

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 18, 2025**

A regular meeting of the Marquette City Planning Commission was duly called and held at 6:00p.m. on Tuesday, March 18, 2025, in the Commission Chambers at City Hall. A video recording of this meeting is available on the City of Marquette website.

ROLL CALL

Planning Commission (PC) members present: W. Premeau, Vice Chair K. Clegg, M. Rayner, J. Fitkin, Chair S. Mittlefehldt, A. Wilkinson, K. Hunter, D. Fetter, S. Lawry.

PC Members absent: none

Staff present: D. Stensaas, City Planner and Zoning Administrator; A. Landers, Zoning Official, S. Hobbins, Deputy City Manager

AGENDA

It was moved by K. Clegg, seconded by M. Rayner, and carried 9-0 to approve the agenda as presented.

MINUTES

The minutes of the March 04, 2025, meeting were approved by consent, with a change to an error under the New Business item.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

**A. 01-PUD-03-25 – W. Magnetic St. multi-lot residential Planned Unit Development
Concept Proposal**

Chair S. Mittlefehldt explained the process for the public hearing and asked staff to begin the proceedings.

Zoning Official A. Landers Veridea Group LLC is seeking concept plan approval of a proposed Planned Unit Development for a mixture of townhomes. One unit, duplexes, triplexes and six units for a total of forty units to be located at the preexisting parking lots on the south side of the W. Magnetic St. between Lee St. and Fourth St. This public hearing is to determine if their criteria in Section 54.323(F) of the Land Development Code are met. Attached the agenda was the Staff Report and Analysis. All notices have been sent in accordance with the Land Development Code and state law and correspondence has been received.

A. Landers showed and explained all agenda packet items that were included. She also said that three pieces of correspondence were received after the agenda was posted, and she and D. Stensaas read the correspondence from Robert Kamperschroer and Kari O'Keefe, Marquette County Housing Now-Christopher Germain, and the Messiah Lutheran Church-Rev. Dr. Andrew Porcher.

City Planner and Zoning Administrator D. Stensaas stated:

That's all the correspondence we got after the agenda was published on Friday. There are a couple pieces of correspondence in the packet from John Myefski, and one from Grant Soltwisch. I just want to say for everybody here, this is an administrative process with the Planning Commission. They are tasked with going through the sections of the Land Development Code that deal with a Planned Unit Development. Approval and housing affordability is not in the Planning Commission's purview. If that's what anybody was here to talk about, that is a policy level issue that the City Commission would need to address and that is not at all addressed in the Land Development Code ordinances.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 18, 2025

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

If I could just add to what City Planner Stensaas just said, for those of you who are not zoning experts and are wondering what we're here to do tonight, a Planned Unit Development is a tool that Planning Commission and Zoning Administrators can use that gives flexibility to the Land Development Code. Tonight, just to echo what Dave said, we are here to determine whether or not this proposed project, which is in its concept stage here, meets the Land Development Code requirements for a Planned Unit Development. That's really our task tonight. We as a Planning Commission deal with land use and we don't have any authority over the question of affordability, which I think we all universally value and share and want to see more affordable housing, but that is outside the scope of the Land Development Code.

D. Stensaas said:

If I could add that this is the first step in a multi-step process that requires three public hearings. This is the concept phase of the project for qualification of the PUD as a concept. The next phase would be approval of the preliminary plan by the City Commission. The developer would still have to propose a site plan that has all the details for the development of civil infrastructure, such as water, sewer, actual street dimensions and anything like that. That comes back to the Planning Commission for a recommendation, so there are multiple steps. This is the most complicated development process that the City administers, and it requires several public hearings, so this is just the first phase.

Bob Mahaney, 310 Lake Enchantment Rd., CEO of the Veridea Group, stated:

Thank you for the opportunity for us to be here tonight and thank you for the turnout of everybody. I'm assuming that you're here with an interest in this project, which I think is great. You have the preliminary materials in front of you and I won't spend a lot of time on what you already have in your packets, I just want to touch on a couple of things. Number one, to get to this point of making a preliminary application to you for the PUD has been over five years in the making for Veridea and our people. All the way back in 2019 when we first had conversations and a preliminary agreement with Life Point to acquire this property, we put a lot of time and effort into the work on this development. We've been fortunate that we have been able to partner with the City, with the NMU Foundation, and a number of community organizations to get us to this point. I have been asked a lot of questions in respect to the overall site and what is our plan?, and I think all the community is waiting to hear that and we're very anxious to share that with you. The question that would be on the tip of my tongue if I was in the audience is, "When are you going to share that Veridea?". We're going to share that when we can tell you definitively what that plan is. There are still a lot of uncertainty and unknown things that have to be discussed with the City and with others, "What's the future of College Ave.?", "What happens to Piqua St.?", and on and on. There is still some demolition work that has to be done. There's a conversation about who is going to be responsible for that. We don't have full ownership of all the property yet so I'm hesitant to go out and make public representations on the future of that property until we have legal control of that property. So, there's a lot of balls in the air still.

The one thing that's constant though is this site. This site from our very first master site plan concept that we submitted that we shared with the public back in 2018 or '19, I apologize I may have my dates wrong but back then, and our first attempt to acquire the property directly from Life Point called for this area to be townhome type development. In our application to be the selected developer, when the NMU Foundation went through to select a developer, we again reiterated that we envisioned this area to be frankly what you see tonight. It hasn't changed much at all over the five years that we've been involved in this. In order to achieve what we would like to achieve, achieve what is the optimal use of the property, a PUD seems to make sense. We believe that while yes, this is greater density than what you see in the surrounding neighborhood, it is a great transition from what is intended to the north, while their not sharing that site plan yet for that area to the north of Magnetic, it definitely will be a denser use so we see this as honoring the residential area, the neighborhood to the south and to the east and west but at the same time providing some housing that is needed, as was alluded to earlier tonight, and also

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 18, 2025**

creating a very good logical transition from the single family residential neighborhoods that are in existence to what we do with the rest of the property. I'd be happy to answer any questions, hear your comments, I'm sure I might have missed something.

