

# CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CHOCOLAY PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

Monday, April 17, 2017

**I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER BY:** Tom Mahaney at 7:00 p.m.

**ROLL CALL**

*Members Present:* Tom Mahaney (Chair), Eric Meister (Vice Chair), Donna Mullen-Campbell (Secretary), Andy Smith (Vice Secretary) Kendell Milton, Jon Kangas, Judy White (Board)

*Members Absent:* none

*Staff Present:* Dale Throenle (Planning Director/Zoning Administrator), Richard Bohjanen (Township Supervisor), Suzanne Sundell (Community Development Coordinator)

**II. ADDITIONAL AGENDA ITEMS / APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

*Motion by White and seconded by Meister to approve the agenda as written.*

*Vote: Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 MOTION CARRIED*

**III. MINUTES**

**March 20, 2017**

*Motion by Milton, and seconded by Kangas, to approve the minutes as written.*

*Vote: Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 MOTION CARRIED*

**IV. PUBLIC COMMENT**

June Rydholm – 221 Lakewood Lane – wanted to comment on Short Term Rentals. She is very much against them. She has had experience with them next door to her – drinking, drugs, and partying – she has a shared driveway, and the cars would be lined up in the driveway all hours of the night. They would litter the beach with all kinds of garbage. She was the one making them picking it up – she doesn't feel she needs to be the police for the beach. The other experience was with renters two doors over – these renters would be going to the bathroom on the trees and trashing the bayou with bottles. In many communities across the United States, they are stopping short term rentals for the above reasons. She also wanted to know how the short term rentals affect our census numbers.

Robin Smith, 2441 M-28 East – her parents owned the Bed & Breakfast. She still has the B&B with a Conditional Use permit. This is a short term rental. She lives in the main house on the property. She feels this is a wonderful thing for our community. There are a lot of people that come from all over the United States and Europe. Smith would like to speak to the Planning Commission about changing the definition of a bed and breakfast. Smith is a certified massage therapist and a yoga teacher, and she would like to be allowed to offer these services to her guests. She has a room in her house that she already uses for her own personal practice, so would not be expanding. Her family has owned the property since 1924. The idea came up when guests started asking

about yoga retreats. The capacity of the B&B is 4 guests. This would limit the amount of traffic. Smith stated there are no State of Michigan requirements to operate a yoga studio, but she maintains her studio as if there were requirements, with things such as continuing education. Smith has joined a yoga alliance group, which provides for continuing education and oversight on the operation. She has intake forms that are filled out by the guest indicating the level of fitness. Smith feels this would be good for the Marquette area, as it will increase tourism. Smith also stated she has never had a problem with her guests. Smith indicated that she feels the Marquette area is becoming more holistic. Throenle indicated that the definition would be discussed later in the meeting with Item VIII.B on short term rentals.

Dick Arnold, 312 West Branch Road – would like to address the vehicle ordinance. Vehicles don't have to belong to the resident. His neighbor doesn't live there, but stores all his tractors there. The zoning ordinance indicates that the Zoning Administrator can grant leeway to a situation, but it also says that he is not able to do it. The Ordinance also says that you can park vehicles and parts in the front yard. He doesn't feel that the Ordinance was looked at enough. There is no size limit on boats, trailers, etc. His neighbor has three recreation vehicles in his front yard, and according to the Ordinance he can fill up the backyard with recreation vehicles. Agricultural vehicles in a residential area – no number on how many, owner can be anyone, and they can be "maintained" in the yard. He has lived here a long time, but it now seems that you don't know for sure what is going to be next to you. He is also concerned about the BBQ truck parked in the driveway on Cherry Creek Road. Things just don't seem to matter to the Township. Accessory buildings – need number of how many can be on the lot. Needs to be a formula for how big the lot is to determine number of square feet for these buildings.

