

Charter Township of Chocolay

Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, January 10, 2011

I. Meeting called to Order at 7:30 P.M. / Roll Call

Members present: Andy Sikkema, Kendal Milton (Chairperson), Andy Smith (Vice chairperson), Eric Meister, and Tom Mahaney

Members Absent: Dr. Ken Tabor, Mrs. Estelle DeVooght

Staff present: Jennifer B. Thum, Township Planner/Zoning Administrator

II. Approval November 1, 2010 Minutes

Mr. Andy Smith asked that his comment on the last page be written to state that he had a conversation with the gas station manager about placing lights at the corners of the lot. Staff noted the change.

Mr. Meister moved, Mr. Milton seconded to approve the minutes as written

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

III. Additional Agenda Items / Approval of Agenda

Ms. Thum asked that the Sign Ordinance be moved to Item VIII B.

Mr. Milton moved, Mr. Sikkema seconded to approve the agenda with the added change.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Conditional Use Permit #87

Mr. Milton stated that this was the neighbor of the person that had requested the Zoning Board of Appeals grant them a side setback of 2ft on the east side. Mrs. Thum explained that the owners of 2003 M 28E have a signed purchased agreement to purchase 25ft from Ms. Weiger, the applicant, for CUP #87. Mrs. Thum's concern was that if the agreement goes through, than part of the dune and vegetation that Ms. Weiger would like to see removed, could be part of 2003 M28E property. Ms. Thum explained that in her report she had written that maybe the Planning Commission should table this item until they can get confirmation that the sales agreement has gone through and then request that an updated survey be conducted to ensure that the dune and vegetation that is being proposed to be removed is not part of the purchase agreement. Mr. Milton noted that by looking at the pictures, they started the work prior to obtaining any of the permits.

Mr. Mahaney asked about the location of the garage. Ms. Thum stated that they are proposing to remove a portion of the dune and some vegetation on the East side of the property and place the dune fill on the West side.

Mrs. Thum stated that she went to the site and attempted to find where the new property line would be if the 25ft sales agreement went though. She stated that it appears that a portion of the dune that was removed would be located on the 2003 M-28E property.

Mr. Mahaney asked if we should wait and see what happens with the sales agreement? Mr. Milton stated the purchase agreement has already taken place, and the house was removed from 2003 M-28E.

Mr. Gary Enright, the construction firm for 2007 M-28E. He stated that the work began and he was not aware that they needed a permit. He asked if the purchase agreement had been signed. He was not aware of the purchase agreement. Mr. Enright approached the Commission to view the sales agreement that they had as part of their packet. The Commission reviewed the sales agreement and that the closing date had passed, so then it might not be official yet, and Mr. Milton stated that then complicates things.

Mr. Enright, explained the details of the garage, and that it will be a detached garage. Ms. Weiger wants it near the entrance of her house that is on the East Side. Mr. Enright showed the location of the garage on a picture that was provided to get a better idea of where it would be located in reference to the dune. Mr. Enright explained that the dune will be cut into, not completely removed. The dune should only be cut about 10ft in. There was further discussion with regards to the purchase agreement.

Mr. Milton asked if there were any other proposed comments on CUP #87. Hearing none the public hearing was closed.

B. Rezoning #145

Mr. Milton stated that proposed Rezoning #145 is for a five unit apartment complex with record storage in the basement and that the property is located at 425 Corning Ave. Mr. Milton then opened up the public hearing.

The applicant, Mr. Zarkowski, 1982 Orchard Street, they plan to turn the building into 5 units handicap accessible apartments; 4 will be two bedroom and 1 will be a one-bedroom apartment. The building would be 100% barrier free. Mr. Zarkowski went over the floor plan of the building. He stated that the basement will be rented to Bell Hospital as they are the owners of the records in the basement and there will be a separate entrance for them and the basement has sprinklers.

Mrs. Fradette, 126 W. Terrace

Mrs. Fradette, stated that they were concerned about the commercial aspect that is being introduced as part of the neighborhood, where this area is highly residential. They object to the commercial aspect of the proposed PUD. They stated that Bell Hospital were good neighbors. Also, that if the apartments could be done without having commercial in the basement, and then they would support this project. Mrs. Fradette stated that she is concerned about their property values.

Mr. Zarkowsk stated that the parcel has been commercial for over 30 years and the multi-family will be a nice transition between the commercial that exists and the single-family residential. The commercial will be in the basement.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Bob Cambsney, (insert address) engineer for the site. With a PUD if granted their approval and use can be rescinded, and that would assure the residents that no other commercial use would occupy the basement. If at some point the apartments don't make it you can't just put a new use in the basement without going before the Planning Commission, as there would be a major change in the approved plan. The commercial use is only for the continuation of record storage.

VI. PRESENTATIONS

A. None

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Rezoning #145

Mr. Milton stated that we should continue with Rezoning #145. The applicant is proposing to combine the multi-family designation with a commercial designation in the basement and he has to go through the PUD process. He will maintain the storage facility and use the upper portion for the multi-family use.

Mrs. Thum gave her report and her concerns along with the Department of Public Works and Fire Department. Her concerns dealt with regards to the use and that another driveway may want to be added for emergency purposes. Mrs. Thum was also concerned that there could be an increase in traffic on the streets and wondered what the expected number of vehicles would be at the site on a day to day basis. Also if there would be set hours for the building, as to when family or staff such as nurses and other doctors would be permitted to visit the building. Mrs. Thum also mentioned that past practices of PUD development and the Planning Commission's review has been to add landscaping and open space requirements to the proposed development. Mrs. Thum stated that this should be considered. However, the proposed development would be utilizing an existing site, so she was not sure if open space and additional landscaping would be required for an infill development. Mrs. Thum has stated that she has not received any comments from any of the local or state organizations that the notices were mailed to. The future land use map does show this site as residential. With regards to the Commercial use, if the business does not work, one of the conditions can be that it will revert back to residential. Also, the conditions could be that any commercial change in the basement has to come back before the Planning Commission as well.

Mr. Mahaney asked about the minimum lot requirement and if the applicant would be permitted to build an additional building onto the site or not.

Mrs. Thum explained that the proposed rezoning went before the ZBA at their December meeting and went over the minimum Floor Area ratio's and lot coverage. It would be something that the engineer and developer would have to show on a site plan so we could get an understanding as to what the lot coverage would be with an additional building. Mrs. Thum also mentioned that the sewer could be an issue if another building is proposed, she will have to check with DPW.

Mr. Sikkema stated that, the additional building is a good concern and that could be something that we add as part of the conditions, that any new building would have to go through the site plan process again. It would have to be part of the application.

Mr. Wolfson (realtor for Bell Hospital) stated that the only entrance for the basement is in the front. There is a service drive in the rear of the building that is used for maintenance people to get to the air conditioner and dumpster.

Mr. Sikkema read from the Township Zoning Ordinance about the PUD regulations and what is approved and permitted. They would not be able to change the use of commercial and we could name who the records belong to.

The applicant, Mr. Zarkowski, questioned the Planning Commission comments about the types of records that would be stored in the basement. There was further discussion between the Planning Commission and the applicant about the commercial request in a residential neighborhood. The Planning Commission wanted to address the commercial use to satisfy the residents and preserve the integrity of the neighborhood.

Mrs. Thum stated that she can work on a list of proposed conditions for approval of this site.

Mr. Milton went over the final site plan items that are required per the Township Zoning Ordinance and reviewed the current site plan.

Mr. Cambseny went over the current fence location and the staff's comment about the fence needing to be extended. Mr. Cambseny asked that if you were a neighbor, would you want to have to stare at a fence or the trees that they can see now. Also the neighbor's driveway is partially on Bell Hospital's property. Mr. Cambseny went over the neighboring lots that are zoned commercial.

Mr. Sikkema stated that there still appears to be some gaps into the application and that we need to make a recommendation to the Board, but we still needed answers. We need the applicant to quantify some items. A discussion occurred between the Planning Commission and the applicant with regards to record storage. In terms of the way records are stored, there are numerous ways that they could be stored including a computer system, paper, and so we need to get the intentions of the commercial storage.

There was a further conversation about records and the length of the process between the applicant and the Planning Commission.

Mr. Smith asked about what items should be added on the approval of preliminary approval for the applicant to follow and items that need to be added on the final site plan.

Mr. Meister moved, Mr. Mahaney second, that following the review of Rezoning Request #145, and the Staff/File Review, and holding a public hearing, the Planning Commission recommends Preliminary Approval and will forward Rezoning #145 to the County Planning Commission for their review. The applicant shall prepare the drawings for Final Site Plan review and those will be reviewed at our next Planning Commission meeting. The following information must be supplied to the Township as part of the Final Site Plan review.

1. The number of vehicles that would be expected to be at the site on a typical day.
2. Hours that the building will be open.
3. To indicate any signs that might be requested.
4. To indicate dedicated open space, new landscape and any fencing that will be expanded.
5. The Final Site plan will address any comments that were made by the state and local agencies
6. The applicant will provide a detailed definition of what records will be stored in the basement.
7. Any revisions to landscape, parking, lighting be shown on the final site plan and be approved by the Planning Commission.

Ayes: 4 Nays: 0 Abstained 1 (Milton)

Motioned Carried

B. Conditional Use Permit #87

Mr. Milton explained that this is a request for a Conditional Use Permit to construct a new garage at 2003 M-28E and the applicant has already cut into the dune and removed vegetation. We are not sure what type of vegetation was removed. Also the boundary line on the west side needs to be hashed out with regards to the dune and vegetation that is being proposed to be removed. The big issue is the ongoing sales agreement.

Mr. Milton is not sure how the conditions can be met at this time.

Mr. Sikkema asked about the application and the wall that is being proposed to be built. The home owner would like to install a rock wall along the beach and at the toe of the slope. The applicant, Gary Enright, showed on a picture, the potential location of the rocks.

Staff asked a question as to why she would not build a garage on the opposite location of the lot. Mr. Enright stated that is where the home owner wanted to build the garage.

The applicant stated that they would not have to remove the total dune, just enough to place the garage. The dune that was removed would be used for fill on the East side of the lot.

There was further discussion with the Planning Commission, applicant, and staff about the proposed garage and the layout in relationship to the dune.

The Planning Commission asked the applicant for further information, such as a cross section of the dune, and a drawing of the garage.

Mr. Smith commented that if the garage is built and the purchase agreement went through, would the applicant be able to meet the side setback? That needs to be addressed in order to approve the permit.

The applicant may not be able to build on the opposite side, because the applicant would have to drive over the septic tank and drainfield.

Mr. Meister moved, Mr. Sikkema seconded to table this item pending outcome of the property dispute and the applicant shall provide a detailed site plan showing the dune restoration plan, setbacks, cross section of the dune that is being proposed to be removed, and the new lot line

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

C. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-19

Mrs. Thum explained that this was part of the package of additional amendments that were proposed by Trustee Mark Maki. This is the only one that can be started though the process as the other is still in the works. Mrs. Thum explained that the proposed amendment is to change Section 1.6: Administrative Standards and Polices to be changed to the original language in the 1977 Zoning Ordinance. The Township changed this section in 2008 to be in conformance with the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act. Mrs. Thum explained the current language and why it was changed and that the specific MZE does cover what the old language did in relation to publishing and public notices.

Mr. Sikkema moved and Mr. Milton second to hold a public hearing for proposed text amendment #34-19-10 at our March 7, 2011 Planning Commission meeting.

D. Annual Report 2010

Mrs. Thum went over the report and stated that there were some grammar changes that needed to be made. It was also explained that it included what the Planning Commission did for the last year.