Brian Savolainen, Civil Engineer for the proposed development, stated:

I just want to address a couple items that came up in the correspondence. The type of housing that's here is proposed town homes and each of these units has multiple car garages so you're not seeing a lot of hard surface parking area. There is plan for some overflow and visitors. We'll also be working with the City on looking at some parking on Magnetic St. for possible overflow, but this is not what had been there before. That was hospital parking for employees, and this is going back to a residential type of neighborhood. Currently the plan as shown, we're not asking for a variance on parking requirements, currently the plan does meet that and is capable of doing that.

We're also trying to limit the access to Park St. in the back because we're not sure, or Piqua I believe, for emergency vehicle access and the south side of that part it is more like part of an alley where there is capability of accessing from both ways. The parking will be addressed, we'll be working closely with your planning staff and the engineering department on utilities and how were handling water, sewer, storm water. One thing we're doing here is eliminating a sea of black top. Just by doing this type of development, we're already really helping the storm water situation. In that regard, we will be doing some underground storm water on this as well. I just wanted to add those comments and I'm available as well.

S. Mittlefehldt said I just had a quick question about Piqua, in this plan it kind of looks like it's going to be paved but is there plans to do anything with Piqua or has that been part of the discussion?

Mr. Mahaney said we've had discussions with City leadership, mentioned about that on a very conceptual basis, kind of what ifing and what could that look like. That decision has not been made. There seems to be interest on the City's part to improve Piqua at a minimum. If we were to use Piqua as shown here, we would do that most likely only if it was improved. Don't ask me to define improvement right now, I don't think that would be fair to City staff, but there's active discussions going on about that. Adding one comment to Brian's about parking, we want to have as much green space on this property, and you'll see hopefully when we show our master site plan the amount of green space that we're trying to retain. It's a real challenge and a struggle as a developer. Of course you want to have adequate parking, I don't want people parking over at Messiah Lutheran, I fully appreciate what their concern is. As we're going through our design, the question we're asking ourselves is, frankly, is there adequate parking. That's why there's two car garages in most cases. Some are one car garages and there is some overflow parking but we're trying to balance green space versus having a bunch of impervious asphalt. We'd much rather have green space if we can. That's the thinking behind this and as Brian says it's our understanding that we meet parking requirements. Not only that we meet parking requirements, but we feel from a practical standpoint, from a daily use space, that there is sufficient parking. Thank you.

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

Since we did get all our correspondence read into the record, we will now go to public testimony. Now is the time if you have comments on this project, you each have three minutes to state your name, address, and share your thoughts.

Jeff Gagnon, of 437 W. Magnetic St., stated:

I'm not sure if this is the right commission or if it should be the City Commission for my comment but I'll say it here anyway and then I'll come back to the next meeting, but my concern is, I'm not opposed to the development, looks great, but for the current demolition process, my house has been shaken physically from the demolition from the old buildings, cracking my plaster, cracking several storm windows and the house has been covered in the demolition dust even though they've been trying with

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 18, 2025

the water cannons but Mother Nature doesn't want to work with them. I'm just letting you know that's been a thing. I'm kind of the only house right there, I'm not sure if anything happened down the block a little bit but maybe she's far enough removed but that's been my experience over the last year and half. When I read the packet that was provided in the TV6 article from the site plan review standards, and it's E(10), says, "Nuisance, no noise, vibrations, dust, fumes or other nuisance shall leave the property in a manner that affects the surrounding area". That did not happen with the demolition. I'm not saying that the construction will be that way, I'm just saying if that's a normal application for people to do stuff, that didn't happen. And I've got stuff at home I can show you if you want to come tour my house. Just letting you know that was a concern. Also, and I know this is preliminary and nothing is set yet, but there is sort of a concern and it's been breached by a lot of people of Piqua, because it's not currently paved and it's fairly narrow. To expand it would be taking either property from us on the south side of Magnetic, or the Park St. folks to expand that because it's really narrow. That would be another concern and maybe possibly making it a one way would make more sense because then it wouldn't have to be as wide, I guess. I wanted it to be on record that some things have happened, and because I'm a minority one little person there, and maybe it wasn't known by everyone. Thank you.

Scott Rule, of 408 W. Park St., stated:

I have some concerns. I have a concern about Piqua St. and a flurry of dust that's always been there. I've tried to talk to the City numerous times throughout the years and they do a token strip of dust control in the spring and a token strip up in the fall. You people don't realize how much motor oil has been dumped back there, how much carcinogens have been dumped back there and the City used to dump their motor oil back there. I remember because I grew up in that alley. I know people in the City. I want something done about it. Some sort of encapsulation or whatever. This might come back and bite people if the EPA gets involved, if somebody starts taking soil samples. Also, with the hospital, we had a setback PUD, as to how high the hospital could build off Piqua and I'm wondering if that's entertained now. I don't want a four-story building looking down in my backyard. I don't. I think it's wrong. It appears that they're going to have garages on the 300 block, but I don't know what they're going to do in the 400 block yet. I'm wondering if that was going to be a PUD to prevent, if they're going to have a step back in height from Piqua St., Magnetic. I mean, I understand it's going to be a building max, it doesn't really matter there, but for me it does. And are there going to be taxes? Is this going on the tax rolls? Historically, Marquette has put up industrial parks and not charged anything for taxes, given tax breaks in the industry and it hasn't worked, which I'm sorry for that. But are these going to be on the tax rolls? Because my assessment just went up again. I live in over a hundred-year-old home. And I'm also a resident of one of those infamous "through lots" where I have to ask permission if I want to put up a fence taller than four feet and it's a thousand dollars. And they can say no, and I'll lose my thousand dollars. But when the hospital was building things, they gladly put up ten-foot fences. And if I want to put up a ten-foot fence, I don't see why that's a problem. These through-lot rules are wrong. My address is on Park St., not Piqua St. and that's just some of the concerns I have right now. My biggest one is about setbacks and fugitive dust. I've been breathing that crap for years. It's all over in my storage buildings, coating everything I own that I store in my storage buildings. And I think we should do something about it. Thank you.

