

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE  
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
April 6, 2021**

A regular meeting of the Marquette City Planning Commission was duly called and held at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 6, 2021 by remote means (due to the COVID-19 pandemic).

**ROLL CALL**

Present: Chair J. Cardillo, A. Andres, S. Mittlefehldt, W. Premeau, Vice-Chair M. Larson, E. Brooks, M. Dunn\*,

Absent: none

\* Joined the meeting after roll call

**AGENDA**

*It was moved by A. Andres, seconded by M. Larson, and carried 6-0 to approve the agenda.*

**MINUTES**

*The minutes of February 2nd were approved by consensus.*

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

J. Cardillo stated that she spoke with City Planner D. Stensaas about this, related to the 505 Lakeshore Blvd. rezoning request, that a tenant of the building – not the owners – is a client of her business and that she has stands to have no stake in the rezoning request and we didn't feel it was necessary for me to recuse myself but wanted to make that clear that I do have an association with a tenant in that building.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**01-REZ-04-21: Rezoning request for Vacant land on Lakeshore Blvd (PIN: 0490040)**

Zoning Official A. Landers stated that the planning commission is being asked to make a recommendation to the city commission regarding a request to rezone vacant property located on Lakeshore Blvd that is zoned Municipal to be zoned Mixed-Use. The proposed rezoning of the property adjacent to 505 Lakeshore Blvd. is intended to make the zoning consistent with the rest of 505 Lakeshore Blvd parcel so that it can be transferred via a quit claim deed. This property in question is a portion of the abandoned LS&I railroad right of way and is unable to be sold due to the deed restrictions originating in the original transfer of the proper to the city. The property can only be transferred back into the original parcel if the city chooses to cede ownership of the right of way.

She also stated that the Planning Commission has received agenda packets which included the staff report and analysis and showed that on the screen, and she also showed the applicant's Special Land Use Permit application with attachments including the area map with the parcel outlined in blue, the block map with parcel outlined in blue, and photos of the site. She said that there was no correspondence for the case and asked if there were any questions for staff.

*It was moved by S. Mittlefehldt, seconded by W. Premeau, and carried 6-0 to suspend the rules for discussion.*

S. Mittlefehldt stated that she had questions about the area. She is happy with the addition it makes to commercial activity in an area that is appropriate, but she feels like it is odd that there is that tiny little bit of municipally zoned land in an otherwise mixed-use area. She stated that at first, she felt like it was a no-brainer and that it made a lot of sense, but then started thinking about in the Master Plan, looking at the zoning map, it does have it where there is a tiny sliver of municipal-zoned land on the old railroad bed. She stated that north of the site the municipal railroad bed gets a lot of use from the community, a lot of dog walkers and wildlife, and her concern was if that sets a precedent for the rest of the railroad corridor. She also asked if all the property in that old railroad corridor was owned by the City or is it just zoned Municipal for public use.

A. Landers stated that all Municipal zoning is on property owned by the City, and that there is a deed

restriction that prevents the City from selling the property and [if transferred] it must be given to adjacent land owners.

City Planner and Zoning Administrator D. Stensaas stated this is a case where the property owner requested that the city sell the land to the property owner and the city does not have a need for that property. There is not going to be a trail through there at this point.

\*M. Dunn joined the meeting at 6:12 p.m.

W. Premeau stated that he wanted to know if Engineering and Public Works had seen this, because at one time the City Engineer had plans to use that railroad right of way to get utilities out of the road. He also asked if other portions of the railroad right of way would be given to neighbors.

D. Stensaas stated he had not heard of that, but that the staff that is here now does not see a reason to keep the property anymore, and there are no utilities going through that portion of the property and there are no easements. He stated that the city does not really have any constraints as far as needing to maintain anything there over time. He also stated that the city did give some of the former railroad property on the south side of Michigan Street last year to the property owners that had it cutting through their lots, to square up those lots, as a result of the lighthouse project negotiations with those neighbors.

J. Cardillo asked if there were any other questions.

*It was moved by M. Larson, seconded by S. Mittlefehldt, and carried 7-0 that after conducting a public hearing and review of the application and Staff Report for 01-REZ-04-21, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed rezoning is consistent with the Community Master Plan and meets the requirements of the Land Development Code Section 54.1405 and hereby recommends that the City Commission approve 01-REZ-04-21 as presented.*

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. 07-SUP-04-20: Special Land Use Extension Request for 200 S. Fifth St.**

A. Landers stated that attached to the agenda was correspondence from Richard Tegge, of Wealth Strategy Group. He is requesting an extension to the previously approved special land use site plan for an attached single-family dwelling located at 200 S. Fifth Street. This project will currently expire on April 21, 2021. Attached also was the excerpt of the April 21, 2020 planning commission minutes. Per the Land Development Code, if action is not taken by the petitioner to implement a special land use within 1 year of its approval by the Planning Commission, that said permit shall expire, so that is why he is asking for an extension.