E. Top Priorities 2011 (not in any particular order)

1. Sign Ordinance
2. Junk car ordinance
3. Comprehensive plan
4. Attract new businesses
5. Playground in Harvey
6. Underground utilities along US 41S
7. DDA in Chocolay Township
8. Recreation sub-committee
9. Look into creating an additional AF zoning district that has a 5 acre minimum

F. Joint Meeting

Mrs. Thum explained that the Township Board wanted to hold a joint meeting this year. Mrs. Thum thought that the February meeting would be a good one, to get a better idea of the direction of the comprehensive plan. The Planning Commission needs to make a motion to hold a joint meeting with the Board, because they are inviting the Board to one of their meetings. Each Planning Commission member went over a couple of items they would like to see on the joint agenda.

Mr. Sikkema moved, Mr. Meister seconded, to hold a joint meeting with the Chocolay Township Board to discuss the sign ordinance, comprehensive plan, and other items that the Township Board would like to discuss at their February 7, 2011 meeting.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-18

The Planning Commission discussed the definition of height and the Michigan Building Codes department of height. The Commission wanted to remove the word "natural" from the

definition. There was further discussion by the Commission on the word grade and the previous discussion.

Mr. Smith moved Mr. Milton seconded, that the language that is written on the Zoning Ordinance Text Amendment application has been changed to state the change that was made at this meeting, is acceptable and we will hold a public hearing at the next schedule Planning Commission meeting.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

B. Proposed Sign Ordinance

Mr. Sikkema moved and Mr. Smith seconded to table the proposed sign ordinance until our March 7, 2010 meeting

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

C. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-13

Mr. Sikkema moved and Mr. Smith seconded to table amendment #34-10-13, #34-10-14, #34-10-14, #34-10-15 and #34-10-16 until next scheduled meeting.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

D. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-14

Mr. Sikkema moved and Mr. Smith seconded to table amendment #34-10-13, #34-10-14, #34-10-14, #34-10-15 and #34-10-16 until next scheduled meeting.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

E. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-15

Mr. Sikkema moved and Mr. Smith seconded to table amendment #34-10-13, #34-10-14, #34-10-14, #34-10-15 and #34-10-16 until next scheduled meeting.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

F. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-16

Mr. Sikkema moved and Mr. Smith seconded to table amendment #34-10-13, #34-10-14, #34-10-14, #34-10-15 and #34-10-16 until next scheduled meeting.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

Kim L. Hillier, Co-owner of the Maple Tree Court and Togo's. They are looking at adding new signage and are concerned that their proposed sign won't meet the proposed sign ordinance. They would like to add a roof sign and was not sure if it would be permitted. The Planning Commission had discussion about the roof sign, and that due to the location of the sign, it really is not considered a roof sign and, therefore, could be permitted. The roof signs were not intended to extend above the roof.

X. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENT

Mr. Sikkema stated that MDOT is moving ahead of the reconstruction of US 41 from Bayou Street to the Carp River Bridge, which is scheduled for 2012. The project will consist that the pavement will stay in place, raise the road about 2ft and then the curb and gutter will be eliminated, will have a standard ditch.

XI. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A. Public Notices

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Sikkema made the motion to adjourn at 10:00pm.

SPECIAL MEETING
CHOCOLAY TOWNSHIP BOARD
CHOCOLAY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

February 7, 2011

A Special meeting of the Chocolay Township Board and Chocolay Township Planning Commission was held on Monday, February 7, 2011 at the Chocolay Township Office, 5010 U. S. 41 South, Marquette, MI. Supervisor Seppanen called the Township Board meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

Planning Vice Chair Andy Smith called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

TOWNSHIP BOARD.

PRESENT: Greg Seppanen, John Greenberg, John Trudeau, Mark Maki, Ken Tabor, Susan Carlson.

ABSENT: Arlene Hill.

TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION.

PRESENT: Andy Smith, Andy Sikkema, Tom Mahaney, Estelle DeVooght, Ken Tabor (also on Township Board).

ABSENT: Kendall Milton, Eric Meister.

STAFF PRESENT: Steve Lawry, Mary Sanders, Jennifer Thum.

The purpose of the Special Township Board/ Planning Commission meeting was to discuss and coordinate direction for the Planning Commission 2011 priorities and goals.

PUBLIC COMMENT.

Mark Maki, 370 Karen Road - Commented that misinformation went unchallenged on Planning and Zoning issues prior to him being a Trustee on the Board. There have been decisions made based on this inaccurate information. Examples are Blondeau Trucking stipulated agreement, zoning for the church on Green Garden Hill, and the Sign Ordinance/Holiday Station sign.

PLANNING COMMISSION 2010 ANNUAL REPORT.

Jennifer Thum, Planning Director summarized the 11 page annual report; Including descriptions of 18 text amendments, Sign and Junk Car Ordinances and various permits.

Comments made by Planning Commission members and Township Board members on the annual report:

- When the Sign Ordinance is complete the Planning Commission will test it on at least 5 business locations to check compliance of current signs.
- Technology is rapidly changing and the Sign Ordinance needs the ability to evolve with it.
- Discussed the difference between flashing light vs. lighted sign (Holiday Sign).
- The change on the Holiday Sign is not noticeable when driving past it.
- The entrance lighting at the Holiday Station is poor and should be addressed.
- Planning Commission feels the assessment of all of the Township parks is important, but they did not have time to complete it in 2010.
- The Planning Commission worked mainly on text amendments and the Sign Ordinance in 2010.
- Judy Vonck – 559 Little Lake Road, concerns about lack of access to wireless communication towers in the agricultural district. How do we move forward in that direction?
- The demand for wireless communications continues to grow and the tower demand will grow with that.
- Page 10 of the 2010 annual report stated that the Planning Commission made several changes to the Sign Ordinance and should have read *the Planning Commission suggested many changes to the Sign Ordinance*.

Greenberg moved, Trudeau second to accept the Planning Commission annual report with the changes addressed above.

AYES: 6

NAYS: 0

MOTION CARRIED.

PLANNING COMMISSION 2011 PRIORITIES AND GOALS.

Dick Arnold, 312 Co. Road 545 commented that the rezoning of A/F District rezoned 13,000 acres into agricultural district that currently contains 3 active farmers, 6 or 7 part time farmers and 300 single family homes.

The Planning Commission proposed top priorities for 2011 are:

- Sign Ordinance
- Junk Car Ordinance
- Comprehensive Plan
- Attract new business to Chocolay Township
- Playground in Harvey
- Underground utilities along U S 41 S.
- DDA in Chocolay Township

- Recreational sub-committee
- Look into creating an additional AF zoning district that has a 5 acre minimum

Comments from Township Board and Planning Commission:

- Farming area should stay at 20 acres or larger.
- Industrial and commercial zoning districts are needed in the Township.
- DDA district would have to be initiated by the business community
- We need an area designated as transitional for commercial and industrial.
- The market should decide on when and where additional commercial and industrial zoning should be.
- Zoning should be flexible enough to allow for adding commercial and industrial when the need arises in the future.
- The Comprehensive plan would be a good place to indicate locations for future commercial and industrial development.
- The Board is not interested in setting up a Township Industrial Park area; that should be driven by the market.
- The Township should notify the residents through larger display ads and larger mailing areas when we change zoning.

Tabor moved, Carlson second to accept the Planning Commission 2011 priorities with the Sign Ordinance, Comprehensive Plan, transitional commercial zoning and a playground in Harvey as top priorities.

AYES: 6

NAYS: 0

MOTION CARRIED.

SIGN ORDINANCE.

Considerations when writing the Sign Ordinance:

- The Holiday sign is set at a lighting change every 20 seconds. That seems an appropriate amount of time and is not distracting to drivers.
- Changeable LED lighting is appropriate on signs; scrolling text/flashing on signs is too distracting.
- We need to think about multiple businesses in the Township with lighted signs possibly being a hazard to driving.
- The Planning Commission should get input from sign companies while writing the Sign Ordinance.
- We need to consider camp signs on M-28 and Lakewood Lane when writing the Sign Ordinance.

PUBLIC COMMENT.

Trustee Maki is concerned with absences of Planning Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals members.

Supervisor Seppanen thanked the Planning Commission for all the work they do for the Township.

Supervisor Seppanen adjourned the meeting at 9:15 pm.

Arlene E. Hill, CMC
Clerk

Mary L. Sanders, CMC
Deputy Clerk

**Charter Township of Chocolay
Planning Commission Minutes**

Monday, February 15, 2011

I. Meeting called to Order at 7:30 P.M. / Roll Call

Members present: Kendell Milton (Chairperson), Andy Smith (Vice chairperson), Andy Sikkema, Eric Meister, Tom Mahaney, Dr. Ken Tabor, and Mrs. Estelle DeVooght

Members Absent: None

Staff present: Jennifer B. Thum, Township Planner/Zoning Administrator

II. Approval January 10, 2011 and February 7, 2011,

Mr. Milton asked that page 5 of the Minutes be amended. There were only 4 Ayes votes and he has to abstain. Mrs. Thum stated that she corrected that part.

Mrs. DeVooght moved, Mr. Milton seconded to approve the Minutes as written

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

I. Additional Agenda Items / Approval of Agenda

Mr. Sikkema moved, Mr. Milton seconded to approve the agenda with the added change.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

III. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. None

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Darrell Adair, 141 Terrace Street, stated that he received a letter from the Township concerning the proposed use by Z and P properties. He stated that he is not for the project, because of the concern with the increase in traffic the multi-family site could cause because it's nearby a day care center. He also stated that the site is large and the applicant will probably want to expand. He was concerned with the possibility of traffic and the expansion of additional multi-family buildings.

Steve Zarkowski, 1982 Orchard Street, Marquette, MI

Showed the plan of the building will remain one story and will be barrier free, but no government money, so he cannot discriminate against anyone, but being barrier free should determine who goes into the apartment. In the future, he may want to build an additional building that would be a 5-plex apartment. With the commercial across the street his lot will be a transition lot from the commercial to the residential. He is to present the proposal for the final site plan approval.

Mr. Milton asked for any additional public comment. Hearing none he moved to Old Business.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Rezoning #145

Mr. Milton stated that the proposed use will improve the overall Township's tax base as the building will go back on the tax roll, so it will be a benefit to the community. He then asked for any other Board comments.

Mr. Tabor stated that it looks like a good idea.

Mr. Sikkema discussed the parcel size and that the applicant has stated that he would like to develop more apartment buildings on the site. That is something that the

Planning Commission needs to consider, especially when you look at what the residents' concerns have been with the proposed plan. The residents, who took the time to come to a Planning Commission meeting, stated that there were concerned about the possibility of a future building.

There was further discussion on if an additional building would change the overall character of the R-2 neighborhood.

Mr. Sikkema discussed the numbers in detail, under the R-2 District, 7 units would be permitted, so the applicant could potentially have two more units. We need to address this and figure out what number we would expect to see on the lot.

Mr. Mahaney stated that he likes what is on the plan and that is what we are approving tonight.

Mr. Sikkema – we need to have a discussion so that we are fair and let him know what we will expect. So we need to pick out some number that is fair for both the applicant and the neighbor.

There was open discussion about the zoning ordinance and the current layout of the lot and the future layout of the lot if another building is proposed. The commissioners discussed if they can discuss if they should have discussion with the applicant on the future development and how many additional apartment units they would approve.

Bob Camsney, Engineer for Z & P properties, stated that you are looking at one building, but any additional change will have to go through the process again, so it's hard to say what number we will expect.

Dr. Tabor- stated that we are approving what is in front of us. We cannot really set number. Tabor does not see the practically to a point, nice to look in the future, but things could change.

There was further discussion on what to expect in the future. The rest of the members felt that they are approving what is in front of them.

Mrs. Thum asked the applicant, Mr. Zarkowski, about the expected traffic impact, as it was not noted on the site plan.

Mr. Zarkowski stated that its hard to figure out what the traffic impact would be. Should not see more traffic.