Bill Medick, owner of a vacant lot at 324 W. Magnetic St., stated:

Just one comment that basically surrounds infrastructure. The intersection of Fourth St. and Magnetic is not really a cross street. The four roads are coming in at different angles. I remember when the hospital had employees there at 5 o'clock, 8 o'clock in the morning and it was pretty congested and busy. And so, my question is it would be nice if the City or developers would keep that in mind, and perhaps add a stop light, or a roundabout, or something like that to resolve some of the congestion that is going to happen in that area. Thank you.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 18, 2025

Margaret Brumm, of 404 E. Magnetic St., stated:

I'm looking at a piece of paper title planned unit development requests. The developer is requesting an extension from quadplexes to six plus multiplexes. Even former Commissioner Evan Bonsall in his most egregious desire to cram as many people into as small of area as possible never mentioned a quad-six-plus. No two-car garage is going to accommodate six separate houses with six separate vehicles. And there's a lot of hand waving saying well we'll put cars on Magnetic St. - not from November 1st to April 1st will you put cars on Magnetic St. There's also, in the pictures, which I've looked at with great detail, there's no room for snow. There's absolutely no room for snow removal in this area. We have had a ridiculous amount of snow in the past while and this is going to be a problem because in townhouses, nobody is responsible for sidewalks, and nobody is responsible for keeping the snow away from everyone else. And there's no place to move it. You've got this beautiful four-foot fence in front of it, you can't lift snow over a fence. Number three, there is no place for the garbage and recycling bins. I looked and I looked, and I looked and nope, there's no place to slide them underneath. You're going to have a beautiful townhouse, worth hundreds of thousands of dollars and those green and blue bins up and down and sidewalkss and in the road in the wintertime. That's what happens because there is no place for them.

And so, the common sense of cramming more people into this area, and please, anybody in this town who has driven up and down Piqua would not even think of it as an alley. It is a wide spot of brown dirt. I apologize to the people in the neighborhood who love it, I appreciate that you grew up there and you love it, but everything these people said about how abused it was, it was a dumping ground for many different things. And the fact is, none of this planning takes into account an environmental impact statement about what's in the ground. They're talking about stormwater underground. Well, when they start digging those stormwater tunnels, what are they going to dig up? There is no room for this many people in that space. A dear friend of mine can't use the recycling bin she has now because it's in her snow field, it's been stuck there for four months, and I don't even want to suggest what she's been doing with her recycling. A little bit of common sense goes a long way, and these are beautiful drawings, but they don't account for bins upside down in the roadway and Piqua, you cannot get an emergency vehicle down that road, and you know that's going to be necessary if you cram that many people in that short of space. Will you please demand more of the developer than pretty pictures and pleasant thoughts. Thank you.

Patrick Markey of 419 W. College Ave., stated:

I own the lot at 366 W. Park and also back up to the development. Though I am excited to see progress, a little bit more information is needed. If you were just to return this to what it originally was, it would be approximately twenty city lots, not forty. I understand the need to cram more housing in and I'm not really opposed to the number forty, but I am opposed to the actual PUD development, more from the aspect of changes to the zoning. They mention wanting to change the setbacks for the streets, but do they talk about the setbacks for the height restrictions? Currently it's 31.5 feet. Number two, zoning for a three-story building, so what information do we have on that? I understand it's preliminary, and it's a multistage process, but if you give them this permission to go around the current zoning for that development for that block, are they going to be held to height restrictions? More so because you have two houses, which have both spoken, they're stuck right in the middle of that. So, they'd have a thirty-foot brick wall right next to their house. I just don't think this planned unit development is the right idea for this lot, for this section. For them to ask to combine two different ones to meet their requirements, I'm sorry, it doesn't meet the requirements, and I as a neighbor, don't approve of it. Again, I think it's a great idea, I don't have a problem with the townhouses, I don't have a problem with trying to get more than just the twenty lots in there, but I think it's a bit of stretch the way it's currently drawn out, from that aspect. Because as I look at some of these drawings, we've talked about snow plowing, it's going to be the backup beepers. Yes, I know, when the hospital plowed it, everyone listened to the backup beepers but it's kind of nice they've been gone for the past several years. I'd hate to see them come back. Honestly, another thing is they're not restoring it back to its original residential area like they said

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 18, 2025

they are, if they were, it would be twenty lots with twenty single family houses on it, so that's a misrepresentation in their own submission here, and that's (b). Thank you for your time.

Mike Ouimette, of 400 W. Park St., stated:

I am kitty corner from this. Most of my questions have been answered, however I do think the density is too much. Especially these four units that enter onto Piqua. There're sixteen cars there that will be going up and down Piqua. Piqua's basically a two track. It's big enough for one commercial vehicle like UPS truck, garbage truck, one fire truck. Two cars can't pass going opposite directions without going on someone's property, jumping the curb that isn't there. It is a street, not an alley, which was said numerous times here. The City, at present, only minimally maintains it. It's not a criticism, it's just a statement of fact. Once, maybe twice a year they come down with calcium chloride and spray for the dust. A few days later, a couple rainstorms later, the dust is back. Cars zip up and down that street, especially taking cut-offs from Seventh down Piqua to Lee or down to Fourth. I guess they don't want to deal with the stop sign. But there's already a lot of traffic on there. We have a fair number of little kids that play in their backyard, their safety may be at risk. There're no stop signs where Piqua hits any of the main intersections - people literally do not stop - they just fly across the intersection, they go fast. If that's bigger units to the west, that means opening Piqua, there's potential for another twelve cars. You have a lot of cars going on an already busy, two-track dirt road, so I think that's a problem. If you do improve it or encapsulate it or whatever, it's going to cost money. My big concern is who pays for that. I have land that abuts Piqua in the 400 block, as does Scott, and usually that would be an assessment on our property tax right? Or will Veridea pay for any improvements to that road? So safety, traffic, dust, road maintenance - which is a problem right now - and then cost if you incur that new road. Thank you.