Jennifer Bruggink, 673 Lakewood Lane – has owned the property for 19 years, and lived there for 18 years. When they moved in, there were families living there, including one long term rental. When the renters moved, the owners decided to do short term rentals. She has 50', so there isn't any space – not able to grow trees or bushes, and she doesn't want to live between two barrier walls. She is very concerned that short term rentals could become okay with the Township. She doesn't want to have to worry about who is next door. The noise and vacation atmosphere make it hard for residents who have to work the next day. There is also an issue with trash, as the people that make the trash are not usually there on trash pickup day. The landlord has provided a dumpster for trash removal, but this is an eyesore. She did not buy the house for that type of environment – for lake living and the residential neighborhood. She encouraged the Planning Commission to consider the people that are already living there. Mahaney asked if she had ever called the police. Bruggink indicated she usually calls at least once per week during the summer and special events.

Jenny Cammerata, 669 Lakewood Lane – she does not support short term rental. She lives in a neighborhood – you know your neighbors and you trust your neighbors. She used to clean for a short term rental, and oftentimes, the beach was littered with beer cans, and there have been times where there has been drug use that she had to clean

up. She does not support short term rentals. She feels the Planning Commission needs to pay attention to the language and how the ordinance is written because it could be okay in certain cases. This will not work if the homeowner is not present, because no one is taking care of the property. From what she has seen, someone rents a short term rental, and then you start seeing additional people show up with tents and RV's – as many as 25 people, where there should have only been 5 or 6.

Public comments closed.

**V. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Conditional Use Permit CU 17 02 Public Hearing is deferred to item VII.A

**VI. PRESENTATIONS**

Presentation of Citizen Planner Certificates (this portion of the meeting was overlooked, so was done at 9:00 PM when the second part of the meeting started).

Throenle indicated there were four people that completed the Citizen Planner Seminar – certificates were handed out to Kendell Milton, Judy White, and Donna Mullen-Campell.

**VII. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Conditional Use Permit CU 17 02 – 140 Carmen Drive**

**Staff Introduction**

Throenle indicated that the property is located behind Main Street Pizza, which is owned by Brandon and Jess Croney. He would like to operate a small contractor yard to store equipment and materials to be used for his business. The material used is a noninvasive material, with no threat to the environment. There have been no negative comments received from adjoining property owners. No business transactions or other activities, other than storage, would occur on the property. Maximum amount of people would be 3 or 4 at a time when they are getting the materials needed. Throenle does not see a traffic problem or a noise issue. Throenle indicated that he would recommend approval, as he feels this is a good use for the space, as it sits behind Main Street Pizza. There should be no impact on Main Street / Big Burger as they have no entry accessing their property to the back.

**Applicant Discussion**

Croney indicated that he had spoken with the Main Street Pizza owner and their only concern was that anything stored there would not be a groundwater issue (Croney owns Jet Black Asphalt Seal Coating). Croney has talked with DEQ and about disposal should there be a spill. Croney feels he is going above and beyond – getting a building permit, pouring a concrete pad with rebar and putting side braces on it. Croney is also clearing the stumps, rather than just pouring over it.

Mahaney indicated that the sheet shows that the product is asphalt based. Croney explained it is a thickened cold tar product. All he does is add water to it. Insurance does not consider it asphalt based. It is stored in a completely contained unit, and

can only be released by opening the three shutoffs.

White asked about fencing. Croney plans on doing a 6-ft wood panel fencing. White indicated that the Ordinance stated it needs to be an 8 foot fence. Croney stated that was fine – he would prefer it being higher. Meister asked if Croney was fencing the west side, or was he going to leave the tree screening. Croney indicated that he would like to do it in the future. Meister stated that it looked a little thin in back by the home. Croney indicated he would have no problem planting additional trees there.

Mahaney asked if Croney was intending to gravel the lot. Croney indicated that was his plan. Mahaney asked about number of vehicles – Croney stated he had around a dozen vehicles and trailers.

