restricting our ability to have boats on hoists would reduce property values in Shared Waterfront HOA's. As a result; reduce taxes and potentially further reduce income for the township. 'What about compensation for our lost property values? Please don't decrease our home values.

You also may want to consider people employed to install/remove, maintain, and sell docks and hoists? This could hurt a lot of small businesses or maybe even bankrupt some. Please don't put your neighborhood small business "out of business".

I'm very concerned this is going to create an unsafe Public Boat Launch and Parking problem at our 3 launches. People that had a hoist in the water are now going to overcrowd our Boat Launch facilities. There is not nearly enough boat launch parking to accommodate everyone who's going to lose hoist space on the water. The process to launch a boat can be time consuming, we could potentially see vehicles with trailers lined up at boat launches for hours; causing back ups onto public roads and causing dangerous traffic jams. There is also a chance of Boat Launch Rage; similar to Road Rage. Also, people who can't find parking spaces will park their vehicles (with trailers) on the side of the

road. The Bowers Harbor Launch could potentially have vehicles with trailers using Neatawanda for parking. Then there's the launch on Center Rd with very limited parking as well. This Launch could be extra dangerous if people park on the opposite side of M-37 and try to work their way back across the highway to the launch. You could create a deadly situation with people trying to cross that busy road. People will be excited to get on their boat and could dart out from between parked vehicles and trailers to get to the launch. The new launch at Haserot/Kelly could be overrun as well. I believe the current Haserot/Kelly plan only has 25 vehicle/trailer parking places. Then there's the concern with emergency vehicles trying to navigate around parked vehicles at Launches. Please don't cause neighborhood consternation with parking or put your fellow residents and neighbors in harms way. Someone could get killed trying cross these busy roads.

Our Local Sheriffs Deputies could be overwhelmed writing parking tickets. Taking precious time away from their other more important duties. Some people may consider the cost of a parking ticket as the added price of boating and just park anywhere they can find a spot. Please don't burden our awesome Sheriff's Department with unnecessary paperwork.

Boats are expensive, many feel they're an investment to be protected. Currently, many boaters have covered boat hoists to keep their boat protected from bird droppings, sun damage and rain. You could potentially be forcing them to build extra garages, pole buildings or makeshift covered areas to keep their boats dry and out of the elements. Your office could see an increase in permits and requests for building exceptions. Please don't exchange hoists on the water for unsightly eyesore buildings on land. You will be forcing hoists out of the water in exchange for trees removed and concrete poured to build shelters. Please don't promote the removal of trees and earth to be replaced with more unsightly structures.

People are not going to stop boating, you're going to see these boats parked somewhere. If not on hoists, then in roads, driveways, moored on the water or new buildings. Many HOA's prohibit boats and trailers from parking in yards and driveways. This could potentially cause issues with neighbors and our township enforcement officers. Please don't stir up discourse between neighbors and add additional enforcement/permitting issues with our Peninsula Township Staff.

Traffic will greatly increase with people towing boats in and out of the water. It's not just one car or truck, but a large vehicle towing a boat with a trailer. It's like a double traffic increase and they move much slower than normal traffic. Please don't create additional traffic issues for our already crowded Peninsula roads.

If you restrict the number of hoists residents can have in the Water; there is going to be unneeded dock sections; Boats and hoists "For Sale" lined all up and down our Peninsula. It will take years for people to sell off their inventory. Talk about eye pollution, not to mention the junk ordnance. Based on supply and demand, most people will have to sell at a loss. Will you be providing some sort of compensation for our losses? Please don't put this financial burden and eye sore on your fellow neighbors shoulders.

Everyone knows that the occasional drink happens while boating. Now you're creating a situation where people will have to get in a vehicle (with a trailer) drive home and park their boat, versus just floating onto a hoist and walking home.

Have you considered that if you restrict the number of hoists HOA's can have that people will just start mooring their boats out in the water? That has the potential to be a real unorganized eye sore. An even bigger problem could arise when a storm rolls in and blows them all off Anchor. Loose boats in a storm can cause significant damage to other boats, hoists, docks, property and the shoreline. If a boat is moored in the water, it would be rather difficult to contact the owner in the event of a issue. Please don't create a dangerous situation where we have boats haphazardly moored offshore.

The majority of HOA's love and respect our access to the Bays. We go to great lengths to protect and preserve our cherished waterfront. The majority have peacefully maintained and lovingly cared for our beaches for years. This feels like a situation where a few bad apples are spoiling the enjoyment for everyone else; please don't punish the good HOA's.

Respectfully,

13356 Hedeem Dr.

Peter M. Braden

Investment Advisor Representative, Financial Advisor

Northern Financial Management: <https://www.northern-financial.com/>

309 E Front St

Traverse City, MI 49684

Office: 231-947-4685

Mobile: 646-639-4177

Fax: 231-947-0018

peter@northern-financial.com

Account access: www.wealthscapeinvestor.com/cir

Account access: <https://wri-cirstatements.woveplatform.com/>

Wealthscape password reset: 888-245-0452

Securities offered through Registered Representatives of Cambridge Investment Research, Inc., a Broker/Dealer, Member FINRA/SIPC. Advisory services offered through Cambridge Investment Research Advisors Inc., a Registered Investment Advisor. Northern Financial Management and Cambridge are not affiliated. The information in this email is confidential and is intended solely for the addressee. If you are not the intended addressee and have received this email in error, please reply to the sender to inform them of this fact. We cannot accept trade orders through e-mail. Important letters, email, or fax messages should be confirmed by calling 231-947-4685. This email service may not be monitored every day, or after normal business hours.

Becky Chown

To: Maura Sanders
Subject: RE: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

From: Nick Torpey <ncktrp@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 10:54 AM
To: duneclimber55@yahoo.com <duneclimber55@yahoo.com>
Cc: David Spinweber <daspinweber@gmail.com>; Maura Sanders <supervisor@peninsulatownship.com>; Elise Loud <planner@peninsulatownship.com>
Subject: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

Dear Peninsula Township Planning Commission Members c/o Kevin Beard, Chair:

My family and I are writing to you regarding your contemplation of a new regulation framework that could reduce our rights to water access that we have enjoyed for several decades. We are members of a shared 330' waterfront community that currently has thirteen boat hoists, which we responsibly self-manage within our neighborhood every year. We support the Shoreline Regulation Study Group recommendation of three hoists per 50 ft of frontage and urge you to adopt it. If you vote to reduce this allowance, we see clear implications for our neighbors:

1. Some boat owner neighbors that currently enjoy boat access to the bay from our docks could be asked to now forgo this right
2. Reductions in boat access now and in the future will have significantly negative impacts on our current and future property values.
3. Residents who have purchased property may have many years to wait to have boat access.