Frank King, of 1105 Presque Isle Ave., stated:

I live on the corner of Fourth and Magnetic. I am intimately aware of how difficult traffic is at that corner. I do think it would have to be adjusted. We hear honks, and car crashes all night long. I do have concerns about the heights of the buildings. To walk out your front door and have a daunting building across the street that stretches for an entire city block is not the most appetizing thing for our community. I also have a big concern with the amount of green space in the forty-unit system. If we are trying to attract people who are going to be investing in the community and living here for a long time, I feel we need to accommodate for pets, livelihood, and kids. Kids love to be outside. Those are my concerns.

Carol Touchinski, of 1123 Presque Isle Ave., stated:

I'd like to underscore some of the things I've heard tonight because I've experienced them myself and I thought - oh maybe it's just me, is something wrong with me? The dust, the fine particulate matter that's flying around in the sky every single day of that project. I've had to, for the first time in my life, go to the doctor for medical advice on allergies and how to handle them. My dog is now on allergy medicines. So, something is happening there that needs to be looked at. We're breathing in some things that aren't healthy and I'm hoping they're just not toxic. And I have a lot of concern moving forward, if we've already received some of this, we can't control it, we have these water hoses on it, but it did nothing to help. As the project moves forward and they begin to build, they need to be really cognizant of the dust, especially if we have Piqua, that has been a contaminated site. I think that what I'd like to see from you guys is just a really hard look at that, because I'm quite frankly kind of scared of what I've been breathing and how things have been working. And like the gentleman said earlier, we have cracks in our walls and houses now, probably due to the banging and stuff. How do our long-term citizens of Marquette City feel about these issues? Is there anyone to go to, is there anyone to talk to, and what do we do?

Darin Johnson, of 501 W. Magnetic St., stated:

I had a lot of problems with the demolition - cockroaches, power surges, water problems. I talked with somebody about a year ago, and I got kind of shut down. I wasn't too happy about that. It looks better

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 18, 2025**

now than when it was a hospital. I do like the concept of what's going on. I don't have any real concerns except for the two neighbors that are going to be surrounded by this. We do have a problem with the way that was taken down. I haven't looked for all the cracks, yet but is there anywhere we can talk to someone about the financial losses that we had because of it?

D. Stensaas said that Mr. Johnson should contact the City Manager's office.

Maria Horton, of 372 W. Park St., stated:

Our backyard backs up to the two townhomes that would be behind us. And my concern is Piqua is just not a street. It's like an alley, and we drive in there at the moment because in the wintertime you have to park in your yard, you can't park on the street. You can't have two cars coming in there at the same time. So, my concern is with the four that are on the alley it's just going to cause a lot of traffic, and there's kids coming in and out. And already there's a fence where that backs up, and kids are running in and out, you can't see. My concern is more traffic.

S. Mittlefehldt closed the public hearing after no one else wished to provide a comment. She said that the hearing will now proceed to Commission discussion and that if anyone wishes to respond to any of the comments provided, they can do so now. She also said that the Commission must address the PUD qualification criteria of section 54.323(F) of the Land Development Code.

S. Lawry said (51:15) he has a comment on Piqua St., and related that the City has a published long-term Capital Improvements Plan that addresses paving all the gravel streets in town, and I realize they are probably not on track with it right now, but it does list what year that was supposed to get paving. He also said it's not a hard and fast (inaudible), and things move around a bit depending on (inaudible) availability, but quite a few years ago the City sold a grader with the idea that they were going to pave all of the gravel streets, and they've been working on it.

S. Mittlefehldt said - as a follow-up on that, regarding the concerns heard about fugitive dust, she is wondering if staff knows if there is any wiggle room in the PUD process to ask for the developer to help pay for some of those improvements - can the Planning Commission recommend that as part of the PUD?

D. Stensaas said that the Planning Commission should steer clear of that. He said that is called an exaction, and there have been numerous court cases around those types of requests [of developers], so that's something you should leave for the City Commission to deal with.

D. Stensaas also said that he wanted to help inform the Commission a bit on an issue Commissioner Lawry raised, and about the lots on the south side of the street. He said Piqua is an "Act 51 street", which means it is a street that the City receives a bit of funding for through the Act 51 statute, but it was platted as an alley in the Normal Subdivision. He related information that the City Surveyor had provided to his office about the status of the lots on the south side of the street, several of which - but not all - had "excepted out" of their deeds ten-foot (10') portions at some time long in the past. He related that this presents the City with challenges for the paving and draining of the street, regarding the ownership of those parcels, and others that did not except portions out of their titles and which now protrude - on paper - into the right-of-way.

W. Premeau said - I just have a question on utilities. All of those people on Piqua are getting their water from somewhere and their sewer is going somewhere, maybe Mr. Lawry knows where it's going.

S. Lawry said - I don't specifically. On the lots that are left there, I know in the next block to the west, some of those lines went out through the yards on, fronting on Magnetic and tied into the Magnetic street line. I think it's quite possible that some of the lots that are built on at the east end of this block

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 18, 2025

might be similarly served. There are no mains other than perhaps a power or phone cable in Piqua. There's no water or sewer lines.

W. Premeau said - also it's my understanding there is no storm sewer on Magnetic St., and the hospital took care of all their water and those parking lots by putting in huge drain fields. Any loads of rock that the water is now draining into? The future development, the way it looks, the water would run to Magnetic unless they use some of those. In order to build these, they're going to have to destroy a lot of those. I know we did one parking lot there, and that's what we did. For maintaining the water, I believe they even filled some basements with rock.

D. Stensaas said - looking at the City's mapping program that shows utilities (and staff showed the map on the monitors), Magnetic St. shows several storm sewers in green, so there is a storm sewer system.