Dr. Tabor, moved Mr. Meister seconded, that following the review of Rezoning Request #145, and the Staff/File Review, and holding a public hearing on January 10, 2011, the Planning Commission recommends Final Approval and will forward Rezoning #145 to the Chocolay Township Board for their review. The applicant shall prepare the drawings for the Township Board with the recommended changes from the Planning Commission. The following are conditions of approval:

1. The rezoning is consistent with the Township Comprehensive Plan; and
2. The rezoning will allow the redevelopment of a current vacant building and put the building back on the Township tax roll ; and
3. That the applicant is required to obtain all necessary State and Local permits prior to opening of the development; and
4. If the proposed development does not make it, then the building and lot shall revert back to the original zoning district of R-2 (High density residential).; and
5. The applicant shall complete a Zoning Compliance Permit and pay the necessary fee; and
6. The applicant shall contact the Department of Public Works before utilizing the sewers.

Mr. Milton asked if there was any discussion.

Mr. Sikkema stated that he just cannot support this proposed development. It's still too

wide open and by not knowing what the future development looks like, it's not fair to the development or neighborhood.

Not against this type of development, but just cannot support this.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 1 (Sikkema)

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

B. Proposed Sign Ordinance:

Staff asked about the bill board near the Varvil Center and the snowmobile signs. There was discussion on billboard and billboard permits.

There was discussion about the electronic message signs and the results of the joint planning commission sign.

The Commissioners discussed the joint meeting and the Township Board input and about their idea to send it to the local sign companies.

There was discussion on the residential signs and what would be permitted as far as camp signs in the WFR district and the AF District. The Commission also discussed the definition of "camp" and how we could regulate residential signs and certain areas.

There was further discussion on the sign ordinance, and the types of banners that will be permitted, the sandwich board signs, and the size of signs that would be permitted in the AF District.

The Commissioners felt that more square footage should be permitted for banners, but they did like the 20% limit. The Commissioners felt that 100 square foot would be sufficient, with the 20% rule.

Mr. Sikkema moved and Dr. Tabor seconded to table approving the sign ordinance until the local sign companies can read the document over.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 All in favor.
No discussion.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

Jennifer introduced Mr. Anthony Gerzetch, an intern from NMU, that will be working with her to assist with the Township Planning and Zoning Projects.

X. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENT

XI. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Public Notices

A. Dick Arnold stated that it's not too much to ask the Township to place the public notices as block ads. Talked about the zoning ordinance change. We should do more notices.

Mr. Mahaney mentioned that we could try running off some copies of the proposed ordinance changes and leave them in front of Ace, and if they are in the newspaper, they should be located in the main section not the legal section.

B. Zoning Amendments

Amendments 1.6, talk to Mike Summers about the proposed ordinance. If we can use portion of his amendment or if we have to take our own and start over.

Staff will put together a tentative calendar of zoning text amendments, and proposed work schedule.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Milton adjourned the meeting at 9:00pm.

Charter Township of Chocolay Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, March 7 2011

I. Meeting called to Order at 7:30 P.M. / Roll Call

Members present: Kendell Milton (Chairperson), Andy Smith (Vice chairperson), Andy Sikkema, Eric Meister, Dr. Ken Tabor, and Mrs. Estelle DeVooght

Members Absent: Tom Mahaney

Staff present: Jennifer B. Thum, Township Planner/Zoning Administrator

II. Approval February 7, 2011 and February 15, 2011 Minutes

Mrs. DeVooght moved and Dr. Tabor seconded to approve the Minutes as written.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

III. Additional Agenda Items / Approval of Agenda

Dr. Tabor moved, and Mrs. DeVooght seconded to approve the agenda with the added change.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- A. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-18
- B. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-19
- C. Proposed Bicycle and Snowmobile Ordinance #57

Don Britton – 121 Deerview Trail

Spoke about proposed ordinance #57. He stated that he is an avid snowmobiler, and is the Vice Chair for Iron Ore Heritage Trail. Mr. Britton stated the he supports the Township allowing snowmobiles to use the M-28 and US41s trails and for two-way traffic along M-28 and one-way traffic along US 41S. Mr. Briton also indicated that the MDOT and DNR funds were used for the trail and bridge. The grant money that was used does not allow motor traffic, but it does allow local government to authorize sleds to use the trail, then they can operate the trail with snowmobiles, will not allow ATV's.

Mark Maki - 370 Karen Road

Spoke about proposed text amendment #34-10-19

Mr. Maki discussed his previous amendments and that he did not receive notification for some of them and that is why he is proposing text amendment #34-10-19. Mr. Maki stated that he would like to use the old administrative procedures language that was used in the 1977 Township's Zoning Ordinance. (Mark approached the table to look at one of the PC packets to show the old administrative procedures and law).

Mr. Maki stated that he just received a copy of what Ms. Thum is now proposing and read the sentence where it referenced that the applicant for any proposed text amendments shall be notified. He stated that the wording looks ok at this point and that he could work with Ms. Thum on the wording that should be used.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mark Maki – 370 Karen Road

Mr. Maki discussed the minutes from the joint meeting and that he was not in favor of changing the sign ordinance. He believes that the flashing signs could be a hazard for drivers who are passing the signs along US 41S. Mr. Maki also commented about his own experience driving by the Holiday Gas Station sign.

VI. PRESENTATIONS

A. None

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-18

The commission discussed the 2ft adjustment within the setback and the requirement of site plan review. It was stated that if you stay out of the setback then you are fine, but if the grade change is located in the setback area then you have to come before the Planning Commission.

Mr. Meister moved, and Mr. Sikkema seconded, to approve Proposed Text Amendment 34-10-18, to amend Section 2: Definition- Height to read as follows, the vertical distance measured from the average grade to the highest point of the roof. (Accessory structures are to the midpoint of the roof) and to amend Section 6.1 General Provision – footnote #6 to read as follows, no detached accessory building shall exceed sixteen feet and six inches (16’6”) in average BUILDING height as determined by the Zoning Administrator nor exceed the exterior perimeter dimensions of the principal structure on the lot. Any grade adjustment within the setback of any district and/or any grade adjustments over 2t would require site plan review, with the following formula:

R-1 District - Side and rear yard setbacks for accessory structures must be increased two (2) feet for every foot over fifteen (15) feet.

R-2 District - Side and rear yard setbacks for accessory structures must be increased three (3) feet for every foot over fifteen (15) feet (34-09-17)

The Planning Commission recommends that this proposed amendment be approved by the Chocloy Township Board. The Planning Director shall forward this amendment to the County Planning Commission for their recommendation then send it to the Township Board.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 All in Favor

B. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-19

The Planning Commission discussed the current language and the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act. Mrs. Thum went over the new law and that it does not state that the applicant should be notified. She clarified that she has brought forward new suggested language that the Commission should consider adding under Letter B in Section 1.6. Mrs. Thum also stated that the requirement to send the date of the schedule public hearing to the applicant is part of a checklist that staff does follow. However, it might not be a bad idea to include it in our Township Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Sikkema moved and Dr. Tabor seconded to table proposed text amendment #34-10-19 until our next meeting. Also to direct staff to review ordinance in the surrounding areas that deal with notification of the applicant for various zoning changes.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 All in Favor

C. Proposed Bicycle and Snowmobile Ordinance #57

Mrs. Thum explained why the ordinance is needed and that we had a resident voice their concern about the decibels that the snowmobiles produce. It was pointed out that it's not the manufacture mufflers, it's the modifications that people do to their machines.

The dates of the snowmobile trail were discussed and it was stated that ordinance should include the actual dates and not just say that when the trail is covered with snow. Then the snowmobilers know when they can utilize the trail. If the signs are up for motorized users, the dates have to be up and shown then they can operate on top of the trail.

There was conversation about bicycles and snowmobile using the trail and it was stated that under most circumstance they won't be sharing the trail.

The Planning Commission discussed the decibels of snowmobiles compared to logging trucks on the highway. The snowmobile act states that the limit is 78 decibels at 50 feet.

Mr. Andy Smith that there is the potential for him to groom the trail so he will excuse himself from voting on the proposed ordinance.
The Planning Commission also discussed two-way traffic along M-18 and US 41S.

Dr. Tabor moved, and Mr. Milton seconded to approve the proposed Bicycle and Snowmobile Ordinance #57 with the change to Section 3 to specify the dates that the trail may be used by snowmobiles and recommend that the Chocoday Township Board concur with the Planning Commission and approve the proposed ordinance #57. The Planning Director shall forward the proposed ordinance and any comments received by the Township residents for or against the proposed ordinance to the Marquette County Planning Commission for their review.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 (Mr. Smith abstained)

D. Township Noise Ordinance

Mrs. Thum stated that it was suggested by Dr. Scott Emerson to look at a Township wide noise ordinance and to deal with the snowmobiles. Mr. Sikkema discussed that the state does set limits for the decibel levels for vehicles traveling on the roads and some vehicles do exceed the limit, but it's hard to enforce. There was further discussion about the snowmobile testing that has been going on by law enforcement and that it's a long procedure and the problem is the aftermarket additions to the sleds. The commissions felt at this time the current ordinance is in place and is effective so no changes were recommended.

E. Home Occupations

The Planning Commission discussed the current ordinance in relationship to the Michigan Medical Marijuana Act.

F. Schedule for Zoning Amendment

The Planning Commission looked over the schedule for the next four months as to what proposed text amendment will be brought forward and no changes were recommended. The proposed schedule is:

- April 11, 2011**
- 34-10-19 (section 1.6)
- 34-10-13 (acreage requirement for livestock)
- 34-10-14 (Revising definition for agriculture)

May 2, 2011

34-10-10 (roads)

34-10-15 (wireless)

June 6, 2011

34-10-11 (PUD's)

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. None

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. None

X. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENT

The commissioners discussed the Holiday Gas station entrance. Mr. Sikkema talked about the reconstruction of US 41S for 2012. There was also discussion about adding something to Section 1.6 that all owners that would be affected by a zoning map change shall be notified. For example if the AF2 is created the effected properties will be notified by mail.

XI. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A. None

Dr. Tabor made the motion to adjourn the meeting at 8:50pm, all were in favor.

Charter Township of Chocoday Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, April 11, 2011

I. Meeting called to Order at 7:30 P.M. / Roll Call

Members present: Kendell Milton (Chairperson), Andy Smith (Vice chairperson), Andy Sikkema, Eric Meister, Tom Mahaney, Dr. Ken Tabor, and Mrs. Estelle DeVooght

Staff present: Jennifer B. Thum, Township Planner/Zoning Administrator

II. Approval of March 7, 2011 Minutes

Mr. Milton moved and Mrs. Devooght seconded to approve the Minutes with the suggested changes from Mr. Milton written.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

III. Additional Agenda Items / Approval of Agenda

Dr. Tabor moved, and Mrs. DeVooght seconded to approve the agenda with the added change.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

IV. Public Hearings

A. None

V. Public Comment

A. None

VI. Presentations

A. None

VII. New Business

A. Silver Creek Recreation Property

The Township has discussed at the staff level about purchasing a lot on Silver Creek Rd that would make ingress and egress easier for our residents to utilize our SCRA. The lot would also allow the Township to straighten out the driveway and make it easier for the park users to park their vehicles. Ms. Thum went over the assessed value and the history of that lot. Also, there was some concern if a new home would be able to be built and meet the current setback for that zoning district. Mr. Johnson, the DPW Foreman talked about the benefits to the users of the park and to the Township.

Dr. Tabor moved, and Mr. Smith seconded to have Township staff explore the possibility of utilizing the neighboring property that we already own to straighten out the driveway. Then also to explore how much the home owner would sell the property for.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 2 (Sikkema, DeVooght)

Motion Carried

B. Township Marina

Ms. Thum talked about how staff came across this grant opportunity and thought it would be a great idea for the residents in the Harvey area. Ms. Thum went over the details and that the Board granted permission to start the writing and to submit the grant, as they can always turn it down.

Mr. Sikkema stated that this park of the larger scale tend to attract more people and wondered what the size of the proposed park will be.

Mr. Mahaney questioned what type of equipment would be at the park? Ms Thum stated they are looking at a large play structure, slide and some swings. In the future we hope to relocate the current pavilion that is at the Township Hall property to this site as well.

