

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
June 21, 2022**

A regular meeting of the Marquette City Planning Commission was duly called and held at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 21, 2022, in the Room 103 of the Municipal Service Center, 1100 Wright St.

ROLL CALL

Present: A. Andres, Vice-Chair M. Larson, N. Frischkorn, S. Mittlefehldt, Chair J. Cardillo
Absent: N. Williams (unexcused) and W. Premeau (excused)

AGENDA

It was moved by A. Andres, seconded by N. Frischkorn, and carried 5-0 to approve the agenda with 2 pieces of additional correspondence submitted for 03-SUP-06-22.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST and EX-PARTE CONTACT

City Planner and Zoning Administrator D. Stensaas stated W. Premeau is not in attendance due to a potential conflict of interest.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

03-SUP-06-2022 442 McMillan Street (PIN: 0514960): Request for a Duplex Dwelling

A. Landers stated Staff has reviewed the Special Land Use permit for a new duplex dwelling located at 442 McMillan Street. Please see the attached STAFF REPORT/ANALYSIS for more specific information regarding the Special Land Use application, required narrative, and plan sheet. The Planning Commission should review the Special Land Use application and plan sheet, along with the support information provided in this packet, and determine whether or not the proposed Special Land Use is in compliance with the City of Marquette Land Development Code, more specifically, the Special Land Use Standards in Section 54.1403 and Section 54.613 for Duplex Dwellings. In accordance with State Law, if the proposed Special Land Use meets all of the standards prescribed in the City Land Development Code then it shall be approved. However, the Planning Commission may consider placing conditions on approval if it is deemed necessary to assure compliance with the above standards. Visuals of the agenda attachments were shown.

Correspondence opposed to the request from Andrew Ylkanen, 444 McMillan St., was read into the record.

Correspondence opposed to the request from Julie Hagstrom, 435 McMillan St., was read into the record.

Paul Tangora, of Marquette Design Group and is architect for the project, stated that he believes we are complying with all of the zoning rules. He also stated that Mr. Murray (property owner) plans on living in one of the duplex units once its built, so he won't be an absentee landlord and will be living in Marquette full-time.

Geoffrey Murray, the applicant stated, stated that will be as soon as he transfers from the Kinross prison in two years. He also stated that he has the floor plan drawings and elevations if you want to look at them.

Mr. Tangora stated that the footprint of the building is 42 ft. x 32 ft., plus the 22 ft. x 22 ft. garage.

Mr. Murray laid out his construction drawings on a table and stated that each unit is 1,800 sq. feet, three bedrooms, 2 and a half baths, and that entrances will be on each side. He also stated that the building height is 20 feet.

A. Landers stated the proposed height is listed as 27'4". Mr. Murray stated okay.

J. Cardillo asked staff what the allowable height is. A. Landers stated that it is 31.5 feet.

Chair Cardillo opened the public hearing.

Andrew Ylkanen, 444 McMillan St., stated:

My wife and I own and reside at 444 McMillan St. with our 7-year-old twin daughters. This is adjacent to the property in question. and we urge you, in no uncertain terms. to deny Mr. Murray's Special Land Use Permit Application. The will of the people. A common. catchy, and popular phrase. For some it is a phrase that is much easier to say than implement. City officials, both elected and appointed must uphold the laws and rules and regulations of their municipality while at the same time considering the will of the people. It is a balancing act, and I imagine a very difficult one at times. If you were obligated to govern only by the laws, rules and regulations. then these public hearings would not be necessary, they would be a waste of time. You are fully able to do your own due diligence, check your own boxes and make your own decisions. If you were obligated to govern only by the will of the people, this decision would be as easy as they come. You have a room full of people here right now who do not want this duplex in their neighborhood for a myriad of reasons. and you would deny the permit application this very minute. But you must consider both, which is the way it should be.

Throughout this application process I have been left with an unpleasant impression that the opinions of the neighborhood do not matter, that the concerns of the people who will be affected by your decision do not matter, that as long as the application complies with regulations then none of this here tonight matters, that there is no reason for any of us to be here tonight; that this is nothing but a charade. But I choose not to believe that. Maybe someday the laws, rules, and regulations will be changed, and become all that matters. But that day is not here yet. I choose to believe that you can and will consider both when making your decision. You will hear many concerns and objections from many people here tonight. They are legitimate and I agree with all of them. And most importantly, they come from the people who live there. The people who will be most affected. I have learned that in considering this Permit Application, you must follow the checklist of 14 items contained in Article 14 Administrative Procedures, Section 54.1403 Special Land Use Review, Part C. Most of these checklist items are very subjective in nature. They are not black and white. To follow such a subjective checklist and interpret it only for yourselves would be a disservice to those affected communities. In these subjective cases I urge you to err on the side of the People. To err on the side of those affected by your decisions. To err on the side of those who care about the neighborhood in which they live. To err on the side of everyone in this room. Thank You.