Smith wondered if there was a checklist for Conditional Use permits. Throenle indicated that he did not have one. Throenle indicated that things such as number of vehicles could be limited by a condition on the permit.

Mahaney asked if there were any plans to build a structure at the site. Croney indicated he does not do maintenance, so he has no desire or need to build anything there. Meister indicated that with a Conditional Use, you would have to come back to the Planning Commission. Smith indicated that the potential use needs to be considered, in case of sale.

Mahaney asked how this fits with the Master Plan. Throenle indicated that this is Commercial property, and fits in with the uses listed there.

Milton indicated that a contractor's yard next to a Class A highway is a valuable piece of property.

There was some discussion on the number of vehicles that could be in the yard at one time. Smith explained that the reason for this was because the Conditional Use permit goes with the property, and if the property was sold tomorrow there needed to be some guidelines as to what is acceptable. Throenle indicated that the type of trucks that will be in this contractor yards are the crew cab type – smaller and less noise.

### **Commissioner Discussion**

Smith indicated there needs to be conditions – to leave it wide open causes problems. He feels it is very important that this is done right. This is a conditional use, so it needs to have conditions. It sets the bar for everyone. Smith feels there should be limits set on hours of operation, days of work and what's stored. Smith would like to see a generic checklist to make sure they are considering everything.

Mahaney indicated there were some things that the Commission needs to discuss such as hours of operation and days of work. Milton asked if it was going to be electrified. Croney indicated there was no need for electricity – he would not be there after hours, and there would be no maintenance being performed.

The hours of operation were discussed – many different options were discussed.

The decision was made that hours would be Monday through Saturday from 6 AM – 7 PM, and Sunday 9 AM – 3 PM. These hours would be year round.

The number of vehicles was then discussed – Throenle indicated that the size of the lot is limited (0.63 acres) and the size for the container (180 sq. ft.), which will greatly decrease the number of vehicles if you set the condition that all vehicles must be on the lot. It was also suggested that Croney may be able to negotiate with other property owners (Habitat for Humanity, Cherry Creek Market) to be able to have employee parking on their lots.

With fencing, the Planning Commission feels that the whole area should be enclosed. Croney felt he would need some additional time to fence the west side, such as by September 1, 2017. Other sides will be fenced immediately, primarily for security and visual reasons.

Milton asked if there would be deliveries made to the property. Croney indicated that once a month there would be a delivery of seal coat by a tanker. This would not be on Sunday.

Maintenance was discussed, such as changing a tire, oil changes, etc. in the yard. This would need to be contained. Croney indicated that he does not feel they will be doing this, as he usually has his mechanics (who are off site) go over the vehicles before starting up for the spring. Throenle stated maybe it should be limited to emergency repair. Supervisor Bohjanen commented from the audience wondering who would normally regulate this. It was noted that the owner would need to go through the MDEQ. Bohjanen felt that there should not be regulating at this point – if Croney decided he wanted to do maintenance, it would then need to go through the MDEQ.

Kangas asked about the driveway on Cherry Creek Road. Croney feels this would be a safer entrance, rather than the entrance on Carmen Drive. The entrance on Cherry Creek would allow for a better line of sight. Kangas indicated he was glad that Croney had thought about the line of sight, but questioned whether it was a good idea to put another driveway on Cherry Creek Road if it was not needed, especially from an access management perspective. Kangas is also concerned about the speeds on Cherry Creek Road. Throenle pointed out that the speed limit is 45 mph. Smith indicated Marquette County would have control on the addition of a driveway. Meister stated that having access from Cherry Creek Road would be safer than pulling out off of Carmen Drive onto Cherry Creek Road. Croney indicated he would like to add the driveway in the fall.