What we are asking you to do is the following:

1. Respect the resident/township collaboration through the Shoreline Regulation Study Group (SRSG) including their recommendation of three hoists per 50 ft of frontage
2. Cooperate with the neighborhoods to manage the shoreline responsibly as defined in the latest SRSG recommendations.

We urge you to adopt these SRSG recommendations as these were the result of many months of collaborative township/community dialog. Rejection of their recommendations will discourage future cooperation from residents. We all need to continue to work together to support the rights and privileges of residents. Working together can avoid conflict and benefit all.

Thanks for listening and we appreciate all of you and your volunteer service to our community.

Respectfully Submitted,

Name: Nicholas Torpey
Address: 1041 Bayside Dr, Traverse City, MI

Becky Chown

To: Maura Sanders
Subject: RE: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

From: Peter Zinn <petezinn@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:07 PM
To: duneclimber55@yahoo.com <duneclimber55@yahoo.com>
Cc: Maura Sanders <supervisor@peninsulatownship.com>; Elise Loud <planner@peninsulatownship.com>; David Spinweber <daspinweber@gmail.com>
Subject: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

Dear Peninsula Township Planning Commission Members c/o Kevin Beard, Chair:

We are writing to you regarding your contemplation of a new regulation framework that could reduce our rights to water access that we have enjoyed for several decades. We are members of a shared 330' waterfront community that currently has thirteen boat hoists, which we responsibly self-manage within our neighborhood every year. We support the Shoreline Regulation Study Group recommendation of three hoists per 50 ft of frontage and urge you to adopt it. If you vote to reduce this allowance, we see clear implications for our neighbors:

- Some boat owner neighbors that currently enjoy boat access to the bay from our docks could be asked to now forgo this right.
- Reductions in boat access now and in the future will have significantly negative impacts on our current and future property values.
- Residents who have purchased property may have many years to wait to have boat access.

What we are asking you to do is the following:

1. Respect the resident/township collaboration through the Shoreline Regulation Study Group (SRSG) including their recommendation of three hoists per 50 ft of frontage.
2. Cooperate with the neighborhoods to manage the shoreline responsibly as defined in the latest SRSG recommendations.

We urge you to adopt these SRSG recommendations as these were the result of many months of collaborative township/community dialog. Rejection of their recommendations will discourage future cooperation from residents. We all need to continue to work together to support the rights and privileges of residents. Working together can avoid conflict and benefit all.

Thanks for listening and we appreciate all of you and your volunteer service to our community.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peter Zinn, Board Member, Old Mission Peninsula School Foundation

1036 Bayside Dr, Traverse City, MI 49686

Becky Chown

To: Maura Sanders
Subject: RE: Shoreline regulations for shared waterfront neighborhoods

From: wheatgerm@sbcglobal.net <wheatgerm@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 11:21 AM
To: duneclimber55@yahoo.com <duneclimber55@yahoo.com>; Maura Sanders <supervisor@peninsulatownship.com>; Elise Loud <planner@peninsulatownship.com>
Cc: David Spinweber <daspinweber@gmail.com>
Subject: Shoreline regulations for shared waterfront neighborhoods

Dear Peninsula Township Planning Commission Members c/o Kevin Beard, Chair:

We are writing to you regarding your contemplation of a new regulation framework that could reduce our rights to water access that we have enjoyed for several decades. We are members of a shared 330' waterfront community that currently has thirteen boat hoists, which we responsibly self-manage within our neighborhood every year. We support the Shoreline Regulation Study Group recommendation of three hoists per 50 ft of frontage and urge you to adopt it. If you vote to reduce this allowance, we see clear implications for our neighbors:

- Some boat owner neighbors that currently enjoy boat access to the bay from our docks could be asked to now forgo this right.
- Reductions in boat access now and in the future will have significantly negative impacts on our current and future property values.
- Residents who have purchased property may have many years to wait to have boat access.
- Shared docks significantly reduce the clutter of boats individually mooring below the high water mark and improves access and safety for all.

What we are asking you to do is the following:

1. Respect the resident/township collaboration through the Shoreline Regulation Study Group (SRSG) including their recommendation of three hoists per 50 ft of frontage.
2. Cooperate with the neighborhoods to manage the shoreline responsibly as defined in the latest SRSG recommendations.

We urge you to adopt these SRSG recommendations as these were the result of many months of collaborative township/community dialog. Rejection of their recommendations will discourage future cooperation from residents. We all need to continue to work together

to support the rights and privileges of residents. Working together can avoid conflict and benefit all.

Thanks for listening and we appreciate all of you and your volunteer service to our community.

Respectfully Submitted,

Charles and Dinah Kretschmer

1101 Bayside Drive

Becky Chown

To: Maura Sanders
Subject: RE: Shoreline regulations for shared waterfront neighborhoods.

From: Cheryl Naperala <napperch@yahoo.com>

Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 3:35 PM

To: duneclimber55@yahoo.com <duneclimber55@yahoo.com>; Elise Loud <planner@peninsulatownship.com>; Maura Sanders <supervisor@peninsulatownship.com>

Subject: Shoreline regulations for shared waterfront neighborhoods.

Hello Kevin, Elise, and Maura (Please share with the Peninsula Township Planning Commission Members)

We are members of a shared waterfront community - Quaker Valley North - that currently has three boat hoists per 50ft. of frontage.

As you work on new regulations for the number of boats per feet along the waterway - we urge you to do the following:

1. Support the Shoreline Regulation Study Group (SRSG) recommendations, including their proposal of three hoists per 50 ft of frontage.
2. Cooperate with the neighborhoods to manage the shoreline responsibly as defined in the SRSG recommendations.

We urge you to adopt the SRSG recommendations as they are the result of many months of collaborative community discussions. We all need to work together to support the rights and privileges of residents.

Thank you.

Richard and Cheryl Naperala
1064 Lochmoor Lane
Traverse City, Michigan

Becky Chown

To: Maura Sanders
Subject: RE: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

From: Lukas Mullins <lukas.mullins@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 5:22 PM

To: duneclimber55@yahoo.com <duneclimber55@yahoo.com>; Elise Loud <planner@peninsulatownship.com>; Maura Sanders <supervisor@peninsulatownship.com>

Subject: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

Dear Peninsula Township Planning Commission Members c/o Kevin Beard, Chair:

We are writing to you regarding your contemplation of a new regulation framework that could reduce our rights to water access that we have enjoyed for several decades. We are members of a shared waterfront community that currently has three (3) boat hoists per 50 ft of frontage, which we responsibly self-manage within our neighborhood every year. If you vote to reduce this allowance, we see clear implications for our neighbors:

- Some boat owner neighbors that currently enjoy boat access to the bay from our docks could be asked to now forgo this right.
- Reductions in boat access now and in the future will have significantly negative impacts on our current and future property values which will impact township taxes
- Residents who have purchased property recently and are waiting their turn to have access may have many years to wait to have this opportunity.