Mr. Meister stated that if you look at the parks that are in the City of Marquette, they are close to water and hardly any of them are surrounded by a fence.

Dr. Tabor moved, and Mr. Meister seconded to hold a public hearing at our May 2, 2011 Planning Commission meeting to hear the residents' concerns and suggestion on the proposed park at the Township Marina.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

C. Planning Commission Ordinance

The commissioners discussed the proposed ordinance, one error was noted by Mr. Sikkema. Ms. Thum explained that this ordinance does not have to go to the County Planning Commission, she just wanted the PC to review.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-19

Ms. Thum discussed that this proposed text amendment was raised by Mr. Mark Maki and it's to change section 1.6: Administrative Standards and the wording regarding public hearing notices. The Commissioners like the newly suggested language, Mr. Smith wanted one changed. He suggested that no matter how many property owners would be affected, the individual owners should be notified if their zoning district is going to change. The proposed change was to (B) #10, which stated, "If there is a proposed zoning map change the owner(s) will be given written notice at least 15 days prior to the public hearing. The notice shall explain their current zoning district and the proposed zoning district. This shall be done regardless of the number of parcels that would be potentially affected."

Mr. Meister moved and Dr. Tabor seconded that we accept proposed text amendment #34-10-19 and recommend that the Marquette County Planning Commission approve the text amendment.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Carried.

B. Sign Ordinance

There was discussion on the electric licensing, and whether the Township should enforce it. Mr. Milton suggested that some language stating that electrical permits are required and must be pulled from the County Building Codes should be included on the sign application.

The commissioners looked through the ordinance and the suggested changes from Cook Sign and made the following changes to the proposed sign ordinance.

1. Change page 7, Page 5. To read - other sign configurations can be submitted and approved by the Township Zoning Administrator. Each individual signs shall be compatible in size, in relationship to width and height.
2. Strike #5 from Section 18.5, on page 8
3. Add to Section 18.5, #6, the word County after Marquette and before Building.
4. Add to Section 18.5, #9, the sign only has to be removed at grade if such sign is not located in the right-of-way.
5. Add to Section 18.7 Letter F, increase the square footage of the menu board to 40 square feet.
6. Modify Section 19.0 #2E, to read that sandwich board signs shall not be located in the right-of-way.

Dr. Tabor moved and Mr. Milton seconded to approve the proposed sign ordinance, with the suggested changes listed about and to recommend approval and send it to the Marquette County Planning Commission for their approval.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion carried

C. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-13

This is a proposed amendment that was brought up by the Planning Commission in 2010 to explore the possibility of placing acreage requirements on livestock in the Agricultural/Forestry District, (AF). The commissioners felt that if you are living in the AF District, regardless of the acres you should be permitted to have chickens and other livestock. It's not the Planning Commission job to regulate animal safety. Ms. Thum thought we should look into modifying the definition of kennels.

Mr. Mahoney moved and Mr. Meister seconded to rescind proposed text amendment #34-10-13.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion carried

D. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-14

Mr. Sikkema moved and Mr. Mahaney to table proposed text amendment #34-10-14.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 1 (DeVooght)

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. None

IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENT

- A. Mr. Sikkema discussed the construction project that will occur on US-41S during 2012.

X. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- A. Ms. Thum informed the Commission of the correspondence from Trustee Maki.

XII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND CORRESPONDENCE

- A. Planning and Zoning News, February 2011
- A. Fax from Mark Maki, April 4, 2011
- B. Information from MSU Extension about Census

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Milton adjourned the meeting at 9:15pm

**Charter Township of Chocolay
Planning Commission Minutes
Monday, May 2, 2011**

I. Meeting called to Order at 7:30 P.M. / Roll Call

Members present: Kendell Milton (Chairperson), Andy Smith (Vice chairperson), Andy Sikkema, Eric Meister, Tom Mahaney, and Mrs. Estelle DeVooght

Absent: Dr. Ken Tabor

Staff present: Jennifer B. Thum, Township Planner/Zoning Administrator

II. Approval of April 11, 2011 Minutes

Mrs. DeVooght moved and Mr. Milton second to approve the Minutes with the suggested changes from Mr. Sikkema concerning the vote on the Township Property and his comment about the size of parks.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

III. Additional Agenda Items / Approval of Agenda

Mr. Milton stated that there was an additional item presented, which was to reappoint two Planning Commission members, Mr. Milton and Mrs. DeVooght. Mrs. DeVooght has not made up her mind yet.

Mr. Milton moved, and Mr. Sikkema second to approve the agenda with the additional change.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

IV. Public Hearings

A. Township Marina, proposed playground

Public Comment

Mr. Pete LaRoo wanted to state that as a long time volunteer for Chocolay Township, there have been a lot of upgrades with regards to bicycle paths and tunnels, but we have neglected the little kids. The Lion's Club is willing to help out with the proposed park. He has visited the site and he thinks that the east side of the marina would work out well for the kids. A lot of our residents and their kids go to Marquette to utilize the playgrounds. However, the park should be in small scale.

Ms. Deb England, 1431 M-28E, she stated that she is the youth director at the Silver Creek Church and runs the Block Party that the Church has put on the past three years. Agrees that we need a park for little kids, she does use the marina and believes that it's a great place as it's off the highway.

Ms. Dorothy Kahler, 121 W Main Street, thinks that a park for little kids is a great idea, but the marina is a bad idea. That location is for boaters and it has been established as a Hiawatha Spot and basically it has been established as an adult place and they won't want little kids at that site.

Mr. Don Harris – objection to the Marijuana place that is in Chocolay Township. Not sure how the permit was issued when the gentleman asks for set donations.

Mr. Forrest Libby, 136 W. Main Street, not in favor of the playground at the Township Marina site due to the number of fisherman. He does know that young adults and children need recreation and is ok with a slide and some picnic tables. He has had individuals park their vehicles on his property.

Mr. Denny Magadanz, 158 Main Street, also recognizes that kids need a place to play in that neighborhood, but there are people that park on their lawn. Another place would be the Lion's field for the kids would give them a playground on that side.

Public Comment was closed.

V. Public Comment

A. None

VI. Presentations

A. None

VII. New Business

A. Planning Commission Reappointments (added at meeting)
Mr. Milton asked if Mrs. DeVooght has made her decision yet, and she stated that she has not decided.

Mr. Sikkema moved and Mr. Meister second to recommend to the Township Supervisor to reappoint Mr. Milton to the Planning Commission.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Abstained: 1 (Milton)

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Township Marina

Mrs. Thum went over the grant project and that it was indented for a neighborhood park, and the Harvey area does meet the criteria. The applicant does require an exact location, as an address needs to be typed in.

The Commission asked if the Silver Creek Recreation Area could be utilized for the playground equipment as there appears to be less of an issue with parking and traffic. Also it was pointed out that there siblings of the children that are participating in a baseball or soccer game would be able to utilize the equipment.

The Commission asked question about what equipment would be used (slide, swings, etc.) staff stated that there would be a slide, swings and playground unit with a climbing wall. The total amount would be about \$25,000. There is room for playground equipment, but it was intended to be a walk to park and not for people to drive too.

Mr. Mahoney discussed that the City of Marquette has several parks that are near water and roadways. It's more the parent's responsibility to watch their children. There could be a problem with the parking at the marina and that is a concern. That is the big issue. The location is good because it's in a neighborhood.

Mr. Milton stated that we should pursue the grant as the consensus is more for it than not.

Mr. Milton moved and, Mr. Smith second, to pursue grant through Lowes and the Planning Commission would like to have the playground located at Silver Creek Recreation because more of the funds could be spent on the equipment, with the Township Marina as a back up space if Lowe's does not feel that the SCRA would be a suitable location.

Ayes: 4 Nays: 2 (DeVooght, Sikkema) Motion passed

B. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-14

Mr. Sikkema read the current definition of agriculture. There was further discussion on businesses that are currently active in the AF District and that there is nothing that states that they are not permitted. Mr. Sikkema stated that he does not see anything wrong with the current definition, Mrs. DeVooght and Mr. Meister agreed. Mr. Milton stated that the Right to Farm Act should cover the rest.

There was discussion on what types of farms would be considered commercial and what would be permitted.

Mr. Sikkema moved and Mrs. DeVooght second to rescind proposed text amendment #34-10-14

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Motion approved

C. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-15

Mrs. Thum went over the history of this proposed amendment and stated that there is part of the current zoning ordinance that states that wireless towers are permitted in the Agricultural/Forestry (AF) District. There was discussion about the current language in the ordinance and if there should be a lot size requirement. There is current language in the ordinance that states that towers in the AF District can only be 75 feet. It was the consensus of the Commission to do more research and to see what other communities have as far as regulating wireless towers in their communities.

Mr. Meister would like Wireless Towers to be a conditional use that way the neighboring parcels would have input on the proposed tower. There was a question about what would be considered a tower.

There was discussion about what would happen if a home owner who wants to put a tower for the purpose of Television should be required to obtain a permit.

Overall the Commission felt that towers should be a conditional use in the AF District. Looking at acreage requirement should also be part of the research.

Mr. Sikkema moved and Mr. Meister second to table proposed text amendment #34-10-15 to allow staff more time to research neighboring communities' ordinances on wireless towers.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Motion carried

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. None

IX. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENT

A. Mr. Smith asked about the marijuana operation in the Township

X. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A. None

XI. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND CORRESPONDENCE

- A. Planning and Zoning News, March 2011
- B. City of Marquette Planning Commission minutes, March 1, 2011, March 15, 2011 and April 5, 2011

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Milton adjourned the meeting at 9:15pm

Charter Township of Chocelay Planning Commission Minutes

Monday, June 6, 2011

I. Meeting called to Order at 7:30 P.M. / Roll Call

Members present: Kendell Milton (Chairperson), Andy Smith (Vice chairperson), Andy Sikkema, Eric Meister, Dr. Ken Tabor, Tom Mahaney, and Max Engle.

Staff present: Jennifer B. Thum, Township Planner/Zoning Administrator, and Police Chief Greg Zyburt.

II. Approval of May 2, 2011 Minutes

Mr. Sikkema moved and Mr. Milton seconded to approve the Minutes as written

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

III. Additional Agenda Items / Approval of Agenda

Dr. Ken Tabor moved and Mr. Sikkema seconded to approve the agenda as written for the June 6, 2011 meeting.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

IV. Public Hearings

A. None

V. Public Comment

A. None

VI. Presentations

Mr. Tony Harry, ORV's

Mr. Harry lives at 6369 US 41S and has been a resident of Chocelay Township for 26 years and asked to be on the agenda to discuss ORV's in Chocelay Township. He stated that in 2008, Marquette County passed an ordinance to permit ORV's to drive in the shoulder of County Roads, but shoulder of roads, but Chocelay Township opted out. He stated that he would like to see them allowed on the rural roads such as, Little Lake Road, CO 480, West Branch Road, Magnum Rd, Kawbawgam Road, Greenfield Road, N and S. Big Creek Roads and Green Garden Road.

Police Chief Zyburt spoke and stated that Chocelay Township is considered a bedroom community and roads are not maintained for ORV's. The department gets about 30 to 50 calls a year, and the individuals are calling about ORV's tearing up their property, and their speeds. If the Planning Commission does decide to move ahead with this, he would like the Planning Commission to spell out the roads they would like to see and then get the public comments about those roads to see if they would be for or against them.

Mr. Milton asked the Commission if at this point they should entertain the idea of opening up the roads to ORV's. Mr. Engle stated that when you opt in all the roads will be open to ORV's, but we could specify which ones and then signage is going to be another factor of this as well.

Mr. Milton stated that we could add this to our Master and Recreation Plans.

There was further conversation about how education is the key in this process and that there will be people that would like to see the Township allow ORV's on certain roads and those that don't want them anywhere.