*Mullen-Campbell moved, Kangas seconded, that after public comment and staff review and analysis in consideration of Conditional Use application CU 17 02, and the understanding that the proposed use is compliant with all terms of “Section 16.2, Conditional Use Permits Basis of Determination and General Standards” and the intent of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Commission approves Conditional Use Permit 17 02, with the additional conditions of:*

1. *Completion of a fence by September 1, 2017 along the west property line.*
2. *Hours of operation will be limited to Monday through Saturday, 6:00 AM – 7:00 PM, and Sunday from 9:00 AM – 3:00 PM, year round.*

*Vote: Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 MOTION CARRIED*

*A motion was made at 8:50 PM to take a short 5-minute break.*

*Vote: Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 MOTION CARRIED*

*Meeting resumed at 8:55 PM.*

**B. Zoning Ordinance Rewrite**

*Mahaney moved, White seconded to skip this agenda item at this meeting.*

*Vote: Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 MOTION CARRIED*

**VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**A. Review of Planning Commission Priorities**

Meister asked Throenle to give more detail on the Asset Management Plan. Throenle indicated that Manager Lawry will be working on this as part of his responsibilities to go in-depth on roads, the sewer system, and a potential water system. This would then go to the Planning Commission. Kangas asked if Lawry would be collaborating with the Road Commission on this. Throenle indicated that Manager Lawry is part of the US 41 Corridor Group.

Mahaney asked about the order of the priorities. Throenle indicated that the Planning Commission is not held to a certain order.

Meister asked about the Nuisance Control Ordinance – Throenle indicated that this is to take a look at the Ordinance in the AF zoning district.

Mahaney asked about the Accessory Homesteading Activities – Throenle indicated that this had to do with the trend for different structures on a property, and the possibility of renting these structures (i.e. two houses on the same property – is one able to be rented).

*Meister moved, Mahaney seconded, to accept the 2017 – 2018 Planning Commission priorities as presented.*

*Vote: Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 MOTION CARRIED*

**B. Short Term Rentals**

Throenle opened this discussion with a trip he had taken downstate to a conference last week and a side trip he had taken to the Boyne Highlands area. All areas at the base of the mountain are rentals. He then went to Harbor Springs, where everything along the lake was a rental, and the homes were huge. After seeing this, he would like the Planning Commission to keep the rural character of our area in mind when looking at definitions for short term rentals. He would also suggest staying with the

size restrictions that are currently in our Ordinance.

Mahaney asked how to police this – Throenle indicated that they would still need a Zoning Compliance permit for an addition.

Meister felt the only way to make it acceptable is to have restrictions that would make it fit in with what is there. Mahaney also felt that the owner or someone who is responsible for the property needed to be local.

Throenle felt that short term rentals need to be looked at district by district. Meister stated that they could possibly look at road frontage. Throenle stated that the Planning Commission will need to use caution when establishing restrictions.

The Planning Commission then went through the definitions.

### **Zoning Ordinance Definitions in Relation To Short Term Rentals**

#### ***Bed & Breakfast***

##### ***Current***

*Means a use that is subordinate to a single-family detached dwelling unit in which transient guests are provided sleeping rooms (not to exceed four (4) rooms) and a breakfast only, in return for payment; is the owner's personal residence; is occupied by the owner at the time of rental; and, the length of stay of any guest is not to exceed 14 consecutive days and 30 days in one year.*

##### ***Proposed***

*A use of a single-family dwelling unit in which guests are provided temporary sleeping rooms, meals, and related amenities in return for monetary payment to the owner.*

*The dwelling unit is the owner's personal residence, is occupied by the owner at the time of rental, and the owner does not provide more than four sleeping rooms for guests.*

*The length of stay for the same guest is limited to 14 consecutive days and 30 days in a calendar year.*

##### **Discussion**

In the proposed, the related amenities would involve any kind of services that would be provided to the guests. The current only includes breakfast. The change would allow the owner some flexibility on if they wanted to provide coffee, treats, or other meals, or other services such as yoga or massage therapy.