Furthermore, restricting the number of hoists per frontage feet does not actually address what you are looking to address regarding docks and hoists being unsightly. There will still be as many docks, taking up the same amount of space. People walking the shore line will still have the same number of docks to navigate. The boat trailering traffic up and down the peninsula will increase significantly if the # of hoists is reduced as owners will have to take their boats to local marina.

What we are asking you to do is the following:

1. Respect the resident/township collaboration through the Shoreline Regulation Study Group (SRSG) including their recommendation of three hoists per 50 ft of frontage.
2. Cooperate with the neighborhoods to manage the shoreline responsibly as defined in the SRSG recommendations.

We urge you to adopt these SRSG recommendations as these were the result of many months of collaborative community dialog. Rejection of their recommendations may discourage any future cooperation we might receive. We all need to continue to work together to support the rights and privileges of residents. Working together can avoid conflict and benefit all. Thanks for listening and we appreciate all of you for your volunteer service to our community.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lukas Mullins

1153 Braebury Way

Traverse City, MI 49686

Becky Chown

To: Maura Sanders
Subject: RE: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

From: nicole selby <nikiselby@yahoo.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 22, 2025 4:30 PM
To: duneclimber55@yahoo.com <duneclimber55@yahoo.com>
Cc: Maura Sanders <supervisor@peninsulatownship.com>; Elise Loud <planner@peninsulatownship.com>
Subject: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

Dear Peninsula Township Planning Commission Members c/o Kevin Beard, Chair:

We are writing to you regarding your contemplation of a new regulation framework that could reduce our rights to water access that we have enjoyed for several decades. We are members of a shared waterfront community that currently has three boat hoists per 50 ft of frontage, which we responsibly self-manage within our neighborhood every year. If you vote to reduce this allowance, we see clear implications for our neighbors:

- Some boat owner neighbors that currently enjoy boat access to the bay from our docks could be asked to now forgo this right.
- Reductions in boat access now and in the future will have significantly negative impacts on our current and future property values.
- Residents who have purchased property recently and are waiting their turn to have access may have many years to wait to have this opportunity.

What we are asking you to do is the following:

1. Respect the resident/township collaboration through the Shoreline Regulation Study Group (SRSG) including their recommendation of three hoists per 50 ft of frontage.
2. Cooperate with the neighborhoods to manage the shoreline responsibly as defined in the latest SRSG recommendations.

We urge you to adopt these SRSG recommendations as these were the result of many months of collaborative township/community dialog. Rejection of their recommendations will discourage any future cooperation from residents. We all need to continue to work together to support the rights and privileges of residents. Working together can avoid conflict and benefit all. Thanks for listening and we appreciate all of you and your volunteer service to our community.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kevin and Nicole Westrick

1089 Quaker Valley Dr.

Traverse City, MI 49686

Becky Chown

From: Ed Schlitt <eschlitt57@charter.net>
Sent: Sunday, October 26, 2025 4:22 PM
To: Becky Chown
Subject: Water usage

I'm in favor of 3 boats per 50' for Peninsula Twp.
Ed Schlitt
1188 LinDale Dr., TC, 49686
Sent from my iPhone

Becky Chown

To: Maura Sanders
Subject: RE: Shoreline Regulations

From: Sandy Nordin <sknordin44@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, October 29, 2025 8:55:36 PM
To: Maura Sanders <supervisor@peninsulatownship.com>
Subject: Shoreline Regulations

Maura Sanders, Peninsula Township Supervisor

We are absolutely in favor of the long overdue ordinance of three hoists per 50 feet that was proposed by the Shoreline Working Group. If you own a piece of property on the Bay, you should be able to enjoy the water as long as you properly maintain your property.

Respectfully,
Sondra and Richard Nordin

--
+++++

Becky Chown

To: Maura Sanders
Subject: RE: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

From: Maura Sanders <supervisor@peninsulatownship.com>
Sent: Monday, November 3, 2025 4:26 PM
To: Kay Boshaw <klboshaw@gmail.com>
Cc: Becky Chown <clerk@peninsulatownship.com>
Subject: Re: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

Greetings Kay,

Received and I will add it to the communications.

You must still have this email address saved under Rob Manigold on your end (in your contacts). Everything is updated on the township side.

Sincerely,

Maura Sanders 🍒

Peninsula Township Supervisor

13235 Center Road

Traverse City MI 49686

phone - 231-223-7323

fax - 231-223-7117

supervisor@peninsulatownship.com

Office Hours: Mondays 7:30 am to 6:30 pm, Tuesdays – Thursdays 7:30 am to 5 pm and closed Friday – Sunday and Holidays.

From: Kay Boshaw <klboshaw@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 3, 2025 12:23 PM
To: Maura Sanders <supervisor@peninsulatownship.com>
Subject: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

This message is to Maura Sanders, Rob Manigold is the previous supervisor? This should be changed to the current supervisor as it is confusing.

I am writing in support of the message below. I am a 73 resident and homeowner in Lindale Estates. I bought my retirement home here in 2012, and finally, just this summer, I was able to realize my dream of owning a boat and boat slip with our shared waterfront property. I spent a considerable amount of my retirement savings. Now I understand that you are considering a change to the acceptable number of boats per 50' of shared frontage. I would be one of the victims of losing my rights to the boat slip as I was the last one in. This would be such a huge disappointment to those of us who will fall victims of this decision. Please consider those of us who will be impacted, both financially and our quality of life!

Dear Peninsula Township Planning Commission Members c/o Kevin Beard, Chair:

We are writing to you regarding your contemplation of a new regulation framework that could reduce our rights to water access that we have enjoyed for several decades. We are members of a shared waterfront community that currently has three boat hoists per 50 ft of frontage, which we responsibly self-manage within our neighborhood every year. If you vote to reduce this allowance, we see clear implications for our neighbors:

- Some boat owner neighbors that currently enjoy boat access to the bay from our docks could be asked to now forgo this right.
- Reductions in boat access now and in the future will have significantly negative impacts on our current and future property values.
- Residents who have purchased property recently and are waiting their turn to have access may have many years to wait to have this opportunity.

What we are asking you to do is the following:

1. Respect the resident/township collaboration through the Shoreline Regulation Study Group (SRSG) including their recommendation of three hoists per 50 ft of frontage.
2. Cooperate with the neighborhoods to manage the shoreline responsibly as defined in the SRSG recommendations.