Mr. Sikkema asked the Commission, "How far do you allow someone to ride to get to a trail, 5 or 10 miles?"

The Commission discussed what the first step should be; develop a map, and establish criteria to choose the roads, or form a sub-committee? Staff will use a computer program to generate a random sample from the following roads and work with the Police Department to find people who would be interested in serving on the committee and there are for or against them. The roads that people for the sub- committee would be chosen from are: Timber Lane, Lakewood Lane, Magnum Road, Green Garden Road, Greenfield Road, Silver Creek Road, Ortman Road, Cherry Creek Road, Kawbawgam Road, West Branch Road, and County Road 480.

The PC liaisons will be Mr. Kendell Milton and Mr. Andy Smith who will be the chairperson.

VII. New Business

A. Planning Commission By-laws

The Planning Commission looked at the By-laws and discussed if they should go up to nine members or stay at seven members.

Mr. Sikkema moved, and Dr. Tabor seconded to keep the Planning Commission members at seven and not amend their By-laws.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion passed

B. Election of Officers

Chairperson

Mr. Smith moved, and Dr. Tabor seconded, to appoint Mr. Milton as Chairperson.

Vice Chairperson

Mr. Milton moved, and Mr. Meister seconded, to appoint Mr. Smith as Vice Chairperson.

Secretary

Mr. Milton moved, and Mr. Meister seconded, to appoint Mr. Sikkema as Secretary.

Vice Secretary

Mr. Milton moved, and Mr. Smith seconded, to appoint Mr. Meister as Vice Secretary.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Passed

C. 2010 Corridor Access Management Plan Update

Mrs. Thum explained that at the Planning Commission August 2010 meeting they went over the 2004 Corridor Access Management Plan and the suggested improvement that could be made along US 41S and the items that were accomplished since that time.

Mr. Sikkema then went over the upcoming 2012 project and that it now includes resurfacing of US 41S from the Welcome Center to the M-28/US 41S intersection and as part of that construction work MDOT will be trying to work with the business owners to close some driveways that are either underutilized or problem areas. Currently, they are working with Ace Hardware to close one driveway. It was also discussed that installing a service road between the Vet Clinic and Ace would not work because they are two different uses.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-15 (Section 4.7: Wireless Communication Facilities)

Mrs. Thum discussed why this amendment is before the Planning Commission and stated that we could also look at changing parts of this Section in the Ordinance. As requested, she was able to get information concerning wireless towers from Marquette and Negaunee Townships.

There was discussion on why the current ordinance only permits towers in the AF District that are 75 feet.

The Commission went over the ordinances and picked a couple of items from both of them that they liked and felt that would be appropriate in our ordinance. They felt that we could put a text amendment together that would include some language similar to Marquette and Negaunee Township's ordinance. It was stated that this section of the ordinance should not be more restrictive than any part of the ordinance.

The Commissioners will mark up the ordinances and give them back to Mrs. Thum before next month's meeting. Mrs. Thum will then prepare a text amendment for next month.

B. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-10 (Section 6.7: Road Frontage Requirement)

Mrs. Thum stated this proposed text amendment was proposed by Mr. Maki and that he was unable to make the meeting tonight. This amendment was postponed at our August 2010 meeting. At that time Mrs. Thum was directed to speak to the fire department about any concerns that they had regarding private roads. Mrs. Thum stated that the biggest concerns that they had at this time was addressing of the homes and used Pine Cone Trail as an example.

Mr. Sikkema suggested that the ordinance be clear as to what option people have when developing private roads and that its essentially site condominium projects. For example, an individual that wants to build a subdivision can sub-divide, have a common driveway (servicing 4 homes) or develop a site condo project. Then the Township does not really allow private roads, but we give developers a couple of options. The site condo would deal with the maintenance, signage and how the road should be constructed.

There was further discussion on the width and length of roads and other private roads in our Township.

Mr. Sikkema moved, and Dr. Tabor seconded, to table proposed #34-10-10 text amendment to allow staff time to look at the impacts of site condos on private roads and compare neighboring communities.

C. Silver Creek Recreation Area Driveway

Mr. Smith talked about how he went to the site with Mr. Brad Johnson and there was a difference in going out there and comparing that to the aerial photo. Mr. Smith stated that it makes sense to pursue purchasing this lot and went over the current driveway and entrance and the safety concerns that were there. Mr. Smith went over what you could do with the area if the Township was able to purchase the lot from the current owner.

Staff will continue to move forward with the project and Dr. Ken Tabor will bring it up at the next Township Board meeting.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. None

X. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENT

Mr. Mahaney spoke about the pedestrian/bicycle tunnel and the potential damage when you are coming through the tunnel and heading towards Fairbanks Road. There could be riders coming down the ramp and people leaving the tunnel that don't see each other. Mr. Mahaney would like this to be looked into.

Mr. Milton stated that he was asked by the Zoning Board of Appeals to bring up the fact that maybe the Planning Commission should look at amending the section about not allowing detached accessory structures to be larger than the home, in the AF District only though. Staff will check into this and see if some language could be written up.

Mr. Smith discussed the meeting time and date. After some discussion, it was decided to keep the same day of the week, Monday. The time could be discussed in November of this year when the calendar gets created.

XI. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Mrs. Thum asked for the members to come see Deputy Clerk Mary Sanders to get sworn in.

XII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND CORRESPONDENCE

A. Planning and Zoning News, April 2011

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Tabor moved, and Mr. Milton seconded, to adjourn the meeting at 9:30pm.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0

Motion passed

**Charter Township of Chocolay
Planning Commission Minutes
Monday, July 11, 2011**

I. Meeting called to Order at 7:30 P.M. / Roll Call

Members present: Kendell Milton (Chairperson), Andy Smith (Vice Chairperson),
Andy Sikkema, Eric Meister, Tom Mahaney, and Max Engle.

Members absent: Dr. Ken Tabor

Staff present: Jennifer B. Thum, Township Planner/Zoning Administrator

II. Approval of June 6, 2011 Minutes

Mr. Engle moved, and Mr. Sikkema seconded, to approve the Minutes as written

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

III. Additional Agenda Items / Approval of Agenda

Mr. Milton noted that there was additional information on the table, a resolution for HB 4746.

Mr. Sikkema moved, and Mr. Meister seconded, to approve the agenda with the additional item under New Business, VII D.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

IV. Public Hearings

A. None

V. Public Comment

A. None

VI. Presentations

A. None

VII. New Business

A. Burn Barrel

Mrs. Thum explained why the Planning Commission was asked to review the burn barrel issue and read a letter from a Township resident. The letter was presented to the Township Board at their June 20, 2011 meeting. The Township Board requested that the Planning Commission look into having a burn barrel ordinance. Mrs. Thum stated that Negaunee and Marquette

Townships have ordinances on burn barrels. The Planning Commission discussed in length potential setbacks for the barrels in the higher density subdivisions and the types of items that should be prohibited from burning. The overall consensus of the Commission is they did not want to outright ban burn barrels, but felt some restrictions were needed for the smaller lots. The Commission felt that people should still be allowed to burn logs and brush.

The Commission discussed burn barrels in length and stated that, they can be a nuisance and some type of setback from neighboring homes needs to be established. The Commission discussed reasonable setback distance and types of items that should be prohibited from burning. After discussion it was decided that there should be a 150 foot setback from any residential structure. The following items should be prohibited:

- I. Non-wood construction material, including but not limited to fiberglass, shingles and tar.
- II. Hazardous Substances including but not limited to batteries, household chemicals, pesticides, used oil, gasoline, paints, varnishes, and solvents.
- III. Tires
- IV. Any plastic materials including but not limited to nylon, PVC, ABA, polystyrene or urethane foam, and synthetic fabrics and plastic containers.
- V. Treated or painted wood including but not limited to plywood, composite wood products or other wood products that are painted, varnished or treated with preservatives.

Mr. Sikkema moved, and Mr. Milton seconded, to direct staff to develop proposed language to regulate burn barrels with a setback of 150 feet, prohibiting the items listed above, language stating that the fire shall be monitored at all times, and a description that the burn barrel shall have 3.4 inch openings on the sides. Also a permit shall not be required. Staff is to bring this back for the August 1, 2011 meeting.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Motion passed

B. Potential Snowmobile Routes

Mrs. Thum explained that the Township Board adopted Ordinance #57, Bicycle and Snowmobile Ordinance that states that snowmobiles are allowed to utilize the paved bike paths in our Township, but the Township Board has to approve which paths. At this point the Commission can request which portions of the bike path they would like to see snowmobiles be allowed, and this includes US 41S. The Commission discussed in the length the safety concerns with regards to the right-of-way and the grooming aspect of the trails. Mr. Sikkema stated that

the Township has been asked on several occasions to look into that portion of the trail and if it would be MDOT guidelines for a snowmobile trail with the flow of traffic.

Mr. Meister moved, and Mr. Engle seconded, to recommend to the Township Board to authorize snowmobiles along the bike path on M-28 and if the Township can meet the MDOT and DNR requirements allow snowmobiles on US 41S, one-way with the flow of traffic.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Abstained: 1 (Sikkema)
All in Favor Motion Passed

C. Potential Agricultural/Forestry 2 (AF-2)

Mrs. Thum gave some background on this item and the Planning Commission pointed out they raised this problem up to the Township Board at their joint meeting back in February. The Commission discussed the current AF and the number of lots that are under the 20 acre requirement. There was further discussion on what types of activities such as farming would be permitted in the AF-2 District. Mrs. Thum explained that the old RR-2 permitted animals as a right and there were certain acreage requirements for intense farming activities. The Commission felt that this needed to be addressed.

Mr. Milton moved, and Mr. Sikkema seconded, to continue this discussion next month and to develop language with potential permitted and conditional uses for the Planning Commission next meeting, August 1, 2011.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Motion Passed

Mr. Sikkema commented that the map would need to be adjusted, but the boundaries can be parcel to parcel.

D. Resolution for HB 4746

Mrs. Thum explained what HB 4746 is and how it could impact local zoning regulations. Mr. Smith explained that natural resources are where Mother Nature put them and we cannot control where they are locate. There is a current problem where local governments are not allowing for local sand and/or gravel mines to expand. There was further discussion on the impact of local mines and the Township current zoning regulations. Mr. Engle explained that the Township Zoning Ordinance does allow for mining operations within reason and the applicant is required to do a site plan and go before the Township Board for review. The Commission felt that the regulations that the Township has in place is the right way to do things and communities should permit the opening and continued expansion of the mines, within reason.

Mr. Engle moved to sign the resolution to not support HB 4746. There was no second.

Motion Failed

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-15

Mrs. Thum explained the history of this text amendment and that the language has been written to include the comments from last month's meeting. The Commission discussed the language and made some changes to the proposed amendment.

Definitions –no comment

Section 13.2 (A)

- #3 Changes were acceptable
- #15 Modify the statement about professional engineer
- #16 - Delete
- #17 Modify to state the National Tower Code

Section 13.2 (B)

- #1 Modify the height requirement

Mr. Sikkema moved, and Mr. Milton, seconded to table proposed text amendment #34-10-15 for staff to make the changes and present them at our August 1, 2011 meeting.

B. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-10

Mrs. Thum stated that she incorporated the suggestions from last time and stated that the Michigan Condominium Act does not state that private or public roads are required. Mrs. Thum went over the Marquette and Negaunee Townships' ordinances. The Commission felt that there was not enough time left to properly discuss the proposed text amendment and would like to see it at the beginning of the agenda for next month's meeting.

Mr. Sikkema, moved, and Mr. Smith, seconded to table proposed text amendment #34-10-10 (roads) until our August 1, 2011 meeting, and to place the item at the beginning of the agenda.

C. ORV Committee (verbal update)

Mrs. Thum gave an update and stated that letters were sent to random residents asking if they wanted to be part of a sub-committee and if they did not have time to give input if they would like to see some or all the roads in Chocelay Township opened up to ORV's.

