

∞ AGENDA ∞

MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
Tuesday, June 16, 2026, at 6:00 p.m.
Municipal Service Center, 1100 Wright Street

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

- 1) ROLL CALL
- 2) APPROVE AGENDA
- 3) APPROVE MINUTES: **Minutes of 06-02-26**
- 4) CONFLICT of INTEREST



1. PUBLIC HEARINGS
2. CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION ON AGENDA ITEMS
3. OLD BUSINESS
4. NEW BUSINESS
5. CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS
6. CORRESPONDENCE, REPORTS, MINUTES OF OTHER BOARDS/COMMITTEES
7. TRAINING
- A. Water Bill Mail Insert**
8. WORK SESSION ON REPORTS/PLANS/ORDINANCES
9. COMMISSION AND STAFF COMMENTS
10. ADJOURNMENT

PUBLIC COMMENT

A member of the audience speaking during the public comment portion of the agenda shall limit his/her remarks to 3 minutes. Time does not need to be reserved for an item of business listed on the agenda, or otherwise addressed under Item #2, as time is provided for public comment for each item of business.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

The order of presentation for a public hearing shall be as follows:

- a. City Staff/Consultants
- b. Applicant
- c. Correspondence
- d. Public Testimony
- e. Commission Discussion (Commissioners must state any Ex-Parte contact or Conflicts of Interest prior to engaging in any discussions), if it occurred, prior to entering into discussion or voting on a case).

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 02, 2026

A regular meeting of the Marquette City Planning Commission was duly called and held at 6:00p.m. on Tuesday, June 02, 2026, in the Commission Chambers at City Hall. A video recording of the meeting is available online at the [City of Marquette's YouTube channel](#).

ROLL CALL

Planning Commission (PC) members present (8): M. Rayner, N. Vermaat, J. Guter, J. Fitkin, D. Fetter, S. Lawry, Vice-Chair A. Wilkinson, Chair Kevin Clegg.

PC Members absent: None

Staff present: City Planner and Zoning Administrator D. Stensaas, Zoning Official A. Landers.

AGENDA

It was moved by J. Guter, seconded by J. Fitkin, and carried 8-0 to approve the agenda as presented.

MINUTES

The minutes of the 5/05/2026 meeting were approved by consent, as presented.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Nobody stated a conflict.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. 01-SUP-06-26 424 N. Third St. and 143 W. Michigan St. – Blackrocks Brewery-Taphouse

A. Landers said that City Staff has reviewed the Special Land Use permit for an Outdoor Alcoholic Beverage Service use area that includes mobile vending units at their off-street parking lot located at 424 N. Third Street and 143 W. Michigan Street. She scrolled through the agenda materials and named each item, beginning with the Staff Report/Analysis and including the application, the site plan, staff comments on the site plan set, the applicant's replies to staff comments, maps and photos of the site, and other attachments. She said that there was no correspondence submitted on the item.

K. Clegg asked the applicant to address the Commission.

Mr. Andy Langlois introduced himself and Dave Manson, as the applicants. Mr. Langlois stated:

This is something we were doing during the COVID period and it worked really well. Since 2021 or 2022, we're approved and licensed through the State to do just this. Until now, we thought, let's not. But it seems like, seeing how things have been ramping up this summer, it makes sense for us to do this for a couple different reasons. Currently on weekends, we will have three food trucks at the pub, and they take up space whether they're on the road or in our parking lot. We currently put two of the trucks in the parking lot right now, and one goes on the curb. That presents a few problems too, potentially, that haven't happened, but safety issues with standing out in the parking lot waiting for their pretzel and a car coming out leaving at night. By doing this, it's a safer option to say there's no parking back there, we're going to put people back there, and they can sit down and wait for their pretzel and not worry about a car coming by. I mentioned these trucks take up space. Right now, the Burger Bus takes up three spots, the Pretzel truck is going to take up two spots, another truck is going to take all of one, but it will probably encroach into two spots, so that's like seven spots. Right now, we don't have anything. So, what we're proposing is, there's ten spots in the back and we'd end up taking up those spots, leaving three spots that could have been used for parking.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 02, 2026

Unfortunately, we would lose three spots but in the big picture too, being on Third St. quite a few years back, I don't remember when, but it was designated that businesses aren't required any parking. That being said, we totally appreciate and value the parking we do have so we'll be able to maintain up in front seven spots there. That's the game plan right there. It's seasonal, it's hard to plow when you've got all that stuff in the way.