We urge you to adopt these SRSG recommendations as these were the result of many months of collaborative community dialog. Rejection of their recommendations may discourage any future cooperation we might receive. We all need to continue to work together to support the rights and privileges of residents. Working together can avoid conflict and benefit all. Thanks for listening and we appreciate all of you for your volunteer service to our community.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kay Boshaw

11467 Harbor View Ct.

Traverse City, Mi. 49686

**PUBLIC INPUT TO THE PENINSULA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION, PLANNER
ELISE LOUD AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES RE: PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO AND
REWRITE OF SHORELINE REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO SHARED ACCESS PROPERTY
OWNERS' USE OF SEASONALLY INSTALLED DOCKS AND HOISTS**

11/17/2025

Peninsula Township has over 2,200 residences that have water access (direct, across the road, or shared access). That represents over 60% of the total residences in our Township.

A 50-year-old Township ordinance, which would arbitrarily limit the seasonal use of docks and boat hoists by shared frontage property owners to one hoist per fifty feet of frontage, has never been enforced or even widely acknowledged as existing since its adoption. For all intents and purposes, the ordinance hasn't existed. I and my family have been waterfront boating residents of the Township for many decades, as have others. Over those years, shared waterfront property Associations have responsibly managed the use of their docks and hoists with self-imposed guidelines and limitations, with few exceptions. Occasional conflicts among neighbors have been resolved, sometimes with the involvement of Township authorities....as a trade-off to attempting to legislate the exercise of common courtesy among neighbors.

A well-publicized conflict involving an East Bay shared frontage Association remains ongoing, largely because of site-specific conditions (including unique shoreline configuration and bottomland topography) which have complicated resolution of the conflict. **The rewrite of shoreline regulations should include provisions that enable the Township to resolve conflicts involving unusual site-specific circumstances on a case-by-case basis. A one-size-fits-all ordinance isn't a solution.** The actions or circumstances of one or a few property owners don't justify subjecting all other Township shared frontage property owners to the burden of overly restrictive ordinance provisions.

The Township's Shoreline Study Group (working with Planning Commission members) has proposed a regulatory framework for waterfront regulations, which includes a provision to permit the seasonal installation of up to 3 hoists per 50 feet of shared frontage (along with set-back and other provisions). That regulatory framework is the product of nearly 2 years of exhaustive fact-finding deliberations, analyses, and public and private sector collaboration. The process included consideration of current township demographics and housing development trends, infrastructure constraints, public safety, environmental and esthetic concerns, township shoreline and bottomland topography, and input from township officials and the public. **An estimated 80% to 90% of existing shared frontage boat owners are already in compliance with and will be subject to the Shoreline Study Group's proposed ordinance amendments. The proposed ordinance rewrite is not**

expected to result in any notable increase to the number of boats and hoists which are already being seasonably placed offshore by existing shared frontage owners. Moreover, the Township continues to have regulatory control over the creation of new shared frontage parcels by developers.

In response to a vocal group of non-boaters and new residents who oppose any change to the Township's 50-year-old ordinance (on the pretense that boat traffic density in area waters is already excessive), Township officials are debating a compromise that would arbitrarily reduce, by one third, the number of allowable hoists from the proposed 3 per 50 feet of frontage to 2 per 50 feet, without any supportable justification. Such a change would have no discernable impact on local boat traffic density due to the geography of our local navigable waterways and the high volume of boat traffic that originates from nearby heavily used launch sites, multiple large commercial marinas, and numerous adjoining waterfront boating communities.

Adopting ordinance provisions that are more restrictive than those proposed by the Shoreline Study Group would infringe upon the property rights of shared waterfront property owners, diminish their property values and place those of them who are boaters in an untenable position. Many resident boaters would be forced to launch and reload their boats with each use and to transport them to and from their driveways for parking when they're not in use. Alternatively, boaters could attempt to use offshore moorings. Neither of those are viable alternatives, when considering the current shortage of local public boat launch site and marina capacity, the existence of prohibitive public and residential parking restrictions, space limitations, traffic congestion, volatile weather conditions that cause mooring risks, and **a host of adverse public safety consequences of no longer allowing resident boaters to simply continue parking their boats on hoists offshore of their property.** Moreover, many boaters would be forced to involuntarily liquidate substantial investments in their docks, hoist equipment, and boats.

The Township Board is encouraged to now collaborate with the many residents and fellow township officials who have comprised and supported the Shoreline Study Group, and who have worked long and diligently to formulate and fully vet a well-balanced and supportable shoreline regulatory framework. The arbitrary adoption of more restrictive provisions than those proposed by the Shoreline Study Group would serve no purpose and would needlessly cause significant financial and personal hardship to Peninsula Township shared frontage property owners.

Thank you for considering these thoughts and observations.

George Weber, Peninsula Township resident

Becky Chown

To: Maura Sanders
Subject: RE: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

From: jamie.grace@c21northland.com <jamie.grace@c21northland.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 26, 2025 8:13 AM
To: duneclimber55@yahoo.com <duneclimber55@yahoo.com>; Elise Loud <planner@peninsulatownship.com>; Maura Sanders <supervisor@peninsulatownship.com>
Subject: Shoreline Regulations for Shared Waterfront Neighborhoods

Dear Members of the Peninsula Township Planning Commission,

I am writing to share my concerns regarding the proposed shoreline regulation changes affecting shared waterfront communities. Our neighborhood has responsibly managed three boat hoists per fifty feet of frontage for many years. This approach has served residents well, protected the shoreline, and supported fair access for property owners.

A reduction in this allowance creates several predictable challenges for our community:

- Neighbors who currently enjoy boat access could lose a long-standing privilege they have relied on.
- Limitations on hoists will affect current and future property values across our shared frontage.
- Newer residents who purchased with the understanding of eventual access may face far longer wait times before they have the opportunity to participate.

Shared waterfront communities across Michigan have emphasized similar concerns. Townships that support collaborative shoreline management have found that it reduces dock proliferation, minimizes lakebed disturbance, and lowers enforcement burdens for local government. Our neighborhood's current structure accomplishes these same goals. Shared systems are more environmentally responsible than multiple individualized installations and reflect the kind of cooperative stewardship that benefits the entire township.

It is also important to note that our existing arrangement has not created safety issues, environmental harm, or township complaints. When a system has worked effectively for decades without documented problems, limiting it now appears inconsistent with the principle of reasonable use that guides Michigan

riparian law. Regulations should solve demonstrated issues, not introduce new challenges where none currently exist.

Given these concerns, I respectfully ask the Commission to consider the following.