Jeff Patrick, 441 McMillan St., stated:

My wife, myself, and my 9-year-old twins live on the property across the street from 442. I want to talk about [number] 14 and number 8, the vehicular and pedestrian circulation. Our concern is there are eight kids living in this cul-de-sac and now you add to that two more driveways on one location, and say there's two single families, there's four more cars there. I don't know what the parking situation is in the driveway, but chances are there are going to be people parking on the street and you've got people, renters that may be short-term, coming and going. You never know whether they're going to be young, old, or they're going to be just there to do whatever and I just think that the traffic is just going to add more traffic in an already kind of a congested area. We had put the no outlet sign in mainly because we're getting a lot of traffic through there. People would come in, get halfway around the loop, realize they couldn't get out, and then speed up, trying to save some time. And the no outlet sign helped that, but I think by keeping this all single family and having families that are going to live there long-term, they'll be more appreciative of the whole area. And that's about all I've got to say.

Corey Hanycz, 448 McMillan St., stated:

I live at 448 McMillan with my wife, my two kids, my daughter 6, my son 2. We live right up the street here from the proposed duplex. The proposed duplex at 442 McMillan will have a major impact on the parking in the neighborhood, which will jeopardize the safety of our children. How do I know this? Because there are two college rentals in the neighborhood at 436 McMillan and 438 McMillan and every time there is a party at these locations, they use the neighborhood cul-de-sac as their parking lot, dumpster, littering beer cans and Solo cups from their keg parties that keep up the neighbors and the neighborhood kids up late hours of the night. With these late night parties that happen at these locations, we often have to shield our kids from obscene language and occasional fights that break out, which leads to the local police department responding and dissolving the parties. With the already two college rentals in our neighborhood, and now a possible two more with his proposed duplex, will extrapolate the amount of traffic in our neighborhood using the cul-de-sac for parking and turning around to exit the neighborhood. With this

major increase in traffic in our neighborhood, this will be putting our children at danger. If this proposed duplex is approved, it's only a matter of time before both units are being rented to college kids, which means a potential of additional six people per unit, 12 people total, which will add an additional six vehicle total, not including friends that they have over. Allowing the duplex to be approved in our neighborhood will not only bring college students in our safe family neighborhood, but also result in drunk and high college students driving in and out of our safe cul-de-sac where our kids ride bikes, rollerblade and run freely. All the above mentioned has me and my neighbors deeply concerned for the safety of our children. My other concern with the proposed duplex is our kids use the corner of McMillan and Anderson to get on and off the bus which we can see directly from our house and allows us to monitor the bus stop and quickly get to our children when the bus drops them off. If this duplex gets built, it is my concern that my children's pickup location will get moved to a further location that will not allow us to keep an eye on our children and will also make our children walk a further distance on a relatively tight street that can be dangerous due to the lack of sidewalks. My daughter will be in 1st grade this year and her brother soon to follow, and I believe if the bus route is changed to a further location, this will also put our kids in danger. Now, I know some of you sitting here before me have children and you guys would do anything to protect your kids. And this is why I'm here tonight. I'm trying to protect my children and the children of the neighborhood from the above-mentioned dangers that will become our nightmare if this duplex is approved. If you allow this duplex to be approved in the neighborhood where this does not belong and one of our children is injured or God forbid killed, well, I'll just let you think about that. Thank you.