A. Landers clarified that certain business uses aren't required to have parking. She stated: Your retail isn't but your manufacturing is. That's why you have the parking calculations. You have to have the six required parking spaces, and you're showing eight temporary parking spaces per the site plan.

Mr. Langlois said that this is what we're looking to do, and I think it'll be a great option to kind of create a space for people to go eat and safely wait for their purchase, let that roll through Labor Day probably and then go back to plowing snow.

K. Clegg opened the public hearing and invited comments from those assembled.

Mr. Peter Dohrewend, of 131 W. Ohio St., stated:

I had come before when they were doing the upstairs deck portion on the new addition and we had some communication about just noise and issues like that. They listened to those comments and planned accordingly; the owners did. Then a couple of years ago there were some issues about noise and the bands and things like that. I went to them and said, "Hey, what agreements can we have about the bands playing at certain times?" We had agreements and Andy and Dave were really great about that and sort of working with us as neighbors. I'm just here to say they listen to their neighbors. They realize where they're located in terms of their business in a more residential area. So, I understand and am here to support that. I think they'll do what they say in terms of being easy to work with. If we have issues, they're more than accommodating.

Ms. Alissa Patton, of 118 W. Arch St., stated:

We kind of share the back of the lot there. I just feel like there's going to be a lot more people. There's going to be capacity for a lot more people now. So, I'm just wondering if there's going to be any soundproofing, like walls, that kind of thing. And then if it does get louder, what we can do about it? Just wondering if they're going to make any infrastructure, like barriers for sound. So, that's my question, I just want to make sure there's soundproofing, because I just like think there's going to be a couple hundred extra people maybe, and it just gets really loud. So that's my concern.

Mr. Todd King, proprietor of Downwind Sports at 514 N. Third St., stated:

I think it's a great idea. It's well thought out little plan. My only concern is removing any parking whatsoever is a big problem. So, we have tenants over on our side that overflow from the brewery over to our area, which is fine until the people that rent from us can't park. They come up and can't find a spot. So, I'm just thinking if removing any spots is a question now. So, still a concern.

K. Clegg asked if there were others that wished to comment, and seeing none, closed the public hearing. He asked if anyone wanted to motion to suspend the rules for discussion.

It was moved by J. Guter, seconded by S. Lawry, and carried 8-0 to suspend the rules for discussion.

S. Lawry said that he had a question for the owners. He said the Fire Department comments indicated a problem with the proposed location for the bicycle parking. Do you intend to leave the bicycle parking where it presently is then?

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 02, 2026

Mr. Langlois said he thinks that's what they're going to do for now, and that he would like to talk to [Fire Marshal] Jeff Fossitt and just meet him out there and actually see if there was an issue and if he is looking to pull the [fire] truck right next to food trucks?

A. Landers indicated where the issue was for access.

Mr. Langlois said that they will likely put an opening there for egress so he can come in. He said if there's room on either side and he's cool with it, then they'll put some on the outside of that barricade as long as he has what he needs to keep it safe, but until that happens, they'll just keep it bike parking where it is, which is on that swale.

S. Lawry said that their comments indicate that they don't have a plan for what was marked as an Arts Sale area.

Mr. Langlois said he put it there because he thought it would be a fun thing, like on a Saturday, to have an art market. Andrea (Landers) mentioned that a permit or license needs to be acquired, and they will go through that process in order to do that.

S. Lawry said he was wondering if they were going to alternatively then use that space for extra tables as well.

Mr. Langlois said he wasn't planning on it. Tables are like \$200 bucks a pop right now.

S. Lawry said in reality, seating is probably being added for about 36 people at most.

Mr. Langlois confirmed that this is correct and added that this isn't a situation where, if you order food, you have to eat it out there. It's almost more of a waiting area with your beer, or for if you want to eat there. He said a lot of people would go back to join their group and watch music and eat where they normally eat. He added that it's just another option for people to get their food. He also said that, for extra people, you can only fit six at a table; there won't be much standing room. It'd be great to have hundreds of extra people come every day, but that's not going to happen. They are pretty much doing what they're doing right now but allowing people to hang out and do it safely, and to eat there if they want to.

S. Lawry asked if the food trucks would be staying overnight.

Mr. Langlois said he hoped they would. He said that is part of keeping it more efficient and a permanent structure. He said there are other cities that have food truck areas where they're there and maybe they rotate out every month or something, and there's some new one that comes in, but initially they're looking at three that have committed to being there and that's kind of our approach with that.