1. Uphold the collaborative work of the Shoreline Regulation Study Group and its recommendation of three hoists per fifty feet of frontage.
2. Support neighborhoods in continuing to manage shoreline access responsibly, consistent with SRSG guidelines.

These recommendations reflect many months of thoughtful discussion between residents and township representatives. They balance environmental responsibility with fair access, preserve the character and expectations of long-established neighborhoods, and support stable property values for the community as a whole.

Thank you for your time, your service, and your willingness to listen to the residents who live in and care for these shared waterfront areas. I appreciate your consideration and your commitment to thoughtful governance.

Respectfully,

Jamie Grace

1090 Quaker Valley Dr,

Traverse City, MI

Safety of Shoreline, Mission Peninsula

I am a retired board certified orthopaedic surgeon and practiced for 30 years. During my career I encountered orthopedic injuries caused by boat propellers and have seen the devastating impact they have on the lives of patients and their families.

Propeller Injury

More people die from boat propeller injuries than shark attacks. Boat propeller injuries are devastating injuries.

Propeller strikes to flesh:

- range from 50-250 strikes per second.
- cause death from blunt trauma, hemorrhage/bleeding, and infection.
- cause traumatic immediate amputation and/or the need for surgical amputation due to unsalvageable injury to tissues and/or infection.
- frequently cause severe infection due to depth of the lacerations, severity of the trauma to the tissues, and contaminated water propelled deep into the body.
- frequently cause septic shock, sometimes leading to amputations of all four limbs (more on this below).

The severity of propeller strike infections frequently causes septic shock—a body's response to overwhelming infection that leads to a severe drop in blood pressure. Septic shock can cause death in itself. And the medical treatment for septic shock is to use drugs that cause severe restriction of blood flow to the limbs in order to keep blood flowing to the brain and vital organs. This restriction of blood flow to the limbs causes death of the tissue in the limbs, necessitating amputation of the limbs-- frequently being both hands and both feet, and often including both arms and both legs as well.

When a motorized boat runs its propeller and is in motion, it is a danger to swimmers, paddle boards and kayaks in shared water spaces. The focus here is the mixing of people in the water with motorized boats near the shoreline of Mission Peninsula. Increasing boat density on the Mission Peninsula shoreline increases risk of propeller strikes to people swimming and people on small, unmotorized craft such as paddle boards and kayaks.

Warning

When propeller strike injuries occur on the Mission Peninsula shoreline in the future, you might have said that the event was unforeseeable. I am telling you now that it is foreseeable, and I am giving you fair warning. Even one preventable injury or death from a propeller strike is one too many.

Boating and Alcohol

When was the last time you saw a person holding a beer while driving a car? When was the last time you saw someone holding a beer while driving a boat? Drinking while driving a boat is culturally acceptable. Yet, people operating boats are more susceptible to piloting while impaired than people in cars, not only due to prevalence of drinking, but due to "boater hypnosis," a syndrome caused by stressors unique to the water such as sun, wind, vibration, motion and dehydration. Increasing boat density on the Mission Peninsula shoreline increases risks generated by all of the above.

Solutions for Safety

Propeller injuries are more probable with increased density of boats and people sharing the same water space. For safety's sake, it is important to minimize the comingling of boats and people in the same water space.

Motorized boats and swimmers do not mix safely. It is not possible for the skipper of a boat to see what is in the water directly in front of the bow, especially when accelerating and the tip of the bow rises. It is also not easy for the skipper of a boat to see what is directly behind the boat when operating the boat in reverse.

To promote safety on the Mission Peninsula shoreline, attention has to be drawn to measures which will limit boat traffic in areas where there will be people swimming or operating small, unmotorized craft.

These issues are of particular importance on shared beach property where multiple boaters and multiple families want to use adjacent water areas.

Swimmers are especially vulnerable having to swim in water where boats are coming and going. The shoreline in many areas of Mission Peninsula and especially at our beach is very shallow, requiring swimmers to walk out to where the water is deep enough to swim. This is the same depth and location where boats are docked. Note, I am not referring to swimming in the middle of the bay. I am referring to swimming in water adjacent to the shoreline of Mission Peninsula.

As I see it, there are four issues which need immediate attention:

1. Number of motorized boats/craft
2. Location of boat docks/marinas relative to areas where swimming and paddling occurs
3. Orientation of docks and pathways of boats leaving and returning to berths
4. Effective enforcement

Number of motorized boats—Maintaining the existing regulation of 1 boat per 50' of frontage is safer. Allowing the number of boats to increase will increase danger.

Location of boat docks— The rules about dock location need to be based on measurable, immutable, defined and enforceable criteria such as land lot lines and using the extension of those lines. All docks and marina structures placed in the water should remain in front of the property owner's beach. "In Front of" should be defined as a linear extensions of the lot lines visually into the water. A dock should originate within the lot lines and remain, to the dock's full extent, within the visual extension of the lot lines. Said another way, docks should be placed within boundaries consistent with a natural extension of property lines into riparian space and centered within that space, and not cross over into the riparian space of its neighbors. *This is especially crucial for shared beach frontage.*

Orientation of boat docks-- It would be advisable for motorized boats from marinas and individual docks on the Mission Peninsula shoreline to come and go from their berth perpendicular to the shoreline and not take a path that is parallel or at an angle to the shore to prevent crossing through areas where people are swimming or operating small, unmotorized craft.

A motorized boat cutting across water that is shared with people swimming and on small, unmotorized craft is a hazard.

Enforcement—Enforcement of regulations must be swift, efficient, and effective. Cease and desist orders should be issued and fines should be levied. If cease and desist orders are issued, measures must be in place to ensure that activity has ceased and desisted as well as ensuring that corrective action takes place. If fines are issued, fines should accumulate daily until corrective action takes place.

Shared Beach Frontage vs. Regular Frontage

Since there are a variety of property types and uses of the shoreline, it is possible that special rules need to apply to shared beach frontage, as there are special circumstances with the docking of multiple motorized boats and the resulting risks to safety. Specifically, the marina at Hidden Ridge needs to be regulated as its dock placement in recent years has been hazardous to the safety and wellbeing of its neighbors directly south (the East Beach Association)

If there must be one and only one set of rules for the entire shoreline, regardless of the beach being owned by one or multiple families, and if the new rules create any hardship for a certain property, a solution could be to allow that property to apply for a variance to the new ordinance if it can be shown that their request accommodates the safety and wellbeing of its neighbors.

Please reference the attached Google screen shots with additional information pertinent to the topics discussed herein.

Sincerely,

Howard Pike, MD

Sources: US Coastguard, NHTSA

septic shock leading to 4 extre

google.com/search?q=septic+shock+leading+to+4+extremity+amputation&scas_esv=17b6ad23b7736742&ssrf=AETiFvMkkuqCvdhHrCXFrGXFgLuMcOmA%3A1761153477311...