Mr. Smith asked if the information that was sent out could be part of the packets for next month. Mrs. Thum stated that she would do this.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. None

X. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENT

A. None

XI. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A. Mrs. Thum informed the Commission about the webinar on creating ordinances and if they have an interest to watch them, then let her know. Mrs. Thum informed the Commission of the price that the owner is asking for vacant lot near SCRA.

XII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND CORRESPONDENCE

A. Planning and Zoning News, May 2011

B. City of Marquette, Planning Commission minutes, April 19, 2011 and May 3, 2011

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Milton moved, and Mr. Engle seconded, to adjourn the meeting at 10:15pm.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Motion passed

**Charter Township of Choccolay
Planning Commission Minutes
Monday, August 1, 2011**

I. Meeting called to Order at 7:30 P.M. / Roll Call

Members present: Kendell Milton (Chairperson), Andy Smith (Vice Chairperson), Andy Sikkema, Eric Meister, and Dr. Ken Tabor.

Members absent: Tom Mahaney and Max Engle.

Staff present: Jennifer B. Thum, Township Planner/Zoning Administrator

II. Approval of July 11, 2011 Minutes

Dr. Tabor moved, and Mr. Sikkema seconded, to approve the Minutes as written

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

III. Additional Agenda Items / Approval of Agenda

Mr. Sikkema moved, and Dr. Tabor seconded, to approve the agenda as written.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

IV. Public Hearings

A. None

V. Public Comment

A. None

VI. Presentations

A. None

VII. New Business

A. Home Occupations

Mrs. Thum explained that the new zoning ordinance states that all home occupations are required to go through the conditional use process, which includes paying a fee of \$250.00. Mrs. Thum went over the wide variety of home occupations that one could have and stated that the old ordinance did have discrepancy with the levels of home occupations.

The Commission discussed when a conditional use permit might be required and if having an employee would mean that it was no longer a home occupation, but a commercial operation. There was also discussion on whether a sign made the home occupation a commercial enterprise as well. The Commission felt that the addition of the commercial sign and/or advertising the business via website might be the threshold that would trigger a review by the Planning Commission. The Commission felt that language that was in the 1977 zoning ordinance seemed sufficient, but there was conversation regarding the text amendment that changed the standards and definition for home occupation.

Mr. Meister moved, and Dr. Tabor seconded, to direct staff to draft language that is similar to the old zoning ordinance, specifically to add numbers 1 -3 and modify #5.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion passed

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-10

Mrs. Thum stated that the information that was provided in the packets for this month was the same as last month's. Staff tried to combine some of the wording similar to what the neighboring communities have. Mrs. Thum went over the Marquette and Negaunee Townships' ordinances.

The Commission discussed what the current language is and what the proposed text amendment applicant, Trustee Maki, wanted to see. The Commission felt that by allowing up to four parcels to utilize one common driveway it allowed for less impervious surface, reduces the number of conflict points along the roadways and helps traffic move smoothly along the roads. The standards of approval are located on the private road application for the application and the Commission members to see.

Mrs. Thum stated that the fire department would like to look at how private roads are addressed and the clearance of the road and road width. Mrs. Thum stated that there is a hold harmless agreement that is in place and maybe that should be modified. Mr. Smith talked about the maintenance agreements and they can be the key to the condition of the road. Mr. Milton stated that Ishpeming allows for a driveway to serve up to four parcels as well.

Mr. Sikkema, moved, and Dr. Tabor, seconded to have staff work on the hold harmless agreement and work on the finding of fact for proposed text amendment #34-10-10 and present it at our September 12, 2011 meeting.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion passed

B. Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-15 (wireless towers in the AF District)

Mrs. Thum stated that the language should be ready to hold a public hearing at our September meeting. The comments that were stated at last month's meeting were incorporated into the amendment.

The Commission reviewed the proposed language and found it satisfactory.

Dr. Tabor moved, and Mr. Milton seconded to approve the language as written for proposed text amendment #34-11-03 (formally #34-10-15) and to hold a public hearing at the September 12, 2011 Planning Commission meeting.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion passed

C. Burn Barrel Proposed Text Amendment

Mrs. Thum stated that the proposed text amendment would be to modify Section 6.5 of the Township Zoning Ordinance. Mrs. Thum stated that she believed all the comments that were stated and discussed at the previous meeting were incorporated into the text amendment.

The Commissioners discussed the title and felt that it needed to be changed as it was confusing and gave the impression that the Township banned burning of brush. They also felt that a statement about open burning of brush was permitted as long as the residents followed the MDNR guidelines.

Dr. Tabor moved, and Mr. Smith seconded, to approve the language for proposed text amendment #34-11-04 with the following changes and to hold a public hearing at our September 12, 2011 meeting.

1. Change title to (C) Open and Outdoor Burning of Refuse
2. Add #3 to read, "Open burning of leaves, weeds, brush, stumps, clean wood other vegetative debris is permitted, but the burn shall comply with the requirements of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources."

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion passed

D. Agricultural/Forestry District (AF-2)

Mrs. Thum explained that the Township Board agreed with the Planning Commission that an addition rural residential district needs to be formed and would like the Planning Commission to move forward with this. The Township Board set a deadline of December of 2011 to have this proposed zoning map completed. Mrs. Thum stated at this point she would like to establish the guidelines for the proposed district, such as, setbacks, title, minimum lot size, lot width and the permitted and conditional uses. The Commissioners discussed the permitted and conditional uses along with the lot size and title of the district. Mr. Sikkema stated the new district should still allow for personal gardens, chickens and other livestock. Mr. Meister stated that commercial livestock should be kept for the larger lots. Mr. Sikkema wanted to look at the map next month and see if there are any R-1 parcels that might belong in the new rural residential district.

Mr. Dick Arnold, 312 West Branch Road, passed out a map from the Marquette County Plat book and had concerns about Sections 34 and 35. Dr. Tabor moved, and Mr. Sikkema seconded, to direct staff to complete a text amendment application and present the language in a draft format for review at our September 12, 2011 meeting.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion passed

E. ORV Committee (verbal update)

Mrs. Thum gave an update on the Committee and asked for direction from the Planning Commission due to lack of response from the letters that were mailed out to the residents. Mr. Sikkema stated that a follow up letter should be sent. Mr. Smith stated that Mrs. Thum should maybe contact Mr. Tony Harry to see if the petition that has been circulating has gotten any responses from people, positive or negative.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

- A. None

X. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENT

- A. Mr. Sikkema filled the Commission in on the proposed road construction for 2012 that MDOT has scheduled.

XI. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- A. Mrs. Thum informed the Commission about the special board meeting to review the sign ordinance. The Commission was disappointed to see another item be sent back to them.

XII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND CORRESPONDENCE

- A. Chocoley Township Master Plan – Transportation chapter and the Executive Summary. (DRAFTS)

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Milton moved, to adjourn the meeting at 9:30pm.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Motion passed

**Charter Township of Chocolay
Planning Commission Minutes
Monday, September 12, 2011**

I. Meeting called to Order at 7:30 P.M. / Roll Call

Members present: Kendell Milton (Chairperson), Andy Smith (Vice Chairperson), Andy Sikkema, Tom Mahaney, Max Engle, Eric Meister, and Dr. Ken Tabor.

Members absent: None

Staff present: Jennifer B. Thum, Township Planner/Zoning Administrator

II. Approval of August 1, 2011 Minutes

Dr. Tabor moved, and Mr. Milton seconded, to approve the Minutes with the changes.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

III. Additional Agenda Items / Approval of Agenda

Dr. Tabor moved, and Mr. Meister seconded, to approve the agenda as written.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Proposed Text Amendment #34-11-03 (Section 13: Wireless Communication Facilities)

No public comment was received on proposed text amendment #34-11-03

B. Proposed Text Amendment #34-11-04 (Section 6.5: Outdoor Wood Burning Boilers and Appliances)

Mr. Richard Kierzek, 55 Edgewood Drive stated his opposition to burn barrels and felt that the proposed language was good and the setback distance would help his situation. He also stated that he was happy to see that people could still have fire rings.

Ms. Thum read comments from Ms. Deborah Mulchaey, 633 Lakewood Lane, stated that we should look at listing the items that would be permitted to burn rather than list the items that are prohibited. Also we should define refuse as that is hard to define. Ms. Mulchaey also stated her concerns with the current language for outdoor wood boilers.

Mr. Milton closed the public hearings at 7:45pm

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

None

VI. PRESENTATIONS

A. None

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. Discussion - Rental Properties in the Waterfront Residential Districts

Mrs. Thum commented that she has been seeing an increase in the number of rental vacation homes along the Lake Superior. Mrs. Thum went over the ordinance language. The Commissioners discussed the language and the grey areas that we currently have. The Commissioners could see where people who are not full time residents would rent out their home to help pay the taxes, but could also see the neighbor's point of view, when you have people renting the home next to you, you can lose that safety factor. In the old ordinance some of the zones were allowed to have a "resort" with a conditional use permit. In the current AF District, resorts are a conditional use.

The Planning Commission would like staff to research this issue more and look at other communities such as Autrain, Onota, Houghton and Higgins Lake.

Mr. Sikkema, moved, and Dr. Tabor seconded, to direct staff to investigate other Township's and consult with Township Attorney to come up with more information to consider in regards to rental of properties.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Consideration - Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-10 – Section 6.7 Road Frontage

Mrs. Thum stated that Mr. Maki dropped off some comments and concerns about the proposed text amendment and would like the Planning Commission to look it over and provide any comments they might have.

Mrs. Thum went over the changes that were made to the hold harmless agreement and the Fire Department went over the additions and felt that they were adequate.

Mrs. Thum read the current language with regards to road frontage and lots of record.

The Planning Commission looked at Trustee Maki's comments.

1. The Commission felt that 4 was an appropriate number to have a shared driveway. The Commissioners would like some additional language to the hold harmless agreement about maintenance agreement and that it shall be recorded at the County Register of Deeds. The language could be similar to what is in the Ordinance for private roads. The hold harmless agreement that was presented would address the concerns with regards to fire department access and safety. The Commissioners looked a situation where one driveway could be longer then a shared driveway.
2. The commissioners felt that we should explore a maintenance agreement with shared/common driveways that way everyone would know what the expectations are when it comes to maintenance of the driveways. Afterwards the Township could register the agreement with the County Deeds office and possible put something on our BS & A software.

Mr. Milton stated that this will probably become a problem if the new agricultural district gets approved. The Commission discussed this with regards to properties being split and the recording of easements. Staff is to research the Marquette County Road Commission standards and provide them to the PC at their October 3, 2011 meeting.

Mr. Sikkema, moved and Dr. Tabor seconded to have staff draft a text amendment that allows up to 4 parcels to use a shared driveway, add to hold harmless agreement and requires that a maintenance agreement be attached to the deed and recorded at the County Register of Deeds office to review at our October 3, 2011 meeting.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

B. Consideration - Proposed Text Amendment #34-11-03 – Wireless Communication Facilities

Mr. Milton stated there are no real changes from last time and there have been no complaints.

Dr. Tabor, moved and Mr. Engle, seconded to approve the language as written for proposed text amendment #34-11-03 (formally #34-10-15) and to forward it to the Marquette County Planning Commission for their review and then to the Township Board for consideration.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

C. Consideration - Proposed Text Amendment #34-11-04 – Outdoor Wood Burning Boilers and Appliances –to add language about burn barrels.

The commissioners went over not permitting the burning of household garbage due to plastic being contained in just about everything and the odor that plastic produces. The commissioners stated that the setback would be 150ft.

Mrs. Thum stated that she has not received any feedback from residents, besides the individual that spoke up tonight.

Dr. Tabor moved, and Mr. Milton seconded, to approve the language as written for proposed text amendment #34-11-04, to amend Section 6.5: Outdoor Wood Burning and to forward it to the Marquette County Planning Commission for their review. After their review the proposed text amendment shall be forwarded to the Township Board for their consideration.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

D. Consideration – Proposed Text Amendment #34-11-05 Home Occupation

Mrs. Thum stated that she tried to incorporate the comments and suggestions that were received last month and put them into a draft format.