S. Lawry said - I think the hospital was just trying to get credits for the stormwater runoff by retaining some of it on their property. I think in order to even get the permits to build some of the parking lots, they were required to do some retention. That was how they typically did it, fill a basement with crushed rock, put drains in and break the floor up to allow it to filtrate into the subsoil.

K. Clegg said - I think the snow storage issue is a good point. Are we today looking at feet and inches of that in this preliminary phase of this process?

A. Landers said - that all goes under the preliminary site plan review. This is only a concept, and you have to look if they meet the objectives of the criteria. If they do, then they have to come back, and you guys will go through that preliminary site plan review stage, and that also goes to the City Commission as well.

S. Mittlefehldt said - other things we heard about from the public were concerns about height, which would also be reviewed at that site plan stage.

A. Landers said - correct, but they are also not asking for a height variance, so I don't know if they were planning on meeting the 31.5 feet, but they can bring that up at the next stage as well.

D. Stensaas said that the Planning Commission has also been discussing amendments to the Land Development Code that would increase the height limit for multi-family housing.

S. Mittlefehldt said that she would like to direct attention to LDC Section 54.323(F), on page 25 of the packet. She said that for the Planning Commission to make a recommendation that this meets the criteria for a Planned Unit Development, it must determine that it meets the criteria in subsection (F), and then proceeded to read each subsection of (F), she then asked the members to opine on whether the proposal meets the standards of that item. The following discussion ensued regarding the stated subsections:

(F)(1) – all members agreed that the standard was met after being asked twice.

S. Mittlefehldt stated, after asking for any discussion:

There were some important concerns [registered] about dust, traffic issues, safety - to be considered at the site plan level – especially that intersection at the east side of Magnetic and I agree that could be an issue of concern around traffic, but again I don't think we have enough details to figure that out at this stage.

(F)(2) – all members agreed that the standard was met.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 18, 2025

S. Middlefehldt said - this is one where I think there was generally it was supposed to be a two acre lot for the PUD but there was an explanation about why this sort of parcels, the configuration of the parcels on this particular site maybe would be worthy of consideration just because there is a coherent plan between that whole section which I think the applicant made pretty clear in the packet. Any thoughts on that or other aspects of the application?

S. Lawry said - I do think this probably results in a better option than accomplishing it without the PUD, but Mr. Markey was concerned about the fact that if there were twenty residential lots there, there could be twenty residences. Actually, it would be legal to build duplexes and triplexes on those residential lots and actually fit more than forty units into that same space without the PUD. Just without the same level of organization and planning going into it ahead of time.

(F)(3) – all members agreed that the standard was met.

D. Fetter said - I have a question, on added loads when it comes to Piqua Street, adding more traffic essentially to that road. It was stated that it's not a one-way - it's not able to have two cars next to each other. So how do we accommodate for this, potentially adding more traffic to that road?

D. Stensaas said - from an Engineering perspective, and that is what all roads are evaluated on, there are certain criteria for level-of-service. It's a concept that's been around a long time that describes how well a street can service an amount of traffic. When you are stuck in gridlock, you're basically at a level of service F, meaning that the street has failed to move people in a timely manner or safely. The City Engineer and I talked about the four units that would have driveways backing into Piqua. If every one of those units had five trips a day, you're going to add forty trips on the street per day. The other proposed driveway farther to the west, is through that lot, is a little more questionable how many trips that would add because the major access is on Magnetic St. One of the items in the correspondence was a comment about closing that road and I believe that person has talked to the developer about the possibility of not going forward with that idea because of the potential for car's lights shine into the block to the south as they come out of that lot when it's used. That's the basic thing about those four duplex units there, the amount of traffic they're going to add there is very negligible in terms of level of service. The City only owns thirteen feet on the Fourth St. end and ten feet wide on the Lee St. end, but as for how much traffic it's going to add forty or sixty trips, eighty, ninety, a hundred? Does that cause the road to fail, that's the question.

S. Mittlefehldt asked if there has been discussion about turning the street into a one-way officially? Because that might address some of the safety issues.

D. Stensaas said that it would be a great discussion to have, and it probably makes a lot of sense.

D. Fetter said - I think the main concern here is that that is going to be the only road that those four units can use. What I heard from the community is that maybe the snowplow doesn't come down that road every time the snow comes, so those units won't have access to their property. I just want to confirm that this road is going to be safely utilized for the people that are actually living on that road.

K. Clegg said - I think that it's a reasonable increase that it's not what we're used to but it's not going to cause the property to fail. A lot of the problems, or comments that we've seen, are actually about the road and the problems that people have had in the past rather than with the development itself. We heard from Dave that we can't take this action at this stage, but I don't think it's going to cause the road to fail.

S. Mittlefehldt asked if language could be added, not as the developer's responsibility to turn it into a one-way road, but if that could be something we would be able to talk about at the site plan level?

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 18, 2025

D. Stensaas said that the recommendation to make Piqua a one-way street could be made or could also be made now along with the motion to advance.

M. Rayner asked if this was reviewed by the Fire Department and would meet the access requirements for those four dwellings for safety.

A. Landers stated the Fire department had no comments.

(F)(4) – all members agreed that the standard was met.

S. Mittlefehldt stated this was something that came up that people had concerns about, maybe that was why they were going with a PUD. In terms of parking requirements, that is something that they are subject to, parking requirements. Some of those concerns we'll probably look closer at in the review plan but there are standards for parking that are required as part of a PUD.

S. Lawry said I just had a question about the parking. The drawing that we had showed numbered spaces on the Magnetic St. frontage in the street public right of way. And I was wondering if there was a need to count those development and meet the standard. In particular, it kind of shows them cut into the existing parkway space. Weaving the curb in and out like that has proven to be unsustainable downtown and it probably wouldn't be there either. Really, I think the parking on that block was restricted somewhat at the request of the hospital or neighbors based on the number of cars per employees parking at the hospital. That would be subject to review now that the hospital is no longer occupying the area. Probably would allow for parking on that street, that block in particular is wide enough that it would allow parking on both sides. That's something for the traffic and parking committee to review.