AI Overview

Septic shock can lead to four-limb amputation when a severe infection causes a drastic drop in blood pressure, leading to a lack of blood flow to the extremities. This can cause irreversible tissue damage and gangrene, most often due to blood clots, microvascular spasms, or damage from vasopressor drugs used to treat the shock. Early recognition and treatment of sepsis are critical to reduce the risk of this complication.

How septic shock causes amputation

- Low blood pressure:** Sepsis can cause septic shock, a life-threatening condition where the blood pressure drops so low that vital organs and tissues do not receive enough oxygen.
- Blood clots and microvascular damage:** The inflammatory response in sepsis can lead to blood clots or damage the small blood vessels (microvasculature) in the limbs.
- Lack of blood flow:** The combination of low blood pressure and damaged blood vessels cuts off the supply of oxygen and nutrients to the extremities.
- Peripheral gangrene:** When tissue dies from lack of blood flow, it results in peripheral gangrene, a condition that is often irreversible.
- Amputation:** In severe cases, amputation is necessary to remove the dead tissue and save the patient's life.

Losing Limbs to Sepsis: Limb Loss Awareness Month
Apr 1, 2019
Sepsis Alliance

Four limb amputations due to peripheral gangrene from ...
In conclusion, we report this rare case of 4 limb amputations due to intropote use for septic...
ScienceDirect.com

Amputations - Sepsis Alliance
For people who have sepsis, blood clots are a frequent cause of amputations. Your blood has...
Sepsis Alliance

Show all

https://www.google.com/search?scas_esv=17b6ad23b7736742&cs=0&ssrf=AETiFvMkkuqCvdhHrCXFrGXFgLuMcOmA%3A1761153477311&eq=Low+blood+pressure&sa=X&ved=2&uikewiDz=65cUQA&wshyVfHbvyhJLQ&cc=QH&AD&msrk=AUHE&DELgc7Hq87VNDUKFGW

Russell 2000
-1.85%

Search

52°F
10/22/2025

septic shock leading to 4 extre

Which causes more deaths sh

What is a higher percentage d

google.com/search?q=What+is+a+higher+percentage+driving+an+automobile+impaired+or+piloting+a+recreational+boat&eq=What+is+a+higher+percentage+driving+an+...

AI Overview

While the overall number of impaired driving incidents on the road is far higher, the percentage of fatal accidents caused by impairment is higher for recreational boating. Environmental factors on the water make impairment especially dangerous.

Comparing impaired driving vs. boating

Metric	Impaired driving (automobile)	Impaired boating (recreational)
Percentage of fatal accidents	According to Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD), alcohol-related crashes made up 32% of all traffic deaths in 2022.	The U.S. Coast Guard reports that alcohol was the leading known contributing factor in fatal boating accidents, accounting for 20% of fatalities in 2024. In accidents where the primary cause was known, this figure is higher.
Risk of impairment	Driving a car is a routine activity for many, and impairment is a well-known risk factor.	A boater is more susceptible to becoming impaired than a driver. The effects of alcohol are intensified by stressors unique to the water, such as sun, wind, vibration, and motion. This can lead to "boater's hypnosis," which slows reaction time even before alcohol is added.
Increased fatality risk	Fatality risk for a driver increases with higher blood alcohol concentration (BAC).	A boater with a BAC of just 0.05% is four times more likely to die in an accident than a sober operator. At 0.10% BAC, that risk increases tenfold.

Coast Guard Reports Fewest Boating Fatalities in More Than ...
Jul 7, 2025 — By Chad Tokowicz, MRAA Government Relations Manager. On Tuesday.
Marine Retailers Association

The Dangers Of Drinking And Boating - BoatUS
Oct 14, 2019 — Alcohol Dangers. ... But what you might not know is that a boater is even mo...
BoatUS

More than 13000 People Died in Alcohol-Related Crashes for ...
Apr 4, 2024 — More than 13,000 People Died in Alcohol-Related Crashes for Second Straight.
Mothers Against Drunk Driving

Show all

52°F
10/22/2025

septic shock leading to 4 extre x Which causes more deaths sh

google.com/search?q=Which+causes+more+deaths+shark+attacks+or+boat+propeller+injuries&oeq=Which+causes+more+deaths+shark+attacks+or+boat+propeller+injuries...

YouTube Gmail Maps Visit the Newly Des... Online Star Map an... Margin of Safety Ca... Annualized Return... Crosby, Sills & Nas... Hulu | Watch Adobe Acrobat All Bookmarks

Google Which causes more deaths shark attacks or boat propeller injuries

AI Overview

Boat propeller injuries cause significantly more deaths than shark attacks. While shark attacks receive substantial media attention, they are an extremely rare cause of death compared to boating accidents.

Annual death statistics

Category	Global	United States
Shark Attacks	In 2024, there were only four confirmed, unprovoked fatal shark attacks worldwide. The average annual number of unprovoked fatal attacks is about six globally.	The U.S. recorded just one fatal shark attack in 2024, in Hawaii.
Boat Propeller injuries	While global numbers are not as consistently reported as shark attack data, dozens of deaths occur worldwide each year.	The U.S. Coast Guard reported 41 deaths from propeller strikes in 2022 and 30 deaths in 2024, though it notes that these injuries are likely underreported.

Additional context

- Boating is far more common** While both events are relatively rare, recreational boating is a much more common activity than encountering a shark in the water.
- Risk perception vs. reality** Shark attacks often generate more fear and publicity, which can distort the actual level of danger. Statistical data consistently shows that many ordinary human activities, including boating, pose a higher risk of injury or

Yearly Worldwide Shark Attack Summary
Feb 10, 2025 — ISAF will continue to investigate these cases as data become available. * 2024 ...
Florida Museum of Natural History

Boat Propeller Accidents Can Cause Horrific Injuries
Oct 17, 2023 — How common are boat propeller accidents? In 2022, the United States Coast...
McNicholas & McNicholas, LLP

Shark Attack Statistics & Trends in 2024: What the Latest Data ...
Jun 5, 2024 — Shark Attack Statistics & Trends in 2024: What the Latest Data Reveals? ...
Earthdive

Show all

Freeze watch Just issued

Search

boat propeller injuries leading to septic shock

google.com/search?q=boat+propeller+injuries+leading+to+septic+shock&scisq_esv=17b6ad23b7736742&srxf=AESTIPPKMIGHmdGjib-cruqrAc3PCT4g%3A1761153397417&ei...