The question was then raised about Home Occupation. Throenle stated that if this is just offered to the guests, it would not be considered a Home Occupation. If it was

offered to the public, then it would be necessary to obtain a Home Occupation permit.

There was some discussion on length of stay, and it was decided by the Commissioners that this should be a decision made by the owner, and not regulated by definition. The Planning Commission suggested the following for the Proposed:

*A use of a **single-family dwelling** unit in which guests are provided temporary sleeping rooms, meals, and related amenities in return for monetary payment to the owner.*

*The dwelling unit is the owner's personal residence, is occupied by the owner at the time of rental, and the owner does not provide more than four sleeping rooms for guests.*

~~*The length of stay for the same guest is limited to **14** consecutive days and **30** days in a calendar year.*~~

## **Campground**

### **Current**

*A parcel or tract of land under the control of any person wherein sites are offered for the use of the public or members of an organization either free of charge or for a fee, for the establishment of temporary living quarters consisting of any combination of three or more recreational vehicles, tents or other temporary habitable structures or sites.*

### **Proposed**

*A **tract of land** under the control of an owner or owner designee where the land is divided into sites offered for use by organizations or the public for the establishment of temporary living quarters consisting of any combination of **three** or more recreational vehicles, tents or other temporary habitable structures or sites.*

*This tract of land can be offered for use either free of charge or for a fee.*

### **Discussion**

Throenle explained this is in this discussion because he felt the language needed to be cleaned up in regards to "tract of land". The State of Michigan requires five camping spaces. Throenle also indicated that Chocolay Township has a campground at the marina, which has two camp pads which were built by a DNR grant in 2010. Because we are governmental, we are exempt.

Meister asked if there was any reason that we would need to match to the State. Throenle indicated that this was not necessary. Mahaney asked if campground was an allowable use in the AF district. Throenle stated it was.

The Planning Commission decided to go with the Proposed definition.

## **Dwelling, Multi-Family**

### **Current**

*A structure containing two or more dwelling units designed for residential use, with or without separate kitchens or dining facilities, and conforming in all respects to the standards set forth in **Section 6.3**. These may include apartment houses, apartment hotels, rooming houses, boarding houses, fraternities, sororities, dormitories, row houses, townhouses, and similar housing types, but not including hotels, motels, hospitals, or nursing homes.*

### **Proposed**

*A structure containing two or more dwelling units designed for residential use, with or without separate kitchens or dining facilities, without interior access to the other dwelling units, and conforming in all respects to the standards set forth in Section 6.3 of this ordinance.*

*This definition does not include hotels, hospitals, or nursing homes.*

### **Discussion**

Throenle indicated that since the Proposed is already pointing to Section 6.3 there was no need to go through the list.

The Planning Commission went with the Proposed definition.

## **Dwelling, Single-Family**

### **Current**

*A structure containing not more than one dwelling unit designed for residential use and conforming in all respects to the standards set forth in Section 6.3.*

### **Proposed**

*A building designed for use as one dwelling unit where no more than one family may occupy the dwelling unit.*

*A single-family dwelling unit must meet all requirements described in Section 6.3 of this ordinance.*

### **Discussion**

There was a question on why the proposed includes “no more than one family”. Kangas read the definition of family from the zoning ordinance. This seems to be consistent with the definition.

The Planning Commission agreed with the Proposed definition.

## **Hotel**

**Current**

*Means a structure designed, used, or offered for residential occupancy for any period less than one month, including tourist homes, resorts and motels, but not including hospitals and nursing homes.*

**Proposed**

*A place of business that rents multiple rooms at the same location for temporary occupancy, and has generally offers other amenities that may also be offered to the public (such as restaurants, pools, meeting rooms, and retail stores).*

*The length of stay for the same guest is not limited to a set number of calendar days.*

*This definition does not include hospitals, nursing homes, or group homes.*

**Discussion**

Due to some confusion because of definitions of tourist homes, etc., this has been rewritten to clean up the language. Kangas requested that line two of the proposed definition read "... occupancy, and ~~has~~ generally offers ..."