(F)(5) - The Planning Commission discussed each qualification criteria item (a-j) in section 54.323(F)(5) and found that items a, c, f, g, h, i, j are met by the proposal. The following discussion took place during the analysis of those items.

Item (a) was determined to be met.

Item (b) was not found to be met, due to the fact that specific uses for the former hospital campus property directly across Magnetic St. are still conceptual, and there are no renderings or draft site plans for that anticipated development.

Item (c) was found to be met.

K. Hunter said we don't know that. I don't think we have that information for perpetuity.

S. Lawry said - I was going to say basically the same thing. The first two talk about permanently, and this one about perpetuity. We can't legislate the future that lightly, and even a PUD can come back for an amendment at some future date, but this concept shows green space that would be contractually reserved under the eventual PUD contract if it remains this way in the site plan.

Item (d) was not found to be met.

K. Clegg said - assuming the former hospital site is going to be more dense and have higher density, taller structures, this does provide a transition from single-family homes into something bigger than that, but we're making assumptions based on things we don't know. So (b) it probably is a good step, but we don't have all information available to us.

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 18, 2025**

Item (e) was not determined to be met.

S. Lawry said - I don't think it guarantees provision of public improvement, but it could be the impetus for public improvements on Piqua St. It's not the guarantee that this calls for.

Item (f) was found to be met.

Item (g) was found to be met.

Item (h) was found to be met.

Item (i) was found to be met.

S. Mittlefehldt asked if this site qualified as a Brownfield.

Deputy City Manager Sean Hobbins said that this is officially included in the Brownfield Plan for the former hospital redevelopment and has been designated as included parcels.

M. Rayner asked if the status as part of the Brownfield Plan would help with the road issue and what was dumped there.

S. Hobbins said this isn't an "environmental Brownfield" and rather qualifies as obsolete use of space or obsolete buildings; that is what everything qualified as, and it hasn't been an environmental concern on any of these properties except what was present in the buildings and has been mitigated.

Item (j) was found to be met.

S. Mittlefehldt said that it appears from our discussion that the proposed project appears to meet at least three or more of the criteria in section (5), and asked if anyone wanted to have further discussion or if anyone is prepared to make a motion. She also said that when preparing a motion, to take into consideration some of the issues that we discussed, such as the one-way street.

It was moved by K. Clegg, and seconded by A. Wilkinson, and carried 9-0, that after holding a public hearing, and review of the concept PUD site plan set dated 2-17-25, and the Staff Report/Analysis with attachments for 01-PUD-03-25, the Planning Commission finds that the request meets the following objectives a, c, f, g, h, i, and j and the criteria of Section 54.323(F) of the Marquette City Land Development Code, therefore the proposal is eligible for a PUD, and strongly recommends that the City make Piqua St. one-way as part of this PUD.

S. Mittlefehldt said that the Planning Commission, having found that the proposal is eligible for a PUD, it now needs to address the minimum size requirement. She continued, reading from p.6 of the agenda packet, saying that typically the minimum size of a PUD is two (2) acres of contiguous land, however the City can permit smaller PUDs, and she referred to the applicant's letter asking for a waiver of the LDC section 54.323(C) requirement via the stated exceptions. She asked if anyone wanted to discuss this, or if someone would like to make a motion.

S. Lawry moved, K. Clegg seconded, and the motion carried 9-0 to suspend the rules for discussion.

S. Lawry said - I would note that PUDs can extend across a public street under our current ordinance. That's not considered a break in the continuity of the property. These are all connected on one block, even though there are some other properties in there. It could be developed as a central portion PUD,

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 18, 2025**

leaving the end lots out, but we probably would not get as desirable a result if we allowed that, so I think it makes sense this time to allow it in its "parceled form".

D. Fetter asked if there were concerns regarding the different zoning on lots between these lots, and in this case there are MDR zoned parcels with houses on them in between.

D. Stensaas said that is something for you to consider, and it could be a factor in whether you recommend to approve this request.

S. Mittlefehldt asked if that would create any inconsistencies for land development there? I think probably not, because functionally it probably wouldn't create problems.

S. Lawry said that this does seem similar to the PUD we amended in the last year over on E. Crescent St. – the old Fish and Wildlife building that had been a PUD that was stretched across the street and another right-of-way because it was all one parcel. He also said that this is considered all one parcel in tax coding, so I think there's quite a parallel to that previous PUD.

S. Mittlefehldt asked if there were any other thoughts, or if anyone wants to make a motion.

It was moved by K. Clegg, and seconded by J. Fitkin, and carried 9-0 that after holding a public hearing, and review of the concept PUD site plan dated 2-17-25 and the Staff Report/Analysis with attachments for 01-PUD-03-25, the Planning Commission finds that the proposal is eligible for a PUD, and recommends to the City Commission approval of the waiver request per Section 54.323(C) due to the following findings - there is precedent [for non-contiguous PUD parcels], and for the anticipated achievement of consistent results in PUD development.

CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION ON AGENDA ITEMS

None

NEW BUSINESS

A. Planning Commission Bylaws – Potential Updates

D. Stensaas stated that the six members who attended the last meeting discussed the Bylaws and identified a couple of issues for amendment, and I later found another one that needs to be amended. He went on to explain that items C.3 and C.4 should be struck and replaced with a new item that states "The conditions of appointments and terms will follow City Charter section 6-1(f)."

S. Lawry said that it may be semantic, but perhaps item C.4 should say "one member" instead of "a member." D. Stensaas said that makes sense to him.

D. Stensaas also explained why replacing the BZA representative by vote at a meeting directly preceding a BZA meeting is undesirable, so item D.2 should be amended to allow elections to be held at the second meeting in March.

A. Landers said that the appointments only run until Feb. 15th, so we will always be without a BZA member in March.

D. Stensaas said that he will discuss the issue with the City Attorney before we proceed any further and come back with an update afterwards.