YouTube Gmail Maps Visit the Newly Des... Online Star Map an... Margin of Safety Ca... Annualized Return... Crosby, Sills & Nas... Hulu | Watch Adobe Acrobat All Bookmarks

Google boat propeller injuries leading to septic shock

AI Overview

Boat propeller injuries can easily lead to septic shock due to the severity of the trauma and high risk of infection from contaminated water. The combination of deep, mutilating lacerations from the propeller and exposure to waterborne bacteria creates a perfect storm for a systemic inflammatory response.

Factors leading to septic shock

- Contaminated aquatic environments:** Freshwater, saltwater, and brackish water harbor different bacteria, and open wounds from propeller strikes are a direct route for these pathogens to enter the bloodstream. Common infectious agents include:
 - Vibria vulnificus*:** A bacterium found in warm seawater and brackish water that can cause rapid, life-threatening infections, especially in immunocompromised individuals.
 - Aeromonas species*:** Gram-negative bacteria found in freshwater that can cause severe wound infections.
 - Polymicrobial infections:** Injuries from water exposure often involve multiple types of bacteria, which increases the complexity and severity of the infection.
- Severity of the trauma:** Propellers spin at high speeds, inflicting extensive soft-tissue injuries, deep lacerations, broken bones, and amputations. The sheer force of the injury alone can trigger a massive inflammatory response.
- Dysregulated immune response:** Trauma itself, particularly severe polytrauma,

Sepsis in Trauma: A Deadly Complication - ScienceDirect.com
Nov 14, 2021 — Defining Sepsis and Polytrauma. For many years, sepsis has been...
ScienceDirect.com

Motorboat Propeller Injuries: A Case Series and Review of the ...
Dec 31, 2016 — Abstract. Introduction: Injuries inflicted by motorboat propellers are rare but often result in extensive so...
Trauma Monthly

Sepsis after trauma—evolving paradigms in stress biology and host ...
* Abstract. Severe trauma is often complicated by subsequent infection and organ dysfunction, with sepsis being a major ...
National Institutes of Health (NIH)

Show all

Russell 2000 -1.05%

Search

boat propeller injuries leading to death

AI Overview

Yes, boat propellers can and do cause fatal injuries. Accidents often happen when someone falls overboard and is hit by a propeller, with potential for catastrophic injuries like severed limbs, head trauma, and severe bleeding. The high speed of the propeller (up to 40 times per second) can make a fatality occur very quickly.

Common scenarios for fatal accidents

- **Falling overboard and being struck:** This is a frequent cause, whether from falling from a moving boat or one that is stopped.
- **Being sucked under by the propeller:** When a boat restarts, it can create a suction effect that pulls a person towards the propeller.
- **Attempting to reboard or retrieve items:** Someone in the water may be struck when trying to get back on the boat or retrieve a dropped item.

Examples of fatal accidents

- **Thai Actress Tangmo:** Fell from a boat and was struck by a propeller.
- **Julia Budzinski:** Was tubing with friends in Virginia when she fell and was fatally hit by the propeller of the returning boat.
- **Lana Batochir:** Was on a raft that was sucked into a boat's propeller in Chicago, resulting in the severing of both her legs.
- **Natalia Andrea Larranaga Fajardo:** Was fatally struck by a tour boat's propeller in

Has a human ever been killed by boat propellers? - Quora
May 31, 2019 — Yes. It has happened many times and in many countries. I took a forensic death investigation course in law...

High Profile Propeller Accidents
* 2 February 2022 Tangmo, a beautiful young actress in Thailand fell from a boat during a restaurant trip and was killed.

Over 60 people were injured by boat propellers in 2022
Nov 14, 2023 — 135 pounds multiple...

3:19 PM
10/22/2025

Becky Chown

From: sally sallyerickson.net <sally@sallyerickson.net>
Sent: Sunday, November 30, 2025 7:16 PM
To: Kevin Beard; Randy Hall (rand.plancom@gmail.com); 'David Sanger'; Armen; lwdloski@gmail.com; Julia Alexander (jualexanptpc@gmail.com); shipman.parks@gmail.com; dsh_44@yahoo.com; Maura Sanders; Becky Chown; Katie Clark; Planning & Zoning Administrator; Elise Loud; Robin Noval
Cc: sally sallyerickson.net
Subject: Water front usage - ordinance and enforcement - Planning Commission Peninsula Township
Attachments: Mooring Basemap RIA Draft_2025 Image (002).pdf; east beach manigold letter.docx

To the Peninsula Township Planning Commission,

Thank you for the work you do for the township.

I am writing to you regarding the potential of changing the waterfront usage and ordinances. The problem has not been the ordinance - it has been the lack of enforcement of the ordinance. Please see attached map with *Riparian respect lines* as reviewed/accepted by EGLE and Corp of Engineers for East Beach Association limited common element of Port of Old Mission. (*Riparian Interest area*)

Our issue is with the Hidden Ridge Association (SUP) overuse and abuse of our rights to enjoyment of our beach area.

The image attached shows the UNSAFE & unneighborly conduct of the Hidden Ridge Association.

Hidden Ridge Association overuse and installation of docks and hoists directly in our Riparian interest area – using our area as the runway for their boats and watercraft.

This is a HUGE safety concern for our members for swimming, stand up paddle boarding, kayaks, and non-motorized activities.

We also have concerns about the pollutants from this overuse.

We, East Beach Association, are a shared beach that adheres to our Port of Old Mission Phase III SUP approval and the township ordinances and rules.

We did not ask the township to throw the entire zoning ordinance on to the Todo list for a complete rewrite.

We simply wanted the current ordinances to be enforced. Just like the Gardners and others from this area of the Peninsula.

This is why I submitted a written formal complaint; To then supervisor Rob Manigold.

Please see attached letter outlining our issues and concerns – they have not changed.

At the very least - any dock from shared frontage should be from the center of the frontage.

Not allowed to be pushed to the edge of their riparian area or into the riparian interest area of their neighbors.

The written complaint has never been resolved. 2025 is the first year that Hidden Ridge Association was handed violations and a Cease and Desist by the township. It was also acknowledged that they **do not** abide by the “permit” from the Corp of Engineers. This action by the township was met with frivolity by the Hidden Ridge group, as they did not cease and desist, and had minimal fines assessed to them.

If this is the enforcement method than that the violation should meet with real consequences. The current fines/penalties are too low to be effective.

Years of inappropriate use, and the addition of beach sand to their vegetation striped area, has also changed the cove. The area is so shallow I recommend a site visit to see how ridiculous it is to have a marina in this region of the bay. This beautiful asset, our waterfront, is constantly changing and a one size fits all rule may not be a solution.

If you increase density to the waterfront, you have opened a pandora's box – how many single-family residents will see offering a mooring as a personal profit center... VRBO moorings.