The commissioners discussed the number of employees that should be permitted for a home occupation and if having an employee who does not live at the location would constitute a commercial enterprise and not a home occupation.

The Commissioners went over the proposed language with regards to the permitted and conditional home occupations. Mr. Sikkema had concern about employees who don't live at the home work at the home business. The Commissioners felt that if you have an employee or more then you should be able to pay the conditional use permit fee. The concern is not the number of employees, but the number of employees that work at that specific home.

Mr. Engle wanted to change the language under conditional home occupation #2 to say "at that location."

Mr. Mahaney discussed the effect when to many employees work from home and don't occupy a commercial space. The Commission also discussed the issue of customers visiting the site and the changing of the character of the neighborhood.

Mr. Milton, move, and Dr. Tabor, second to direct staff to table proposed text amendment #34-11-05 and direct staff to re-write the proposed language taking into account the commissioners comments.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

E. Consideration – Agricultural/Forestry District (AF-2)

Mrs. Thum went over the proposed text amendment, including the permitted and conditional uses along with the setback requirements. Mr. Meister felt that the 10 acre requirement for livestock should be removed, but the commercial agricultural would be fine as a conditional use. Mr. Milton felt that there should be no maximum square footage for detached structures.

Mrs. Thum stated that at our next month's meeting we will be discussing the map.

Mr. Sikkema asked to look at some R-1 parcels that could be added to the new R-A District.

Dr. Tabor, moved, and Mr. Sikkema, second, to direct staff to update the text amendment application to start the process of establishing a new zoning district called, Rural Agricultural (R-A) with the permitted and conditional uses, and setback requirements listed above. Staff is to work on a map outlining potential parcels that could be part of the new R-A District.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

F. Discussion - Sign Ordinance

Mr. Milton discussed the suggestions that the Township Board had for the Planning Commission and felt that they seemed reasonable.

Mr. Smith stated that he measured some of the signs in the Township and stated that majority of them would not meet the new sign ordinance. Several of them were larger than 100 square feet. There was conversation as to whether increase the allowed square footage if majority of the signs are larger than the 100 square feet. Mrs. Thum stated that some of the signs had variances and that the permits were approved with the condition that no sign shall exceed 100 square feet.

Mr. Mahaney expressed his concern about the 40 square feet maximum for banners and felt that was supposed to be for each banner not total.

Mr. Sikkema, moved, and Dr. Tabor seconded to table the sign ordinance to the October 3, 2011 meeting.

Ayes: 7 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. None

X. COMMISSIONER'S COMMENT

XI. DIRECTOR'S REPORT

A. Planning Commission Webinar

XII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND CORRESPONDENCE

A. City of Marquette Planning Commission minutes, June 21, 2011

B. Communication from Sands Township

C. Planning and Zoning News, July 2011

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Milton adjourned the meeting at 10:30pm

**Charter Township of Chocoday
Planning Commission Minutes
Monday, October 3, 2011**

I. Meeting called to Order at 7:30 P.M. / Roll Call

Members present: Kendell Milton (Chairperson), Andy Smith (Vice Chairperson), Andy Sikkema, Tom Mahaney, Eric Meister, and Dr. Ken Tabor.

Members absent: None

Staff present: Jennifer B. Thum, Township Planner/Zoning Administrator

II. Approval of September 12, 2011 Minutes

Mr. Sikkema moved, and Dr. Tabor seconded, to approve the minutes with the change on page 3.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

III. Additional Agenda Items / Approval of Agenda

Mr. Sikkema moved, and Dr. Tabor seconded, to approve the agenda as written.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

IV. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. None

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

A. None

VI. PRESENTATIONS

A. None

VII. NEW BUSINESS

A. None

VIII. OLD BUSINESS

A. Consideration - Sign Ordinance

TEMPORARY SIGNS

Mrs. Thum stated that she would like to start with the PowerPoint presentation that was presented, before the Township Board at their August 8, 2011 meeting. That would allow us to go through the Board's main points of concerns such as Temporary, Electronic Message and Realtor Signs. Mrs. Thum also stated that we need to have justification as

to why the Planning Commission wants certain things such as a specific square footage for temporary signs. Dr. Tabor reiterated that point.

Mrs. Thum, read the Board's concerns with regards to temporary signs such as permitting, square footage and location of the temporary signs. Mr. Mahoney, felt that we did not use a specific number, but rather a percentage. There was further discussion on the average size of banners and where they could be located on a building, such as Ace Hardware, which has two faces that could be seen from one or two roads.

The Commissioners felt that a total of 80 square feet should be allowed, but cannot exceed 20% of any one wall space, to which the sign is attached. The temporary signs may be located on a fence, posts, pallets, but may not be attached to light poles, vehicles, trees and/or utility posts. The Planning Commission felt that the rationale for the 80 square feet was that, the average banner is 20 square feet so that would allow a business owner to have 4 temporary signs.

Mrs. Thum asked the board how they felt about requiring a permit for a second temporary banner, during that same 90 day period. The Commission didn't feel that a permit should be required, as it takes time and money for that business owner to complete a permit. The commission felt that any banner over 30 days should be required to obtain a permit.

ELECTRONIC MESSAGE SIGNS

The Commissions discussed the NITS and the face of the sign.

There was discussion about, the statement that the message of the sign needs to be relevant to the business that owns and operates the sign. Mr. Sikkema explained that this is regulated under the Michigan Highway Advertising Act of 1972.

REALTOR SIGNS

The Commission looked at the proposed language and felt that it should allow for larger realtor signs on the larger lots, and for commercial signs to be up to 32 square feet as long as they are located outside the right-of-way. For the smaller square foot realtor signs they felt, should be placed at least 30 feet from the edge of a travel lane.

Rationale – state requirement. The Commission also discussed the directional and other realtor signs located in the right-of-way. There is State language that handles this so, the directional signs will just continue to be regulated by the Highway Advertising Act of 1972.

The language in the proposed ordinance would be changed to:

19.1: Temporary Signs

#3 Real Estate Directional Signs

- Real estate signs advertising the sale, rental, or lease of property in residential and commercial districts are permitted provided:

- A. The sign is located on the lot or in front of the unit for sale; and
- B. Sign shall not exceed nine (9) square feet in area.
 - a. Parcel with over 300 feet of frontage can have two additional signs for every additional 400ft of frontage in residential areas, provided that they are located outside of the right-of-way; and
 - i. In the AF District, lots less than 20 acres, but not less than 5 acres or more could have one 16 square foot sign, provided that they are located outside of the right-of-way; and
 - ii. Lots of 20 acres or more could have one 32 square foot sign, provided that they are located outside of the right-of-way

- Signs shall be placed at least 30 feet from the edge of the travel lane.
- Signs advertising commercial real estate signs and subdivision/development signs of 32 square feet or less provided they are located outside of the right-of-way. Such sign shall be maintained and in good repair.
- Signs shall be removed within seven (7) days after the property has been sold, rented or leased.

RESIDENTIAL SIGNS

Mrs. Thum discussed the concerns that the Township Board had, regarding the different square footage requirements for the different zoning districts. There was also discussion about the large signs along M-28E. The Planning Commission felt that the speeds along M-28 are faster than the ones along Lakewood Lane, so they should be allowed to have larger residential signs. The Planning Commission felt that the M-28 homes should be allowed to have larger signs, due to the speed, rather than the zoning district.

The Planning Commission proposed to have the language read, “For speeds less than 45 m.ph. signs shall not exceed 8 square feet and for speeds 45 m.ph. and greater, signs shall not exceed 16 square feet.

The Planning Commission then looked at setting an overall height limit for the residential signs. They felt that one should be allowed, but wanted to ensure that it allowed for the road and grade variances that occur in our Township. The Planning Commission felt that 12 feet would be appropriate and it should say that no residential sign shall exceed 12 feet from the road grade.

BILLBOARDS AND COMMERCIAL SIGNS

Mr. Sikkema stated that the Township can have stricter regulations than the State, but it's hard to get a new permit to construct a billboard. For the State, M-28E and US 41S are regulated and a billboard could not be placed up without a permit. Mrs. Thum stated that the Board voiced concern that no language would open the door up for billboards. The Commission wanted to add a statement that construction of new billboards is not permitted, but the existing ones shall be maintained and those that are not shall be removed. Mr. Milton stated that we should add a definition of a billboard to the ordinance.

The Commission discussed the commercial square footage requirement of the proposed ordinance and our current commercial signs, the pole and ground sign. Mr. Smith stated that he measured that the Holiday, Family Dollar, Shaws, and Citgo are over a 100 square feet and they would be non-conforming signs with the new ordinance. Mrs. Thum stated that the current ordinance states that "no sign shall have an area exceeding 100 sq ft." Mr. Smith wanted it on record that he wants a sign inventory to be conducted before it goes back to the Board. Mrs. Thum stated that she did a sign inventory and it shows different numbers than he has, and she looked at the sign permits that we have on record. Mrs. Thum wanted to check Mr. Smith's numbers to see how they were calculated. Mr. Sikkema stated that this is a tough part, we need to figure out what the Township wants as far as their signs, do they want larger ones or smaller ones and what would take away from our rural character. Dr. Tabor wanted to know if we have a business that has two sides fronting two different streets, should they be allowed to have additional signs.

Mrs. Thum mentioned the international sign code and how it looks at speed limits for square footage requirements. Mrs. Thum stated that she will bring this back to our November 7, 2011 meeting.

Mr. Milton moved, and Dr. Tabor seconded, to table the proposed sign ordinance until our November 7, 2011 meeting to allow staff to make corrections on A, B, C and D and to have staff present information concerning the international sign code.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

B. Consideration – Proposed Text Amendment #34-11-05 (Home Occupation)

Mr. Meister asked if beauty salons and barber shops are permitted as a home occupation right now, and if so they will have more than two visits per day. Mr. Sikkema voiced his concerns about having an employee who does not live in the home, work at that location. He stated that it's his opinion that is not a home occupation, but rather a business. Mr. Mahaney discussed his concern with the home occupation language, and agreed that you should live at your home for the home occupation. Dr. Tabor and Mr. Meister felt that if there is one person answering phones, then it would not change the character of the neighborhood. If it does not affect the overall character of the neighborhood then, it should be allowed, at that same point it might need to be looked at a case by case basis. There was further discussion about if one employee would change the character of the neighborhood or not. The Commission discussed several examples of business that might

have one employee and would really not affect the character of the neighborhood. The Commission wanted to see AF put back into the list of zoning districts where a home occupation could occur. The commission wanted the proposed language to say that if a home occupation would have any employees then it would be a conditional use. The Commission decided to keep current language and add permitted uses not requiring a conditional use and add #1-5 and #8 -9 from the proposed language and delete #2 of the current language.

Dr. Tabor moved and Mr. Mahaney seconded to keep the current language for home occupations, add the permitted uses, # 1-5 and #8-#9 and then delete #2 of the current language.

C. Consideration – Rural Residential Zoning District (RR)

Mr. Sikkema moved and Mr. Milton seconded to table rural residential until our November 7, 2011 meeting.

IX. PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Dick Arnold, 312 West Branch Road asked about the AF zoning districts and home occupations.

X. COMMISSIONER’S COMMENT

Mr. Sikkema discussed the 2012 construction and the MDOT Welcome Center.

XI. DIRECTOR’S REPORT

- A. Discussed the sign inventory
- B. Priority list

XII. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND CORRESPONDENCE

- A. City of Marquette Planning Commission minutes, June 21, 2011
- B. Communication from Sands Township
- C. Planning and Zoning News, July 2011

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Dr. Tabor moved and Mr. Meister seconded to adjourn the meeting at 10:30pm

**Charter Township of Chocoday
Planning Commission Minutes
Monday, November 7, 2011**

I. Meeting called to order at 7:30P.M./ Roll Call

Members present: Kendell Milton (Chairperson), Andy Smith (Vice Chairperson), Tom Mahaney and Gary Heinzelman.