John Demay, 446 McMillan St., stated:

I'm a 15 year real estate broker. I own one of the largest property companies. I'm all about rental properties. I think everybody should own them and have them. I don't believe you should be building rental properties in neighborhoods with homes of \$600,000 to \$700,000 single family homes in it, so I agree 100% with everything that's said here tonight. I have two young girls, 6 and 8, who play on that street and I 100% believe that parking is going to be an issue. I believe that traffic is going to be an issue. I believe that over time the duplex is going to deteriorate like the rest of them do. This build at 1800 square feet per unit at 3600 square feet, if you were to build a professional grade home there it's going to cost over \$1 million and I'm pretty certain he's not doing that. So, he's building building grade stuff to keep the cost down, maybe around \$200 a square foot at best, so it's never going to be affordable housing ever, and he might be a great landlord and a great person and get great tenants in there but that doesn't mean that's going to be the case over the next 10, 15, 20 years, and it changes hands, and the next person who buys it has to buy it at top dollar because he paid top dollar for it. It's never going to be affordable housing. So, over time as that deteriorates into what we have on McMillan Street now with the duplexes you can go take a drive by and look at what they look like now. That's what happens to these things because when you're putting that much money into a build, you are never going to have enough money to put money back into it without losing out of pocket and that's not the point of investing. So, the capital expenditures on that will be tremendous over time and there's not going to be money there to do it, so for that reason I think the long-term it's not going to be a good fit. The single family homes that are in there are going to continue blossom and flourish and look good and increase value, so therefore I'm not in favor of this project.

Tom Dunleavy, 439 McMillan St., stated:

I'm right on the corner of Anderson and McMillan and I've been there since May of 1970. I'm kind of known on the street, let's put it that way. And for many years, we had problems with traffic there. We always joke that it was the off-ramp for the bypass. Cars would really come fast up Anderson and whip around McMillan and we had stop signs put in. No one stops for them, which is kind of interesting. Some people slow down. Most people just whip right through that corner. That's a fast in effect unregulated corner and with the rentals across the street from us, across on McMillan Street, we have well, quite a few college kids and we like the kids, but I don't like the fact that they have their cars all over the place. They narrow that street down. They park very close to the stop sign on the corner of McMillan and Anderson and also park on my side of the street, which is the west side and, southwest side, and it's very difficult for me to back out of my driveway. When I do back out...I look around for traffic obviously and am cognizant, they fly through that stop sign. Cars park on both sides of the street. By the time I back out of my driveway and avoid the cars parked across the street and also the cars on my side that are blocking my vision, I've really got to be extremely careful because many times when I'm coming up to that stop sign, I've got to really pull over to get in the right lane. So, it's never been an easy driveway, but with the rentals across the street now, wow, it's tough. There are lots of cars. You know, it used to be a one way street way back when,

probably before I was born. But anyway, that's my thought. And then of course the school bus that takes care of the kids on the corner of McMillan and Anderson. That concerns me, too, because the traffic there is very heavy off of the bypass and then we have the apartment building also.

Barb Howard, 431 McMillan St., stated:

I've been there since '84 and I work at that Walmart and I come home at night, coming, going to work, trying to get around that corner where all the big trees are that that lady will not cut down, you cannot see around the corner. Anderson Street is a skinny street. There's little apartments where the college kids live. They parked on both sides of the road. In the wintertime the street gets narrower and they're still parked there and they shouldn't be. No parking made in the wintertime and we add that duplex and two-car garage on either side, that's four more cars, plus company parking on the streets. That's a dangerous corner to begin with. It should not be allowed.

An unidentified man read a letter for JoAnn Benzing of 440 McMillan St., stating:

"Regarding the Special Land Use permit, referenced above, as an immediate neighbor, I have the following comments:

The first two Standards of Special Land Use Review state:

(1) The intent of the Zoning District is met, and the proposed use is in harmony with appropriate and orderly development of the district.

(2) The current use of adjacent lands and neighborhood are compatible with the proposed use.

A revision of land use from single family to multi-family unit clearly violates these two standards.

The property in question is squarely in a neighborhood of single-family dwellings. Any revision to multi-family unit would not be "in harmony with appropriate and orderly development of the district".

Likewise, "current use of existing lands and neighborhoods", which is comprised of single-family units, are NOT "compatible with the proposed use". It is recognized that the land to the North on Anderson St. is multi-family. However, to approve further encroachment on an existing single-family neighborhood is neither reasonable nor fair to the existing homeowners." Staff was provided the letter from Ms. Benzing.