We simply wanted the current ordinances to be enforced and if they change that the future ordinances are enforced.

Thank you,
Sally

Sally J. Erickson, President
POM Associates Inc.
Builder & Developer of Port of Old Mission Neighborhood
East Beach Association – manager
sally@sallyerickson.net
231-218-5125



Property Lines (typ)



Riparian Interest Area depicted is consistent with
2020 JPA submittal - No Scale

Riparian Interest Area Exhibit - 2025 Aerial Image		
PARCEL NUMBER 11-623-900-00		EAST BEACH ASSOCIATION
		Shared Frontage Parcel
		DRAWN 11/17/25 Revised _____

November 18, 2022
Isaiah Wunsch
Peninsula Township Supervisor
Dave Sanger
Zoning/SUP Enforcement

Hello Gentlemen,

I want to touch base and see that this is addressed during the winter 22/23, and before the hint of docks in the water next spring 2023. I know Dave, you are keenly aware of this concern.

Thank you for your help with this safety issue.

Best regards,

Sally

October 21, 2021

Rob Manigold
Peninsula Township Supervisor
13235 Center Road
Traverse City, MI 49686

RE: Beach abuse and dock location Hidden Ridge PUD approved 2001 originally 120' of frontage = Now 237' frontage – allowing by ordinance 4 boats; One boat for 50' of frontage.

From the East Beach Association and Sally Erickson, Developer Port of Old Mission neighborhood/PUD

Hello Rob,

Our concern is for the safety of our members, their families, and their guests.

The current use by our neighbors of the Hidden Ridge PUD Subdivision is selfish on two levels – unneighborly and erosively destructive to the beach and surrounding beaches.

1. If Hidden Ridge is allowed a dock. The dock should be centered on their frontage per Peninsula Township ordinance. This year 2021 the group installed the dock system adjacent to the beach South Property line – thereby forcing all the boats on the dock to drive through our swim and human use area. **Totally selfish and unsafe for our families and friends.** I pointed this factor out to Mr. Tucker the Hidden Ridge Beach representative during the dock installation this past spring, and basically got an “Oh well” response, he would send out a safety memo.
2. We realize that this group (Hidden Ridge Homeowners Association) has gone around local rules, but **the permitting that they have does not allow for an installation of the nature that was put in place in 2021**, and a simple infraction/fine is not a deterrent to this group. We need better enforcement of rules our group, East Beach Association, both respects and enforces. This is a horrific precedent being set for our region by Peninsula Township and the Corp of Engineers and potentially the Great Lakes Basin. Mother Nature requires that we work as a team, and respect the plans and rules instituted by the local jurisdiction and voted upon by local community members.

The Corp of Engineers should not undermine these types of measures.

3. If this type of misuse is allowed – what’s to say someone else won’t do this with 150 families. Is it just a matter of “word smithing” your way around the rules rather than respecting them....?
4. The boats cause extensive wake and shoreline destruction. Hidden Ridge has clear cut their beach area and has had significant erosion, as a result of this stripping of vegetation, and the wake abuse of power boat traffic that 20+ boats inflict on the shoreline. They have consistently brought in semi loads/trains of beach sand to compensate for the destructive impact that their lack of beach stewardship has inflicted on the shoreline. It leaves one wondering if the roadbed for East Shore could be compromised.

Our 157’ of frontage allows for 21 families/3 boats to use our beach from the Port of Old Mission neighborhood; and we charge a membership fee to join our East Beach Association. We have 171+ condo/homes in our neighborhood; that is how we keep the membership limited to the rules of Peninsula Township. Rules, which were incorporated into our Phase III Port of Old Mission Master Deed when we acquired the beach frontage – NOW Port of Old Mission Phase III Consolidated Master Deed.

5. I mention the Master deed because all buyers in Hidden Ridge PUD were/or should have been presented with a Hidden Ridge Master Deed prior to purchase – It does not matter if this was a bank owned or distressed development. That is how the development was approved by the township, and all owners had to agree to this document to close on their lot/home. The limits to beach use, and number of boats is not new information, it is PUBLIC information and familiar to the anyone who resides on the miles of beach frontage in Peninsula Township.
6. Perhaps this would be not issue - however our neighbors have made it abundantly clear that rules and simple curtesy to neighboring properties is not of concern to them as a group.

For this reason, we are lodging a Formal Complaint, and request for plan of action to prevent this type of miss use from happening in 2022, and any years in the future. We will not accept the Hidden Ridge dock system and safety issues that occurred in 2021, as result of disregard for the rules and approvals, for our members. Please let us know how your will resolve this issue.

Please let me know if you need additional information or if I can help to resolve this situation in any way. Available to meet in person, also available by email or text & phone.

Respectfully,

Sally J. Erickson

POM Associates Inc

Port of Old Mission Neighborhood

Builder/Developer

East Beach Association developer & member

sally@sallyerickson.net

[231-218-5125](tel:231-218-5125)

POM Assoc. Inc. & East Beach Association

mailing address

6379 Mission Pointe

Traverse City, MI 49686

cc. Christina Deeren – Peninsula Township Zoning
Dave Sanger – Ordinance Enforcement Officer, PT Trustee
Jill Little, Manager POM Phase III Association
East Beach Association Membership
NEW – Isaiah Wunch 11/2022

Becky Chown

From: Kristin Erickson <kristinaerickson19@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 2, 2025 12:01 PM
To: Kevin Beard; Randy Hall (rand.plancom@gmail.com); David Sanger; Armen; lwdloski@gmail.com; Julia Alexander (jualexanptpc@gmail.com); shipman.parks@gmail.com; dsh_44@yahoo.com; Maura Sanders; Becky Chown; Katie Clark; Planning & Zoning Administrator; Elise Loud; Robin Noval
Subject: Waterfront Usage and Ordinance

Hello Peninsula Township Planning Commission,

I am writing to you to voice my concerns about the waterfront usage and governing ordinance. I am a member of the East Beach Association.

I would like to voice that the zoning rewrite is not an idea or solution initiated by us, the East Beach Association.

I am against increasing the boat density from 1 to 3 boats per 50 feet of land ownership.

This fall, at our East Beach property, there was standing oil, gas, and sludge puddles on our shoreline. Our East Beach property is in a cove. The high density of watercraft from the Hidden Ridge Association is already leaving pollution in this cove area.

Thus, pollution, stewardship of the shoreline, and safety are of concern.

I simply want enforcement of the current ordinance. In fact, if further enforcement was done in the first place, with proper deterring fines, we would not be struggling with such concerns.

Center dock placement, limited quantity of boats/watercraft and enforcement of the current ordinance needs to be at the forefront of this issue.

Thank you,
Kristin Erickson
6379 Mission Pointe