

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
August 09, 2022**

A regular meeting of the Marquette City Planning Commission was duly called and held at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, August 9, 2022, in the Commission Chambers at City Hall.

ROLL CALL

Present: W. Premeau, A. Andres, Vice-Chair M. Larson, N. Williams, N. Frischkorn

Absent: S. Mittlefehldt, Chair J. Cardillo (both excused)

AGENDA

It was moved by A. Andres, seconded by N. Frischkorn and carried 5-0 to approve the agenda as presented.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST and EX-PARTE CONTACT

No conflicts were stated.

CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION ON AGENDA ITEMS

Geraldine Nault, of 1851 N. McClellan Ave. stated:

She just has one question and is wondering if the McClellan Ave. address for the project is correct or if it is S. McClellan Avenue. She said that at her address on N. McClellan Ave. she has had trouble with service people finding her house related to the N. and S. addresses.

NEW BUSINESS

A. 04-SPR-08-22 – 2500 S. McClellan Ave. and part of 2464 Division St.

Zoning Official A. Landers read the memo for the case and presented visuals from the agenda packet including the application and staff comments, consultant replies to staff comments, the area and block map with the parcel outlined in blue, photos of the vacant site, the site plan that was submitted including the civil plans and architectural plans. She also stated that the current address is 2500 McClellan.

City Planner and Zoning Administrator D. Stensaas stated:

I attended MDOT's Corridor Advisory Group meeting today, which includes representatives from all of the communities along the US-41/M-28 corridor, and we submit site plans for development within a quarter-mile of the highway and the M-553 corridor. I submitted this site plan to MDOT and it was reviewed today by the group, but MDOT analyzed the trip generation for the project at full build-out and estimate there will be about 90 trips per hour during the 3-hour evening peak period. The breakdown is about 2/3 of trips will be to/from the north and 1/3 to/from the south, and there are not enough right turns from northbound traffic to justify a departure lane or any other improvements, and that the two-way-center-left-turn lane is adequate to handle southbound turns. So, MDOT sees no need for any improvements or changes.

M. Larson invited the applicant to come up and speak about the project.

Jim Conlin, of Ironshore Properties, stated:

We are the current owner of the project and are local, developing from Green Bay and up to Marquette, Negaunee, Harvey, etc. He said they are looking to add to the inventory in town, being that it has been a much-discussed need for the community for at least the last two years now. We're excited to get the project

going on the ownership side, with Barry Polzin, and if there are any questions he can't answer I would be glad to.

Barry Polzin, 101 N. Lakeshore Blvd. and architect for the project, stated:

Jim came in and thought this is a great site, it's a piece of ground and we've only done Brownfields for about the past 20 years it seems, and it seemed like an easy site. But as it turns out it wasn't so easy. As we looked around the site we thought with the big meadow it would be nice to keep that as a usable space, and then we started looking at how the ground was shaped and there is a tremendous amount of topography in this area. So, our approach was let's not to fight it and dig big holes and build big retaining walls, let's try to minimize the amount of earthwork and balance on the site. And so, what we've done is come up with a unit that can step up and down the hills. We have some units which are flat, but most of them will follow the topography. We still have some earthwork to do, but we're trying to minimize that. The southern area is the highest area of the site and there are a lot of big white pine up there and we are staying out of that area.

We sprinkled the units around the site, responding to the topography, and got it set up for flow with traffic, fire and emergency access. There are a couple of dead-end parking areas, but a very limited number of tenants would be in those situations. There are eight accessible units in the level buildings, with level ground and level parking and fully accessible route. And we have a common area, a clubhouse building which is located near the entry, adjacent to the big meadow area that we wanted to preserve and we have space for some garden plots if there is interest, so it becomes sort of the heart of the community that we're building. We kept the landscaping to a minimum and are really just meeting the requirements for parking and we came up a little short on the front edge because we were planning on just leaving what is there in those areas that we aren't touching. We do have quite a bit of wetland area on the site, a lot of it was created by the highway and M-553 actually drains into that area and when the neighboring property to the north was developed that kind of dammed it up, but those are nice things to have on the property. There are a couple of spots where the drives encroach into that setback area, otherwise we have met the requirement for the buffers in the riparian overlay district. We have two parking spots for each unit and we do see this as more of a car-use kind of thing, although it is located with bike trails that connect to the incredible bike network that we have. We see this as a great product that doesn't exist in the market right now – its near town but kind of in the woods, in a more natural area, and very simple units that have a walk-up second floor and it does repeat. It will be built in phases, we are going to tackle the northern section first and then up we'll get up into those hills as a later phase. That's about all for now.