This change was agreed upon by the Planning Commission and the proposed definition was accepted.

**Recreational Unit**

**Current**

*Means a tent or vehicular type structure, primarily designed as temporary living quarters for recreational, camping or traveling use, which either has its own motive power or it is mounted on or drawn by another vehicle which is self powered. (Such unit shall not include a mobile home as defined herein.)*

**Proposed**

*A tent or vehicular type structure, primarily designed as temporary living quarters for recreational, camping or traveling use, which either has its own motive power or it is mounted on or drawn by another vehicle which is self powered.*

*This definition does not include mobile homes.*

**Discussion**

Mullen-Campbell asked about "tiny houses". Throenle indicated that in this case they would not be considered a recreational unit.

The Planning Commission agreed on the Proposed definition.

**Recreational Structure**

**Current**

*Means a cabin, cottage, camp, hunting camp, mobile home or other similar structure used intermittently for recreational or vacation purposes and which is not a permanent place of domicile or residency.*

**Proposed**

*A permanent structure used intermittently for occupancy for recreation or vacation purposes and which is not a permanent place of domicile or residency.*

*This definition does not include tents, blinds, tree houses or trailers generally used for travel or camping.*

**Discussion**

The Planning Commission agreed on the Proposed definition.

**Resort**

**Current**

*Means any parcel or tract of land under the control of any person wherein buildings or building space are offered for the use of the public or members of an organization, either free of charge or for a fee, for temporary living quarters incident to recreational use for any period less than one month.*

**Proposed**

A **tract of land** under the control of an owner or owner designee where two or more structures are offered for use of the public or members of an organization either free of charge or for a fee, for the establishment of temporary living quarters for any period less than one month.

*A resort has generally offers other amenities that may also be offered to the public (such as restaurants, pools, meeting rooms, and retail stores).*

*This definition does not include bed and breakfast, hotels, short term rentals, hospitals, group homes, and nursing homes.*

**Resorts are limited to the AF zoning district.**

**Discussion**

Throenle indicated that the Proposed language was modified to distinguish between a single family dwelling.

Resorts are currently listed in the AF district as a conditional use.

Mahaney asked if there were currently any resorts in Chocolay Township. Throenle indicated that we don't. Meister indicated that the language doesn't differentiate between a hotel and resort. Mahaney suggested that in a hotel everything is contained, whereas in a resort, it would be spread out, with more than one structure. Mahaney questioned as to why this would not be able to apply to the waterfront district. Throenle will remove the sentence "Resorts are limited to the AF zoning

district.” The Planning Commission approved the Proposed definition, minus the above removal.

## **Short Term Rental**

### **Current**

*None*

### **Proposed**

*A dwelling unit, owned and/or operated by the property owner, providing temporary accommodations for periods as short as one overnight stay, and rented more than fourteen days per year.*

*Such rentals are only permitted in specific zoning districts – AF, C, R1 and WFR – and must meet the established regulations for Short Term Rentals (section to be defined).*

*Such rentals are not permitted in any zoning district if restricted by deeds or covenants.*

### **Additional Language for Consideration**

*This definition does not include the use of campgrounds, hotel rooms, transitional housing operated by a nonprofit entity, group homes such as nursing homes and adult foster-care homes, hospitals, or housing provided by a substance-abuse rehabilitation clinic, mental-health facility, or other health care related clinic*

*This definition does not include housing units owned by a business entity and made available on a temporary basis to employees of that business entity or employees of a contractor working for that business entity.*

### **Discussion**

Throenle indicated that he recommends that the language needs to keep the language of anything restricted by deeds or covenants. Also, there is the stipulation of fourteen days – after this, the homeowner would lose their PRE.