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 18, 2025**

CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Antonio Adan, Executive Director of the Marquette County Land Bank and Housing Specialist for Marquette County, introduced himself and stated:

In the correspondence, you may have received a land bank report from last year, we just finished this. You're the first commission to get our report and I'm excited to try and see how it presents tonight. On the second page, you will see some activities that we helped with. The first one you've already heard about is Housing Now. It's a public/private partnership, why is that important. As the countywide Housing Specialist, I'm here to help municipal government, commissions and organizations that want to build housing, specifically to tackle this housing issue we have here. I've met with a few of you already from last year into this year and I really appreciate all the feedback. It's been really challenging to say the least to build housing because number one, we don't have a lot of nonprofit housing developers in town. Some of the development you do see, like here tonight, like Mr. Mahaney and Veridea that's one of the private developers in town, and we can be in the target market now since last year that was talked about already but that shows there is significant demand for housing in all ranges. Part of my work is trying to identify some of these sites. We convened a report that as part of this funding came from the state. We have about sixteen sites throughout the county and two in the City of Marquette that we try to figure out if we can work with to build on. That's a very challenging process as you can imagine. Some of the successes that we've seen so far in one year is we procured about \$1.8 million dollars from the State of Michigan Housing Authority. These are specifically going to be units that are targeting missing middle or core housing, so that's between sixty percent of median income to about one hundred and twenty percent.

On the second page, we're helping plan about twenty-two units with that funding, which is a very big success for us. We came from the Land Bank building two or three houses a year, sometimes a partnership with Habitat for Humanity, and we're definitely turning the page and I think seeing a lot of ?? (1:44) and I'm very excited about that. The third page is just some of our projects that not only are we involved with housing and helping that cause but also are focused on eliminating blight. Luckily Marquette doesn't have a ton of it, but other neighboring towns and cities do so that map shows where we have forecasted some of those dollars and in the pictures, you will see some of those projects. The Vista Theater was one that helped secure that roof. Tilden Township had a school that had to come down because of years of neglect. And we work with local units, that's the most important part is that we work with cities and towns that want to use us as a tool so we're here to help. On the back side, you'll see our financial report. Some of the highlights, as I mentioned, since the inception of the Land Bank in 2009, we've acquired two hundred parcels, we've done about sixty-nine sales through neighbors, and we've built five houses so far. But the most important part is that we eliminated one hundred and twenty-three structures that normally wouldn't be able to come down on their own and we do seek some of those dollars through City funding. We can't do all of this alone, this is just the beginning. Hopefully we can build more momentum in the housing arena, and keep us in mind if you have any questions, I'm always available. Thank you.

Scott Rule, of 408 W. Park St., stated:

Park Cemetery has a stream that runs out of its north end. It goes underground, under Seventh St. In the past I was told that it went down Piqua and cut across to Magnetic St. That all runs off into the woods and oozes from the ground.

Alec LaPlante, of Summit St., stated:

I stand up here as a student and see that there are plenty of other students that I'd like to recognize for taking time out of their day, along with everybody else here. It's pretty much an important issue that most of us have recognized. Most people walk through Center Street, that cuts through campus, splitting campus in half. The sidewalk there, especially during the winter, is very hard to be walked on, and there's a lot of times that students have to walk through there, and there's that parking lot.

OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 18, 2025

Is everyone familiar with where I'm talking about? The parking lot there for campus on Center? It's a pretty dangerous path that most of us have to travel through. I'm curious on who has control, and I know that Northern is going through their master plan rework. I don't believe it has a plan for what's going through that entire section. I'm curious if there could be something done for that high traffic area to improve the safety, improve connectivity between the parts of campus that see a lot of traffic, which is very dangerous for those citizens along the street, and I think that's something that needs to be addressed. I don't know where the plans are currently on that, but I think there needs to be something done to address the risk for the families that are there, the students that walk there every single day. I live on Summit St., and I do see that there is a lot of traffic that needs to be addressed there, that high-speed traffic.

Dawson Ennis, of 900 Norwood St., stated:

I have some similar concerns to what Mr. LaPlante has said. Norwood St., there is a dirt track, I'd say about 60 meters, it's really bad. I've driven - as an outdoorsmen, as someone who enjoys off-roading - I've driven on better roads that were designed for off-roading in a Jeep, that were better than this road. It's to the point where someone's exhaust system fell off their car and it is currently propped up against a sign. So, it's bad, especially living in a room in the apartments there that are facing that street. It's kind of difficult in the winter at 2 o'clock, 3 a.m. when the snow plows their coming through on the dirt road and they smash into the asphalt road there and it makes a lot of noise. As a college student, it's not fun being woken up at 2 o'clock, 3 o'clock in the morning and then have to go back to sleep and be prepared for the day. In addition, on Norwood St., there is a significant lack of sidewalks. I believe on that stretch their sidewalks change sides three or four times. There are some sections where there is a single house on an entire block, and it's the only one that will have a sidewalk. Given that it's a high-traffic area, I've found that driving through there when Northern is having games results in a lot of traffic from the dorms coming to the dome. It's kind of difficult to get through that road when you have all the students walking in the road. I'll say I frequent the Wooden Nickel fairly often, and coming back I have been approached by county and local law enforcement here, stating that because they've observed me exiting the bar and walking in the street because there are no sidewalks, that can be construed as public intoxication. There's an issue there, that proximity of a bar where you have a lack of infrastructure, it's not exactly entrapment, but I personally think it could fall into that sort of situation where people are forced to walk in the road in a potentially unsafe environment. I just feel like that should be addressed. Thank you.

Barb Owdzjei, of 1344 N. Front St., stated:

Hearing these last two comments, I thought I'd put a plug in, specifically when you have traffic street access issues, you can always bring it to the Traffic Advisory Committee, which meets the second Tuesday of the month at 5 o'clock in the basement of City Hall right around the corner from the police department. And if you actually contacted Captain Finkbeiner, who is the liaison for the committee, a couple weeks before the meeting, like right now, we can get it on the agenda, and you can come discuss. That's the kind of thing we would like to discuss and make recommendations for. Anything to do with traffic, parking, access, so feel free.