Jessica Demay, 446 McMillan St., stated:

I agree with all the points that have been made here tonight and unfortunately - can you pull up the map of, the topographic map of the area that we're talking about so everybody can kind of see what we're talking about? See Anderson Street right there? That's a narrow street. People do not park on that street. Nobody wants to park on that street because you're going to get hit and so what everybody wants to do is pull into the cul-de-sac and keep parking up and up and up that cul-de-sac and now if you're going to add that many more cars to that lot site area right there on the corner you're going to have that many more cars that are parked up and up and up that cul-de-sac and unfortunately as far as our children's safety goes, that's my main concern, too, and the number one accident, or the number one pediatric pedestrian vehicular accident is called a dart out, and that is when a child darts out between two parked cars and somebody doesn't see them. And so every time you have somebody who doesn't live there, who doesn't know that there's children in there playing, we stand outside all night long and watch our kids play. Yes, we do, but we can't prevent everything from happening. What we don't want is for the increased chance of something like that to happen and when people don't realize that there's kids playing out there, they're pulling in like others have said, they're mad because they went the wrong way or they're young college kids, whoever it may be, and they're not paying attention and all that's going to do is just increase the likelihood of something bad happening and on the other side of that is where our kids do get the bus. And where is the bus going to go if there's a bunch of cars parked further up on McMillan Street? I mean, that's a very big likelihood that we might have to actually change our bus stop now. So, I want prison guards for sure. We need them, we need you guys. I totally believe that you might come here and live in that side and rent out the other side, it makes perfect sense. If you're starting to have a family or want to start a family and you want to build a home, that's great. But in 10 years when you're like I think we can afford a single family home, you're going to sell that home and then whoever buys it next isn't going to care. So, that's our main concern there.

Wendy Hanycz, 448 McMillan St., stated:

I'm opposed to the duplex residing at 442 McMillan Street. I'm a property manager as well, so I know what it entails renting to good tenants. What kind of management this property will have highly determines what kind of tenants will occupy the property. If tenants are not screened properly, it risks renting to

anyone, people with bad intentions, criminal records, and young irresponsible college students. When the owners of rentals do not live in the area, the tenants feel they can get away with not maintaining the property and disobeying the rules. Drug dealers select places that have weak management. Weak management is often distinguished by lower levels of property maintenance, less frequent visits by the owners and managers to the property, and fewer efforts to screen tenants. Since poorly managed properties receive less maintenance and often exhibit signs of greater physical deterioration, the exterior appearance will be a factor in the years to come. Unless the property owner will occupy one of the units, this property will just become another run down rental in the years to come. Who is going to cut the grass, monitor the use of subletting and allowance of smoking or multiple pets on the property? All of these are issues when a landlord lives outside the community. It is proven that local owners that reside on property are likely to be more effective property managers than those who live further away. Also, who is to say who will own this property 10 to 20 years from now? One who has good intentions today might not have the same intentions tomorrow. One duplex will pave the way for more to come in the area that was designed to be a nice privately owned residential setting. I chose this neighborhood because of the low traffic and family occupied homes so my children can play and be safe. If this duplex moves forward, I will no longer feel like my children are safe.

Rich Merrill, 472 Blemhuber St, stated:

I also own the lot at the center of the cul-de-sac. I don't want to repeat something people have already said but I was in the rental business for probably 13+ years. I got out of it because I got sick of the drugs, the fighting, the tearing the doors off, the partying, the yelling, the not paying rent, the destruction, all of the above. And I know what tenants are capable of. You can have really good ones and you can have really bad ones and you can have ones that look like they're going to be great, day 1, and they turn out to be – I mean, I had put \$1500 into an apartment and a year later it was completely destroyed. They would have parties, drive on the lawn, and then I would get the ticket from the city, which I was real happy about. It doesn't even make any sense, but it did happen. And I can tell many other stories, but I got out of it. I mean, I run Wendy's now and I did rentals, but the rental thing just got way too, way too crazy for me on top of everything else. So I know quite a bit about how a lot of tenants are and the destruction, and they don't care. They don't pay rent and the rest of it. But the other thing I would say is property value. A lot of the homes in this area, they're worth \$300,000, \$400,000, \$500,000, \$600,000, \$800,000, and what does that look like? Is that the value of the neighborhood? Is that the value of people's property? I think there's definitely something to be said for that and then I also concur about the safety of the children, because tenants will just fly in and fly out and you have that aspect, too. So, again, I don't want to repeat something that others have said, but my big thing is like I say, the destruction factor and the quality of life factor and the property values for everybody getting negatively affected and that's where I'd be coming from.