D. Fetter said that she had two questions. She asked her first question about parking and meeting the requirements. She said her concern is specifically that the handicap spot now appears to have a barrier across it and whether there will be designated handicap access.

Mr. Langlois pointed out on the plan where access would be created the opening for the egress.

D. Fetter said her other question was regarding soundproofing since there will be food trucks there, with generators?

Mr. Langlois said there will be no generators, only onsite electric.

D. Fetter asked if there had been any thoughts for sound reduction with the additional people that will be going to that area.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 02, 2026

Mr. Langlois said no, and added one whole side is surrounded by trees, and if we put out some seating, people will be lower, and there's a six-foot fence. So, in a sense, there's already soundproofing. He said it's like everything else over the last 15 years - figure it out as we go and make adjustments if they need to be made. He also pointed out that it's not going to be a freestanding mosh pit of people back there, and if once or twice a year it is, that would be great. He also said that in general, he's thinking it's going to be a group here and a group there sitting and getting their food, and nothing is being moved back there for entertainment.

J. Guter said he would like clarification on the barrier indicated by the applicant.

Mr. Langlois said that if you go to a festival, they have those galvanized, but they hope to get painted ones because they look sharper, eight-and-a-half-foot-long barriers that you see at running races, bike races, festivals, and they're easily rotated too. It's a semi-permanent structure, but really easy if the Fire Department doesn't have to get in there. It could be moved and easily accessible if they need a bigger space to get through.

N. Vermaat asked Mr. Langlois if he anticipates there being any issues with the flow of pedestrians to that narrow rear entrance, such as people trying to get by, potentially moving to that food truck area.

Mr. Langlois asked for clarification, if N. Vermaat means from the sidewalk or the business.

Mr. Vermaat said they have people coming into the business from there and also have more people potentially using that little path and then going over to the food area, and will extra signage will be added.

Mr. Langlois said it's something they did for Oktoberfest in the past and throughout COVID, and they didn't have any issues, even on Oktoberfest, one of the highest-traffic days. He said that a couple times a year it might get busy if they have some kind of event, but in general, it hasn't been a problem at all.

K. Clegg asked if tents will be installed over the picnic tables.

Mr. Langlois said maybe for once a year, for an event like Oktoberfest.

A. Landers said that she has a question about the divider, and asked for clarification about when the revision is submitted, will it show the parking space indicated with no divider?

Mr. Langlois said he was standing out there today trying to think of the best way to do this. He then pointed out to the Commission on the map what he thought was the best way while still keeping a parking space.

K. Clegg said that he had a question for staff, and asked if this gets approved, and if it's seasonally done, do they have to come before the Planning Commission in future years to do the same thing, especially in regard to the relevant LDC amendments that the City Commission will be considering for adoption?

D. Stensaas said the part about whether or not they'll have to come back again, and we haven't discussed this with the applicants, but in the LDC amendments there is a proposal that food trucks that are going to be on a site for what's deemed long term, to have to get a Special Land Use permit. He said that the DDA in part wanted that as a standard, and so we have to talk to our attorney about what vested rights this approval will confer.

J. Fitkin said just to clarify, you are expecting folks to just go into the outdoor area, go inside and get a beer and then be able to bring it back out and into the area to wait for their food.

Mr. Langlois said yes.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 02, 2026

J. Fitkin asked if they were concerned when folks are walking through that parking area with their beverage?

Mr. Langlois described on the plan what the route would be from inside to outside and vice versa. He said that people are walking around with cups in the Social District at this point, so he didn't see any danger.

S. Lawry said he had concerns about noise for the neighbors too, and the public record shows there's been quite a bit of concern about that in the past. He said he was there in the afternoon, and they didn't have a huge crowd by that time in the afternoon, but there was well over a dozen people in the back talking loudly and the food trucks were making a pretty effective sound screen to the east. If one of them is going to be parked at the far south end of the parking lot, it may be a fairly effective sound screen there.

D. Fetter said she has a question about leaving the property with beer. She's said that she's familiar with the signage about no alcohol beyond this area, but what are the plans for making sure that people are aware that alcohol cannot go into some areas of the parking lot?

Mr. Langlois said that situation could happen now and they're not seeing it often, and that his staff is constantly patrolling out there, and part of their job is to keep eyes on customers and what's going on, even to the point where staff is checking that someone isn't coming in with a Social District cup from somewhere else.

Mr. Manson said it was more of an egregious violation when they were on the street or even in the parking lot, because they don't even think about it; they're just having their beer. So, a lot of the times they'll go back in, put the beer down, then go.