*It was moved by S. Mittlefehldt, seconded by M. Larson, and carried 7-0 to approve the request for an extension for case 07-SUP-04-20 with the expiration date to be 04-21-22.*

## **WORK SESSION**

### **A. Planning Commissioner Training Primer**

City Planner and Zoning Administrator D. Stensaas stated that we had a nice, long break from Planning Commission meetings, but it seems everyone remembers what we do. He also stated that it is good to review some of the basics once in a while and he shared his screen to show the agenda materials for the work session and discussed several points related to doing the job of Planning Commissioner effectively and on parliamentary procedures used by the Commission.

M. Dunn stated that he had a question about the second and if there is room to have discussion after a motion is made, but before a second, because he has been stuck in the situation where initially he would have wanted to second a motion, but then something comes up for a reason not to and I kind of want to say why he was not seconding it, but did know if he was allowed to have that discussion in between the motion and the second.

D. Stensaas stated that he felt like in a small board with relaxed rules you can kind of get away with that, but that he would do the research and give the answer from the book.

## **COMMISSION AND STAFF COMMENTS**

J. Cardillo stated that she would like A. Landers to speak to the possibility of resuming in-person meetings, and asked her to start.

A. Landers stated that tentatively the plan is to begin in-person meetings again in June. D. Stensaas stated That the reason for that is the City Commission is planning to have limited-capacity in-person meetings beginning in June and the Manager would like the other boards and committees to follow suit.

S. Mittlefehldt stated that she was wondering about the tree clearing that was done along the shoreline north of Wright St. and why the trees were removed. D. Stensaas stated that he would look into it.

W. Premeau stated that he liked the Coastlines and People Report done by NMU and Sarah recently, and said that it is a nice document. S. Mittlefehldt stated her thanks and that it was a good project and she was glad to work on it and that J. Cardillo and her husband did great work on the graphics.

M. Dunn stated that he has a concern about the crossing out on 553 right by Marquette Mountain, both going from the parking lot to the ski area and, also up where the mountain bike trails, or the parking is there. He was just wondering if someone could steer him in the right direction or if there is anything that could be done about it, but that there needed to be some sort of pedestrian crossing there. He was very concerned that it is just a matter of time before someone dies out there with people walking across the road with skis and boots and poles and kids. He feels it is just a disaster waiting to happen as cars go through at 60 mph right there and the mountain bikers going across, too.

D. Stensaas stated he thinks the city is looking into that, that there have been people that have contacted the police. That part of the highway is controlled by the state. He stated that he will ask that question at the Corridor Advisory Group meeting coming up on the 13<sup>th</sup> or contact someone at MDOT before then. He also stated that they are going to be looking at the site plans for development on South US 41 at that meeting, and that case will be on your agenda for the next meeting. He also stated that the City doesn't bring cases to them all that often, but we have the one for the meeting on the 13<sup>th</sup> and he will ask what is happening with that request.

D. Stensaas stated that he would like to mention that S. Front St., between Genesee St. and Shiras Hills, will be undergoing reconstruction in the summer of 2022 and that he and the City Engineer met with MDOT last fall to discuss possible curb cuts and pedestrian safety improvements and traffic calming in the project area, and that several proposals were made including a boulevard, a mid-block crossing and pedestrian refuge island off the Craig St. right-of-way by the Women's Center, and speed tables, and sidewalk additions, but that it appears there is really nothing that MDOT is able to do for traffic calming. He stated the only thing that looks possible is some sidewalk additions, which the City will pay for, and they did say they would look at pedestrian safety improvements at the Front/Genesee intersection, with signal timing and to make it more visible. He also stated that he would follow up as he had more information to share.

J. Cardillo stated that she was wondering if D. Stensaas had been in touch with MarqTran or [City appointee to the MarqTran board of directors] Taylor Klipp, as Mr. Klipp said previously he would do a presentation or update about transit for the Planning Commission. D. Stensaas stated that he had recently been in touch with Mr. Klipp, and with another appointee to MarqTran's board, but neither conversation touched on transit. He also stated that he would follow up with Mr. Klipp and report back.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned by Chair J. Cardillo at 6:55 p.m.

Prepared by:

David Stensaas  
David Stensaas, City Planner and Zoning Administrator  
Planning Commission Secretary  
Transcriptionist ach/ Imedat