Robert Howard, 431 McMillan St., stated:

I went to the City before and asked them to put a 1-way street in there. They shouldn't be parking on both sides. They block the mailboxes. You don't get your mail. The mailman has to get out of his vehicle to put the mail in the mailboxes so we could have a 1-way street, put it on the right hand side where there ain't no mailboxes and if they ain't got enough room in their yard, they shouldn't be renting to begin with. Now you call the police for parking in front of my mailbox. They don't do nothing about it.

No one else wished to comment. Chair Cardillo closed the public hearing.

It was moved by M. Larson, seconded by N. Frischkorn, and carried 5-0 to suspend the rules for discussion.

M. Larson stated:

I think first off, yes, I'd like to just say we do – many of us have children, and my children are here, but we certainly understand safety and we take safety seriously when we're thinking about decisions here. It's also a matter of understanding and looking at what is required of us. If it meets requirements, Michigan law says that we must pass it. If we don't pass it and it meets requirements, that can be challenged in court. So, I think we have some of those pieces that we have to consider here, that we're trying to balance. Looking at this Medium Density Residential [zoning] district, I know it's been referred to as single family but it's in the medium density residential district. There are other permitted principle uses there, such as adult foster care is permitted, child daycare in family homes are permitted, family [foster] homes and so on and

so forth. And then on the other side of that, we do have our special land uses and one of those is the 2-family duplex. I think I would like to ask the applicant a couple of questions, just kind of describing their idea and how they perceive it being managed. You don't live in the area currently. I know you said you plan to come back, but if this were to move forward, how is it managed? Is it you managing it? Do you work with a local company that helps manage that, and so on. You've heard the concerns, so I just want to give you the option to discuss here.

Mr. Murray stated:

That he would be living on the property and managing it himself, and that he would perform background checks on his tenants. He said he will keep the value of the property in the neighborhood, or raise it with that duplex.

N. Frischkorn stated:

Looking at the standards – all appear to be met. It doesn't seem that there's any question, but I want to address that this does appear to meet all of those standards. That's the only comments I have at this time.

M. Larson stated:

The frontage is 140' long, and in this neighborhood there is a minimum, if it was just a single family home of 37.5' and so I mean in theory this could have been broken up into smaller lots that would accommodate several additional homes in this location. And so in some ways, as a one large lot and meeting those, you may be actually limiting the number of homes in that particular area, given that it's so long and the minimum is 37.5'.

J. Cardillo stated:

Right, and also the area provided is what, 29,000 square feet?

A. Landers stated:

25 thousand.

J. Cardillo stated:

26,000, and the minimum for this duplex is 6,000, so that reinforces what you're stating in the density of this duplex is not very high.

M. Larson stated:

Right.

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

I really appreciate all the people's concerns we heard today. I appreciate people coming out. We really don't have a lot of discretion in terms of passing things that meet the code and as Commissioner Frischkorn pointed out, they met and are well under a lot of the codes in terms of the setbacks, so if we didn't approve this, I wonder if we would be walking a line, because we're always balancing the rights of two private entities. The rights of the neighbors versus the rights of the developer, and I think legally, I think this would be hard for us to deny because they have met the standards, so I feel like our hands are tied in this situation. But I empathize completely with everything I heard tonight.

J. Cardillo stated that this is a residential use and whether it is a rental or not can't influence our decision.

It was moved by M. Larson, seconded by S. Mittlefehldt, and carried 5-0 that after review of the STAFF REPORT/ANALYSIS for 03-SUP-06-22, the Planning Commission finds that the request meets the intent and requirements of the Land Development Code Sections 54.1403 and 54.613, and hereby approves 03-SUP-06-22 as presented.

CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Ronald Mattson, 912 Horizons Dr., stated:

Good evening, my name is Ron Mattson acting President of Harlow Farms Community and I'm addressing you regarding the need move up on your priority list the Wilson Street multi-use pathway from M-553 to US41 – a 0.9-mile section. This project has been on the City's Master Plan since 2006. I not only speak for the residents of the Harlow Farms Community but also as an unsolicited advocate for Whetstone Village Apartments, Mill Creek Senior Living, plus the other subdivisions along Wilson St. We know the City has difficult financial decisions to make in 2022 and beyond and will be prioritizing projects to balance the needs of the community with fiduciary responsibilities to taxpayers. With the current budget consisting of 133 pages and over \$22 Million, I empathize with the tremendous pressure and responsibility you are under. I'm here not to demand, but here as an engaged citizen lending additional eyes and ears to support the City Commission's efforts in building a safe community. I know the commission places safety first when prioritizing projects and want to publicly thank you for your efforts.