Mr. Langlois said that's one of their hopes, like David said, that with the food trucks in the parking lot, customers will know that cups of alcohol are not allowed outside of the social district. He said they haven't had many issues with that and it's something we continue to keep an eye on.

D. Fetter said that with this addition, will the plan be to have some kind of direction or signage in this area?

Mr. Manson said they're silly with signs, but they realize only about 20% will read them.

K. Clegg said that if there are no more questions, the Planning Commission can review the Site Plan Review and Special Land Use standards.

The standards of sections 54.1402 (E) and 54.1403(C) were reviewed by the Planning Commission, and all were found to be met by the proposal. The review of these standards included the following discussion:

K. Clegg said, regarding section 54.1402(E.10), that noise will be partially mitigated by the existing fence and the placement of the food truck.

J. Guter said he thinks the noise will be reduced just by the fact that none of the trucks will require generators because that's a big noise maker.

K. Clegg stated that they will work to change this plan. They have demonstrated that they have done this in the past and submitted. We had some public testimony that they had done so and worked with the neighbors as well, so I'm feeling good on that.

D. Stensaas related to the Planning Commission that they are always entitled to have a hearing to review conditions after approval and change the conditions if necessary. He said it wasn't very long ago that the City had to do that with Superior Culture because of the noise issue, and that there were actually two following public hearings until the issue was satisfied to the satisfaction of all the neighbors.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 02, 2026

J. Fitkin said, regarding section 54.1403(C.8), that if they plan on keeping the parking spot to the south of the entrance to the bar, she could foresee that creating some issues with someone backing their car out into a person exiting that extra area. She said that could be an issue, but otherwise doesn't see any issues.

J. Guter said, regarding section 54.1403(C.14), that he thinks it meets the standard. He said the N. Third St. Corridor is designated in the Community Master Plan as a mixed-use district with more intense activities along the street, and thinks this goes right along with trying to meet that.

K. Clegg asked if anyone wanted to make a motion.

It was moved by J. Guter, seconded by A. Wilkinson, and carried 8-0 that after holding a public hearing and review of the site plan set dated April 28, 2026, with supplemental documentation and the Staff Report/Analysis for 01-SUP-06-26, the Planning Commission finds that the request meets the intent and requirements of the Land Development Code Sections 54.1403, 54.1402, and 54.636, and hereby approves 01-SUP-06-26 with the following conditions:

- *That an amended plan is submitted to meet staff comments including correcting the site plan sheet for the existing location of the bike racks.*
- *That reasonable efforts be made to address any noise concerns if they arise.*
- *That the applicant resolves the fire department's concerns.*

B. 01-ZOA-06-26 Land Development Code (LDC) Amendments

Ms. Landers said this hearing will consider many proposed LDC amendments that have been underway since late 2025. She related that because the last meeting was canceled on short notice, some proposed LDC amendments were not fully reviewed at previous meetings, and she proceeded to address those subsections. City Staff and the Planning Commission reviewed and discussed portions of section 54.705(3); the definition of Structural Amenity; subsection 54.702(H.1.d); portions of sections 54.502(D) and (F); section 54.905(B); proposed new section 54.630; Figure 53; and subsections 54.636(B.2) and 54.637(B.2). After reviewing the specific sections above, the Planning Commission voted on the package of amendments.

It was moved by N. Vermaat, and seconded M. Rayner, and carried 8-0 that after review of the draft Land Development Code (LDC) amendments presented as case 01-ZOA-06-2026, and after conducting a public hearing and careful consideration of the contents of the draft LDC amendments, the Planning Commission finds that the draft LDC amendments are consistent with the recommendations, goals, and policy objectives of the Community Master Plan, comply with section 54.1405 of the Land Development Code, represent an improvement to regulation that affects property owners in the city, and therefore are justified and appropriate and therefore should be approved by the City Commission as presented.

CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION ON AGENDA ITEMS

Nobody provided comments.

CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Nobody provided comments.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 02, 2026

COMMISSION and STAFF COMMENTS

J. Guter said that he didn't want to lose sight of the need to address the data centers issue, and what we can do as a Planning Commission on that issue, and developing a sound ordinance could be one thing that we could realistically do, and I'm hoping that we can pursue that in the coming months. He also said that revising the tree schedule for the type of trees approved for planting is another thing that the board could possibly follow up on over the next few months.