Members absent: Eric Meister, Dr. Ken Tabor and Andy Sikkema

Staff present: Jennifer B. Thum, Township Planner/Zoning Administrator

II. Approval of October 3, 2011 Minutes

Mr. Milton moved and Mr. Mahaney seconded, to approve the minutes as written.

Ayes: 4 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

III. Additional Agenda Items/ Approval of Agenda

Mr. Milton, stated that the calendar for next year's meetings was before the Planning Commission and it should be placed under VIII - New Business.

Mr. Heinzelman moved and Mr. Smith seconded to approve the agenda with the change.

Ayes: 4 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

IV. Public Hearing

a. None

V. Public Comment

Mr. Mark Maki – 370 Karen Road

Mr. Maki stated that he wanted to apologize to the Planning Commission. At the Board's special meeting, he attempted to get specific comments on what they would like the proposed sign ordinance to say. Mr. Maki went on to say that he was disappointed in the County Planning Commission's review of the proposed sign ordinance. Mr. Maki, then spoke about the proposed road frontage amendment. He stated that the 2005 comprehensive plan recommend that the Township do away with private roads. The Planning Commission was going to do that, until a public hearing was held and people spoke out about their removal. As a result, the Commission and Township Board inserted the sentence, "up to 4 parcels may share a driveway." Mr. Maki went on to say that the problem with common driveways is the addressing of them and that emergency vehicles have problems locating a home.

VI. Presentations

A. None

VII. New Business

A. Consideration - Planning Commission 2012 Meeting Calendar

The Commissioners discussed the days of the week that would work for them and the time. There was a consensus that Monday's at 7:30 would work best for everyone.

Mr. Heinzelman, moved and Mr. Smith, seconded to approve the Planning Commission meeting dates and time for 2012.

Ayes: 4 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

VIII. Old Business

A. Consideration – Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-10 (road frontage)

Mrs. Thum went over the history of the text amendment and that this was proposed by Mr. Maki, and the Commission needs to either approve or deny the amendment. At our last meeting, we had talked about the issue with addressing and making changes to the hold harmless agreement, but that was not part of Mr. Maki's amendment.

Mr. Heinzelman stated that, in his past profession there were several times that he was called out to a home with a shared driveway and he went to the wrong house. There were further questions about the requirement for addressing of residential lots.

The Planning Commission went over the proposed text amendment and felt that some of the language from the old ordinance could be added to a separate amendment. There was further discussion on County Road standards with regards to private roads.

Mr. Smith, moved and Mr. Mahaney, seconded, to deny proposed text amendment #34-11-07 (#34-10-10) and forward it to the County Planning Commission for their review. After the County Commission has made a recommendation, it shall be forward to the Township for Consideration.

Ayes: 4 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

B. Consideration - Proposed Text Amendment #34-10-11 (PUD)

Mrs. Thum went over the history of the text amendment and that the Planning Commission needs to approve or deny it. There was discussion on current PUDs in the AF District and the Township rural character. The Commission discussed the cluster development vs. PUD's. There was a consensus that there were several options to land owners to develop the larger lots without resorting to a PUD.

Mr. Heinzelman, moved and Mr. Milton, seconded to approve proposed text amendment #34-11-06 (#34-10-11) and forward it to the County Planning Commission for their review. After the County Planning Commission has made their recommendation it shall be forwarded to the Township Board for their consideration.

Ayes: 3 Nays: 1 Motion

C. Consideration – Sign Ordinance

Mrs. Thum stated that at our last meeting, the Commission was able to make it though the majority of the Township Board’s comments. Mrs. Thum also stated that she met with Dan Landers from Cook Signs to discuss the International Sign Code and with Mr. Smith to discuss the current language. The Commission decided to review the proposed ordinance page by page. The Commission discussed the height limit on the monument signs and felt that when measuring the height the base should be excluded.

Mr. Milton asked if there were any definitions that need to be added to the sign ordinance. The commissioners discussed freestanding, ground, pole and monument signs. There was a consensus that the monument sign height, should stay at 12ft w/o the base.

There was further discussion on the sign ordinance. The Planning Commission made changes to pages: 4, 5, 7, 10, 14 and 15. The Commission was satisfied with the changes that were made to the commercial signage. The commission felt that regulating signage according to the speed limit was the right approach. There was discussion on setting a maximum square footage for a total number of signs per business, which was set at 200 square feet. There was discussion on temporary signs and canopy signs.

The Commission felt that the language for service station canopies needs additional work.

Mr. Smith, moved and Mr. Heinzelman, seconded, to have staff make the changes that were discussed at tonight’s meeting and bring it back to the Planning Commission for our December 5, 2011 meeting. Staff will post the draft on our website, and mail it to business owners.

Ayes: 4 Nays: 0 Motion carried

D. Consideration – Proposed Text Amendment #34-11-05 (Home Occupation)

The language was discussed and staff would like our attorney to review the proposed text amendment. Staff needs to correct the number of vehicles on page 3, and there was some concern about the enforcement of this.

Mr. Mahaney moved and Mr. Smith seconded to table this text amendment until our December 5, 2011 meeting

Ayes: 4 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

IX. Public Comment

None.

X. Commissioner's Comment

None.

XI. Director's Report

Mrs. Thum stated that there will be a public hearing for the Master Plan at our December 5, 2011 meeting. Mrs. Thum also stated that if anyone wants to read the additional research manuals that go with the international sign code, just contact her and she will provide them.

XII. Informational Items and Correspondence

- A. Planning and Zoning News, September 2011
- B. City of Marquette, Planning Commission Minutes, September 20, 2011
- C. Natural Features DRAFT Chapter for Master Plan

XIII. Adjournment

Mr. Milton moved, and Mr. Smith seconded, to adjourn the meeting at 9:30pm.

Kendell Milton
Chairperson

**Charter Township of Chocoday
Planning Commission Minutes
Monday, December 5, 2011**

I. Meeting called to order at 7:30P.M./ Roll Call

Members present: Andy Smith (Vice Chairperson), Tom Mahaney
Eric Meister, Dr. Ken Tabor Andy Sikkema, and
Gary Heinzelman.

Members absent: Kendell Milton (Chairperson)

Staff present: Jennifer B. Thum, Township Planner/Zoning
Administrator

II. Approval of November 7, 2011 Minutes

Dr. Tabor moved and Mr. Heinzelman seconded, to approve the minutes as written.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

III. Additional Agenda Items/ Approval of Agenda

No additions to the agenda were presented.

IV. Public Hearing

a. None

V. Public Comment

None.

VI. Presentations

A. Township Fire Hall Proposal

Mr. Lee Gould, Lieutenant and training officer with the Township Fire Department, presented a power point of the Fire Department's need for a new hall. Mr. Gould presented various facts, such as the current hall doesn't meet the NFPA or OSHA's requirements, there has been had two electric fires in the past five years, lack of meeting space, gear is close to fire trucks, some equipment is stored outside. Mr. Gould then discussed what the proposed interior of the new fire hall, and stated that the drive-thru bays would be used for additional trucks and the office space and meeting room/lounge would be used for the public in emergency situations.

Mr. Meister asked about funding for the project, Mr. Gould stated that the Township would have over \$500,000, and the proposed cost is 1.8 million.

The Commission asked questions about the number of vehicles, the proposed floor plan, and the location of the hall. Mr. Gary Johnson (ex. fire chief) responded to their questions.

The Commissioners like the site plan, but wanted the Fire Department to make sure the proposed hall meets their needs and not necessarily their wants. They were also pleased to see that the Fire Department has a large portion of proposed amount of money already in their account.

VII. New Business

A. 2011 Planning Commission Annual Plan

Mrs. Thum stated that the Planning Commission annual plan is a requirement under the Michigan Planning Enabling Act. The annual plan lists the status of planning activities, including recommendations by the legislative body related to planning and development for 2011. Also, that they should be proud for all that they have accomplished this year.

VIII. Old Business

A. Consideration – Proposed Text Amendment #34-11-02 (sign ordinance)

Mr. Smith wanted to read page 14, service station canopies, and maybe the maximum signage should be a percentage, rather than a specific square footage. Mrs. Thum discussed a particular company that has installed LED lights around their canopies and signs. The Commission discussed these lights and felt that they had high light intensity and would shine above the canopy and potentially to nearby lots. The Commissioners discussed if a statement should be included in the sign ordinance or under another section in the Ordinance. The Commission asked staff to research this and present the information to them at their January 9, 2012 meeting. The Commission discussed what would be considered a building alteration or addition. There was a further discussion on billboards and the casino sign. The Commission requested clarification on the location of the casino sign to ensure that it is compatible with the proposed sign ordinance.

Dr. Tabor moved and Mr. Meister seconded to send the proposed text amendment #34-12-01 (#34-11-02) to the Township Board for their consideration and the first reading. Staff shall send the proposed language to the business owners and CABA for their consideration as well.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Motion Carried

B. Consideration - Proposed Text Amendment #34-11-05 (home occupation)

The language was discussed and Mrs. Thum stated that one correction was not shown on page 3, under conditional use #3. There was further discussion about the hiring of employees for a home occupation. The Commission wanted the language to be clear that if, the home occupation has an employee, then a conditional use permit is required. Mr. Sikkema stated that any time

you have an employee that is a business and is no longer a home occupation. Mr. Smith stated that by having a process that allows for home occupations with employees, it would encourage people to follow the law.

Dr. Tabor moved and Mr. Mahaney seconded to forward proposed text amendment #34-12-02 (#34-11-05) to the County Planning Commission for their review.

Ayes: 5 Nays: 1 (Sikkema) Motion Carried

C. Consideration – Proposed Text Amendment #34-11-03
(wireless communication towers)

Mrs. Thum stated that at the Township Board meeting on November 14, 2011, the Board had some concerns with three specific items, A: 17, they felt that was too restrictive. They also were concerned with B: #4, which states that the applicant shall make every attempt in the design of the wireless tower to disguise the structure to reduce the aesthetic impact to the surrounding area.

Mr. Trudeau discussed his objection to the language that was presented and felt that it was too subjective. The Commission discussed the monopoles and other communication towers. There was further discussion on stealth towers and felt that people, now accept wireless towers. This is a conditional use permit process, so each tower would be evaluated on case by case basis. The Commissioners felt it would be best to delete A: #17 and B: #1 and #4. Mrs. Thum discussed Chapter nine of the Townships Master Plan, which talks about scenic areas in Chocolay.

Mr. Sikkema moved and Mr. Mahaney seconded to forward the proposed text amendment #34-11-03 back to the Township Board for their consideration, with the changes listed above and the first reading of the proposed text amendment.

Ayes: 6 Nays: 0 Motion carried

D. Consideration – Proposed Text Amendment #34-11-06 (Rural Residential)

Mr. Sikkema stated that we should look at rezoning some of the R-1 lots to the Rural Residential District. Mr. Meister wanted to mirror this new district with the old RR-2 District, and to permit commercial farming, but not necessarily livestock. The Commission discussed the old zoning ordinance and the current language with regards to the minimum lot size. Mr. Meister used his father as an example.

Sikkema moved and Mr. Smith seconded to table proposed text amendment #34-11-06 to give Commissioners time to view the maps and proposed changes that were presented by Mr. Meister.

IX. Public Comment

None.

X. Commissioner's Comment

Mr. Sikkema stated the project for out here will now be let out in February of 2012.

XI. Director's Report

XII. Informational Items and Correspondence

A. City of Marquette, Planning Commission Minutes, September 20, 2011

B. Executive Summary DRAFT and Land Use Chapters DRAFTS for Master Plan

XIII. Adjournment

Mr. Smith adjourned the meeting at 10:15pm.

Mr. Andy Sikkema
Secretary