A little Background - the City's Master Plan has included a multi-use pathway project along Wilson St. when the privately built Wilson Street was transferred to the City in 2006. Per the signed PUD agreement between The City and Harlow Farms Development Corporation dated December 13th, 2006... the City committed to building a "bike/pedestrian pathway and any pathway lighting to be contained within the Wilson Street Right of Way." We understand the delay in construction due to financial concerns but would like to bring to the City's attention the growing safety issue along Wilson Street. We have noticed that Wilson Street has become a bypass for motorist dodging the stop light at US-41/M-553, not only cars but also oversize delivery and construction vehicles, and thus heightening the risk to pedestrians. We have also witnessed an increase of able body and non-abled body pedestrians using this section of Wilson Street to access essential services. Safety is our main concern, and if Wilson St was a low traffic quiet neighborhood roadway ... the Harlow Farms Community wouldn't be here talking with you, but since the roadway is now a high traffic bypass thoroughfare, the Commission needs to be made aware of the increased safety risks. The City of Marquette has been a leader in creating multi-use infrastructure through the center and perimeter of the city for those who don't have or who cannot use an automobile to access essential services. Per Rails-to-Trails Conservancy 2019, "Safe places to walk or ride are a critical option given rising pedestrian and bicycle fatalities and serious injuries. Pedestrian traffic deaths alone stand about 6,000 per year, representing 15 percent of total fatalities and a 35 percent increase over a decade."

Wrapping up...by the City prioritizing Wilson Street St's multi-use pathway project, we would...

1. Prevent the eventuality of injury to pedestrians.
2. Create a safe route to services and businesses for the non-motorized citizens from the surrounding retirement communities, apartments, and subdivisions.
3. Make it easier for the community and tourist to access the existing NTN and IOHT trail systems which intersect Wilson Street.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

J. Cardillo asked if staff could comment on the status of this project and asked if it was in the Community Master Plan.

D. Stensaas stated:

Yes, I believe that this was in the 2004 Master Plan, and it was 11 years later that the current Master Plan was adopted. It was the intent, back to that era, to create a pathway along Wilson St. I can't answer all of the various reasons over the years why it hasn't happened, but it hasn't happened. I know that a few years ago there was a path connection proposed between the new Community Center and the Iron Ore Heritage Trail, behind the new building. I believe this is in the Capital Improvements Plan and it is something that the City could pursue, but it would probably have to be pursued through some infrastructure grant funding because our CIP list has had so many projects pushed back for so many years that we are not near the goals set for keeping up with maintenance of city streets. You may know that this year the City is not doing any street reconstruction projects, the only projects we are doing are resurfacing and basically trying to extend the life of those streets that can be extended in that way. So this is something to talk with the City Engineer about with the Capital Improvements Plan and to emphasize with the City Commission as a citizen, to take these concerns to them. The Planning Commission's authority in that regard is to make recommendations on the Capital Improvements Plan. The reality is that we are far behind our goals on city

street projects, but if there are any high priority bike path extension projects this would be it. I don't know if there is a realistic possibility to create a separated pathway there, a bike route is much more likely, but that doesn't accomplish what most people would like to see. Just like any other area, people would much rather have a grade and distance separated bike facility than an on-street bike route or bike lane.

Julie Higbie, 502 Brookstone Cir., stated:

I would like to just comment a little bit on what you have just talked about, the designated bike path along the side of the road. As residents there, we do a lot of walking. I believe there is about 170 units where people are living and they utilize Wilson Street as their transportation. Like Ron said, some of these people do not have access to a vehicle or are not able to drive, so we do see people that are in motorized scooters going up and down Wilson Street. Wilson Street was made, rightly so, very curvy so that people slow down and have to go a minimum of 25 around those curves. But this really makes it hazardous for these people that are pushing a stroller or operating a motorized vehicle to get them to the grocery store. And this happens on a regular basis. This is not just a one time thing. Any given day you can see this kind of activity on Wilson Street and so yes, we are looking for more than just a bike path along the side of the street. We're looking at a multi-use pathway to accommodate all of the different people. We have a lot of people with walkers. We have a lot of people trying to get out and get some exercise and this is where we have to do it.