There was much discussion about length of stay. Throenle indicated that the line, “A dwelling unit, owned and/or operated by the property owner, providing temporary accommodations for periods as short as one overnight stay. ~~and rented more than fourteen days per year~~”

Throenle indicated there was a need to rewrite the long term rental length of stay.

With the revision of the above, the Planning Commission agreed on the Proposed definition.

### **Structure**

*Means any constructed, erected, or placed material or combination of materials in or upon the ground, including, but not by way or limitation, buildings, mobile homes,*

radio towers, sheds, signs, and storage bins, but excluding fences, sidewalks, and paving on streets, driveways, parking areas, and patios excluding uncovered open porches not to exceed four feet above grade and not to encroach into the front yard setback by more than six feet in front of the single family dwelling.

**Proposed**

Placement of constructed, erected, or placed material or combination of materials in or upon the ground, including, but not by way or limitation – buildings, garages, mobile homes, pole barns, sheds, signs, and towers that will be in use more than six consecutive months.

This definition does not include fences, sidewalks, paving on streets, driveways, and parking areas.

This definition does not include patios and uncovered open porches or decks that do not exceed four feet above grade and not to encroach into the front yard setback by more than six feet in front of the dwelling unit.

Milton stated that code says 21” – Throenle stated that ours shows 4’. Milton feels that it should match the building code – anytime you need a handrail.

The Planning Commission decided to leave the definition of structure for another meeting, as there are many different aspects that need to be discussed in this definition.

**Rural Character**

**Current**

The rural character of Chocolay Township embodies a quality of life based upon traditional rural landscapes, activities, lifestyles, and aesthetic values. The measures of this quality of life and what future rural developments to look like can be found in the Comprehensive Master Plan. For purposes of this section, rural character shall also be defined to mean areas perceived as having a low density pattern of development, being generally void of man-made improvements such as city essential services and exhibiting open fields, farmlands or woodlands as common elements of the visual landscape.

Proposed

None

Throenle will bring the updated definitions back to the May meeting.

**C. Mixed Use Corridor**

Mahaney moved, Mullen-Campbell seconded to table this subject to next meeting.

Vote: Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 MOTION CARRIED

**IX. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**X. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS**

Milton – None

White - None

Mullen-Campbell – None

Kangas – None

Meister - None

Mahaney – Great meeting

**XI. DIRECTOR'S COMMENTS**

Throenle stated that he obtained much information from the conferences he attended. One of the key pieces was the availability of low interest loans from the USDA. These loans not only cover residential, but also infrastructure such as roads and sewer systems.

Next meeting there may be a potential Site Plan Review for the KBIC Casino project. If not in May, it will happen in June.

Suzanne Sundell is the new Community Development Coordinator – this will be a great help to Throenle and Manager Lawry as the Township moves forward with different projects.

There is a scenario that will come up next meeting – the property across the street (St. James the Less) is up for sale. Realtors are marketing the property as commercial, but it is zoned residential (R1). The Planning Commission will need to discuss the rezoning of this property. (Churches are a conditional use in a residential district)

Thanked the Planning Commission for their patience in going through the Conditional Use permit.

Mahaney questioned if the PC would be discussing Short Term Rentals next month. Throenle indicated that this is going to depend on if the Site Plan happens.

White asked about the possibility of having a special meeting in order to get caught up with some of the items that are pressing. This would be a possibility.

In regards to the Site Plan, there have been preliminary plans which have been reviewed by Chocolate Township personnel and the Fire Department. Kangas asked about the test well findings. No results yet. Throenle also indicated that KBIC is planning on having a Town Hall Meeting prior to the Site Plan review. There is a possibility that this could be combined with a Special Meeting.

**XII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND CORRESPONDENCE**

**A.** Minutes – 03/17/17 Marquette City Planning Commission

**B.** Minutes – 03/20/17 Township Board Minutes

**XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

Mahaney adjourned the meeting at 10:35 pm.

Submitted by:

---

Planning Commission Secretary  
Donna Mullen-Campbell