CORRESPONDENCE, REPORTS, MINUTES OF OTHER BOARDS/COMMITTEES

A. Marquette County Climate Action Plan

S. Mittlefehldt said that we did get a very thorough and impressive Marquette County Draft Climate Adaptation Plan, which the Planning Commission has had an opportunity to review and comment on. She asked if anyone had thoughts on the Plan or wanted to discuss it.

J. Fitkin said that it is a wonderful Plan, and thorough, and the only thing she wanted to see in the Plan that she didn't is hazardous waste.

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 18, 2025**

S. Lawry said he understands that they want to keep it to a manageable size, but he was disappointed that it didn't cover all County operations, such as the Solid Waste Authority, the Airport, the Road Commission, the County Medical Care Facility. He said if all they do is concentrate on balancing out the Courthouse complex and Jail operations, they are not really accomplishing the goal that they are publicly stating they are trying to accomplish.

D. Stensaas stated that he received a page of comments from the Chair and would send it as an attachment with a memo of the recorded comments from tonight, along with his own comments. He said that since those will be included with the members' comments, he wanted to share what his comments are, and proceeded to relate that the short list of work done by other local entities on climate adaptation and action did not include the considerable planning work that the City has done, including the 2013 Climate Adaptation Study that was adopted into the 2015 Community Master Plan (CMP), or the 2025 CMP's Climate Action framework or Resiliency Assessment. He also said that in the Goals and Strategies chart/table, there are two issues that merit correction - the first is the inclusion of the Climate Adaptation Task Force (CATF) as a responsible party in several of the strategy items. He said that he has been a member of CATF since its inception, and is currently a member of its steering committee, and is fully committed to its mission, but CATF is not an organization that should be responsible for most of the items where it is listed in the chart, as that is not its mission. He also stated that the cost estimates for some of the items in the chart appear unrealistic, and in most cases, they are underestimated, possibly by multiple levels of cost. He said he had marked up a chart showing the items that he believed were likely to be underestimated, for submission along with the other items and memo, and that he would submit those by the Monday deadline.

WORK SESSION ON REPORTS/PLANS/ORDINANCES

A. Land Development Code (LDC) Amendments

The Planning Commission decided to only address one specific item/issue – indoor and self-storage uses - in the document of amendments for the work session, to accommodate a person who attended the meeting to hear what the Planning Commission would say on the issue.

A. Landers explained that staff added “equipment” to the Indoor Storage definition, as per Mr. Lawry's comment at the last meeting. She also stated that the Planning Commission discussed adding “indoor storage” and “self storage facility” as accessory uses and as Special Uses in the General Commercial zoning districts, and listing them as permitted uses in the Regional Commercial and Industrial-Manufacturing districts, and she showed the documents staff had prepared with those changes made.

S. Mittlefehldt stated that the land use chart makes a lot of sense, including leaving these uses out of the Mixed-Use districts. She said this captured what was discussed and asked other members if this was acceptable, and there was unanimous consensus for drafting the changes.

A. Landers stated that the next part of this issue is addressed in Article 6 standards, specifically in item (B) for the Indoor Storage and Self Storage Facility standards and noted that staff had discussed this with the Fire Department, who suggested the following language. D. Stensaas read the amended text as it was drafted.

S. Lawry said that almost anything is flammable. Members discussed the topic of flammability, combustible materials, and hazardous substances, and shared opinions on the concepts and language.

D. Stensaas said that the board asked staff to ask the experts at the Fire Department about this, and this is the language they were comfortable with.

The board decided to strike the word flammable from item (B) for the Indoor Storage and Self Storage Facility standards.

S. Lawry said that he also suggested to put the term “unrelated” before “...commercial, wholesale, retail...” in standard (A) for the new Article 6 standards for self-storage facilities. He also said that he also had brought up the language about “...each storage unit having a door to the outdoors, and that it shall be accessible by

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
March 18, 2025**

the owner of the storage items” – and he said that a change to consider is “to the outdoors or a common corridors” or similar, to allow for the reuse of existing buildings where they could just rent out rooms. He also said that for outdoor/open storage, he isn’t sure how we’re distinguishing this from car lots or similar uses where items are displayed for sale and asked for clarification about the screening standards for Open/Outdoor Storage.

A. Landers said those are specific uses with their own standards and if they wanted to add Open/Outdoor Storage then they would have to meet the screening requirements.

S. Lawry said that the last line in the chart, which lists the storage facilities, indicates Utility Electrical Power Generation. He said he thinks that, given the extensive work done last year on solar generation, we should consider adding Utility Electrical Power Generation as a Special Land Use in Industrial-Manufacturing districts. The members and staff discussed the issue, and it was agreed that they would revisit it soon.

COMMISSION AND STAFF COMMENTS

W. Premeau stated that the County is doing good work building houses with the limited funds available, and noted that the costs for similar homes from private developers were significantly higher. He also asked what the name of the plan was that they received tonight, if it was a sketch plan or something else.

A. Landers and D. Stensaas said it was a concept plan.

J. Fitkin said she was thankful for everyone that came out tonight for the public hearing and the rest of the meeting.

K. Clegg said he was excited to see that the meeting was well-attended.

K. Hunter said that she too was happy with everybody that came out tonight, that shows great community input.

S. Mittlefehldt said that she echoes the thanks for the turnout tonight and that those who spoke brought up some important points, and that she hopes that the developer in the room heard that and heard that the Planning Commission wants to make sure that the public interests are heard and addressed in the future site plan. She also thanked the members for nominating her to be Chair again and said it was an honor to serve with everyone, and that she is excited to be part of the historic board composed of a majority of women.

D. Stensaas said he was also grateful for those who came to the meeting tonight to provide their input.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair S. Mittlefehldt adjourned the meeting at 8:30 p.m.

David Stensaas

Prepared by D. Stensaas, City Planner and Zoning Administrator, Planning Commission Staff Liaison & Secretary.