Mr. Mattson interjected and stated:

The Iron Ore Heritage Trail is adjacent to Harlow Farms apartment complex, and there's a lot of individuals that don't have motorized transportation so they hop on the trail and then hop on Wilson to go to the grocery store and we see all the time and we hold our breath with all the traffic that is on Wilson Street. It is now kind of a bypass and I encourage you just take a spin over there and just observe a little bit on that corridor.

TRAINING

A. Article: "*Identifying the Solar Potential Next to America's Highways*"

Staff and the Planning Commission discussed the article and related concepts.

COMMISSION AND STAFF COMMENTS

A. Andres stated:

That was a good meeting and laughed loudly. SAIL is hosting a cornhole tournament fundraiser on September 10th and it will benefit the UP Vets Served Program as well as Sled Hockey UP, and he encouraged everyone to take a flyer for the event and give it to anyone they think would be interested.

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

I saw in the paper that Marquette was selected for the MI Next Cities sustainable cities project and the Manager mentioned it was great because it aligns with our plans to develop a climate action plan. Do you have any sense of what our role in that would be and what the timeframe might be?

D. Stensaas stated:

Right now, that project is at the discovery period and I don't think anybody at the City has a really good grasp on where it's going to go. Myself and Mik, the City Engineer, had a Zoom meeting with the consultants for MI Next Cities, because they wanted to interview staff from different departments and they had a preset set of questions and so they're just kind of at the stage of gathering information and one of the things that I brought up was we are in the process of getting an RFP out to hire a consultant for our Master Plan update, and we are looking at adopting a climate action plan, and they knew that the climate action plan was part of what was going on and I expressed to them that it would probably be a lot better if we had two separate processes, so we'll see where that goes. I don't know that anybody really knows what that is going to turn into for us, it's kind of a wait and see. They haven't provided us with a lot of information on what the whole program is, what their outcomes are going to be. They're providing consulting services and they're going to help us develop some kind of – this is definitely along the smart cities theme. So, how that integrates with anything else we're doing is going to be interesting to find out. I really don't know all that

much about the smart cities other than there's a lot of technology adaptation to try to help us be more energy efficient and I don't know that it includes anything like building renovation. That's probably not part of the program, but it could be. I don't know how it gets into transportation. I mean, we've talked about the two big areas of carbon footprint, buildings and transportation. I did ask questions of them about like what they're thinking in terms of are there any advances in transportation that they're looking at that are likely to have any impact on this process, and they said no, besides electrification, besides vehicle EV's. And one point I brought up is that we've done some research on the whole technology around EV's and what we would want to – if we could write a code, what we would want that code to say about what we're going to require of the development, what types of development we would expect to have EV infrastructure, even if it's just the electrical capability to have charging stations, and so I've got to think that's going to be part of it. They're going to probably inform us on some best practices and that's kind of what I asked them if they would do for us because we had been looking into that. But one of the things I mentioned was I thought I understood a lot about the EV stuff just on looking down on it from a high level and kind of looking at all the facets of it. But then I heard like just a month or two ago about a shop in California that takes a car, and it's like a Jiffy Lube, but they take your battery out and replace it with a new fully charged battery. If you have certain types of batteries, they can take your car in and give you a new battery. So, does that mean EV charging stations won't be necessary – it just kind of flipped the whole thing for me. Down in the Detroit area, they're building a road that has an EV charging capability in the street. They've got something embedded in the street that connects with the battery, it charges the battery while the cars are driving on that road. So, there's all these different approaches and I'm starting to wonder well, what do we do?

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

I think your answer is we don't know what it's going to be, what our role is.

D. Stensaas stated:

They interviewed our department, me and Mik from our department – I sat in for Dennis while he was on vacation - and they've talked to people in other city departments, other staff managers, and they're gathering kind of what they need to know about Marquette, what we're planning, where we're at with different projects and that kind of thing. I don't know if our City Manager or anybody at the City really knows better than that.

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

Okay, thanks for the update.

D. Stensaas stated:

That there is no business for the first meeting of July – which is July 12th due to it being moved from the 5th - so it will be cancelled. He said that the next meeting on July 19th is the next meeting with Alex from Superior Culture.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Cardillo at 7:30 p.m.

Prepared by:

David Stensaas, City Planner and Zoning Administrator
Planning Commission Staff Liaison
Transcribed by iMedat/Edited by D. Stensaas