M. Rayner said that some place downstate had an ordinance on data centers that was really good and the state overruled it and approved a data center there anyway, so maybe we need to have an attorney write an ordinance

S. Lawry said that Blackrocks has been here many times over the past fifteen years, and in most cases we have heard from the public, mostly the residential neighbors, and when they first proposed that location they were going to be an indoor facility. He said most, or all, of the other facilities on Third St. now have outdoor seating as well, and the conflicts with that business corridor and the adjoining neighborhoods didn't really factor into our zoning layout (inaudible) when we established that, and the evolution of outdoor seating has created a conflict (inaudible) with abutting residential properties. He said that it may be too late to do anything about that now, and I think that's a societal change that people want the outdoor seating, and it seems the problem now is not so much the individual businesses, but the fact that we set that growth (?) pattern up that allowed that first outdoor seating that may not have been consistent with neighboring residences, and once we did that we have to (inaudible) for everybody. So, if there is a way we can look at to try to preserve residences that are off Third St. He said that the Third St. part of the Master Plan encourages a vibrant Third St. environment, but it also encourages more residential use of the Third St. corridor too, and if we're going to accomplish those goals we might have to change the wording in the ordinance regarding what you can do outside, how big and area you can have outside (inaudible). Thank you.

A. Landers said that we don't have anything for the next meeting in June.

D. Stensaas said he would be glad to cancel the meeting. He also said that the Planning Commission doesn't get to decide whether to move forward with a data center zoning project, and that the City Manager or Commission provides direction for such a project and we have submitted a memo from the PC to the Manager requesting that it be considered.

K. Clegg said that will be a hard road but worth pursuing.

ADJOURNMENT

K. Clegg adjourned the meeting at 7:25 p.m.



CITY OF MARQUETTE
PLANNING AND ZONING
1100 Wright Street
MARQUETTE, MI 49855
(906) 228-0425
www.marquettemi.gov

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Dave Stensaas, City Planner and Zoning Administrator
DATE: May 14, 2026
SUBJECT: Training – Important Code Information for Residents - Water Bill Mailer

The following one-page mailer is sent to residents along with the spring brush and leaf collection information. Staff would like to know the Planning Commission's opinions on the helpfulness of the mailer, and would also like to explain why this mailer is important to staff.

Important Property Code Information for Residents



Please read and keep this document for your reference. Thank you.

Homeowners are responsible for securing permits for new structures, exterior and interior renovations and construction, fences and walls, driveways, and enclosures for animals (chickens, rabbits, beehives). Many commercial property renovations require submitting and obtaining approval for permits or site plans for zoning compliance.

Please inquire with us if in doubt! Call 906-228-0425 for development code inquiries.

Failure to obtain required permits is likely to result in a citation.

Our staff can best help you over the phone, but you can find more information online at <https://www.marquettemi.gov/departments/community-development-old/zoning/>

Question and Answer sampler:

Q: My **siding and/or roof** need replacement; does that require a permit?

A: No - If the structural members, doors and/or window locations, or size of a building are not altered you do not need a permit to replace cladding or shingles/roofing materials. However, any structural alterations—such as changes to posts, beams, joists, roof structure, wall openings, or adding/removing any part of the building’s framework—do require a permit, and so do solar panels installed on a roof.

Q: My **fence** is falling apart, and I want to rebuild it in the same place it has been for decades, just like it is built now. Do I need a permit to do that?

A: Yes, because... The fence may have been erected before permits were required and may be partially in a right-of-way or on a neighbor’s property (not uncommon with old fences). It may also be constructed in a way that does not comply with the current standards. The cost of a fence permit is less than many single, pre-made fence panels.

Q: My **deck** needs repairs, consisting of some new treads on the steps, some new planks, and the replacement of handrails. Does this require a permit?

A: No - If it’s a ground-level deck, and if no structural alterations or changes to the size are intended. Structural alterations (changes to framing, supports) do require permits. A deck at second story or higher may also be subject to the state’s building code requirements for any alterations. Please contact the County Building Codes office for additional information.

Q: I want to expand my concrete **driveway** a bit. Do I need a permit for that?

A: Yes. A Zoning Compliance Permit is needed to construct hard-surface parking anywhere on your property. If paving work is to be done in the right-of-way, a permit must be approved by the City Engineer. New gravel parking (residential only) also requires a zoning compliance permit and must be built to code design standards.

Q: I want to build a small **patio**. Does that require zoning approval?

A: Yes or No - depending on the materials, size, and location. Please call to inquire.

The City of Marquette’s Land Development Code and Zoning Map are online here:
<https://www.marquettemi.gov/departments/community-development-old/zoning/>