M. Larson stated:

My first question is do you have an anticipated timeframe?

Mr. Conlin stated:

The contractors that we are working with would like to get ground work and concrete going by early fall, and framing throughout the winter.

M. Larson asked:

Then, thinking about the phases, is this is 2 year - 5 year - 7 year project?

Mr. Conlin stated:

I think we'll be done in 2025, maybe 2024, but ideally, if the market demands we'll go right from [phase] one to two. The plan is to build 100 units in the first phase and if you look at the map, the four buildings furthest south, up in the hills, those will be the second phase.

M. Larson asked if there were other questions for the applicant. He also stated that he would entertain a motion to suspend the rules if anyone wants to discuss this amongst ourselves, or otherwise a motion if you think this meets the requirements.

W. Premeau stated that he would make a motion.

It was moved by W. Premeau, seconded by A. Andres, and carried 5-0 that after review of the site plan and the supplemental documentation dated 07-12-22, and the STAFF REPORT/ANALYSIS for 06-SPR-08-22, the Planning Commission finds substantial compliance with the City of Marquette Land Development Code and hereby approves the site plan with the following condition that an amended plan is submitted to meet staff comments.

TRAINING

A. Article: Zoning for Market Contexts (Michigan Planner May/June 2022)

Staff and the Planning Commission discussed the article.

B. MSU Extension Training Opportunities – Late Summer/Fall 2022

D. Stensaas stated:

There is an opportunity for a local, in-person Citizen Planner training by our regional MSE Extension land-use educator that takes six weeks, one night each week, and starts on October 3rd and that it would be good if we could send at least one PC member that hasn't had this training. There are some other training opportunities listed that might be good but let me know if you can attend the in-person training.

WORK SESSION

The Planning Commission and staff, consulting the Community Master Plan, worked through the 12 items in the MSU Extension checklist that was attached to the agenda for determining the necessity for a comprehensive plan update, and the content and issues, including data and information, that should be included in a rewritten comprehensive plan.

It was moved by N. Frischkorn, seconded by A. Andres, and carried 5-0 that upon review of the Checklist #1H for land-use planning the Planning Commission finds that many of the items in the Community Master Plan need to be updates and therefore the Plan should be rewritten.

M. Larson stated:

As far as our next steps for this, Dave, I assume that in our next homework series you'll be sending us sections to review, particular sections that you want to chunk out.

D. Stensaas stated:

Yes, and please grab a pile of the copies of proposals for drafting a new CMP that I've set up, there are five proposals, and look them over and if you have any thoughts on them for Dennis and I, please let me know. Selecting the consultants to interview is going to be a staff exercise, so we are scoring the proposals, but the PC is going to help with interviews once we narrow the field down to our top three candidates.

M. Larson asked what the timeframe is – by the end of next week?

D. Stensaas stated:

I think we're going to be making a recommendation to the City Commission by the beginning of September, but this is just...at this point if you have any feedback on these that's what we'd like. We're not going to have you get into the specifics, there is a lot of reading there and you could spend all day with those five proposals, and we don't expect you to do that, but it is good to get a flavor for the different approaches the various consultancies take. One of the proposals is very data-driven, and they would far and away provide more data analysis, that is their world, that firm specializes in finding out information and providing it to the community. A couple of them are very vanilla, in the traditional vein of what we've done in the past. Another one recommends a master plan of no more than 80 pages and is focused on a digital approach. So, those are the major distinctions between the proposals. And I will also send digital copies out if I can get those.

COMMISSION AND STAFF COMMENTS

Andres stated:

September 10th is the SAIL cornhole tournament and I'd like to encourage everyone to come out to support the disabled community.

W. Premeau stated:

I don't think electric cars are the answer, because if you left Marquette and are going to Detroit it's an 8-hour trip, in an electric car its going to be 12 hours, if you're going from Houghton it's going to be 16 hours. And up here where it's cold it will take longer, plus they give off pollutants. Common sense should come into play. Covering the earth with solar panels isn't the answer. And we had a meeting about windmills, and they're 50 meters long, so you'd have to cut down massive amount of forest to get them in...it's impractical. An old friend of mine was the Ishpeming City Manager years ago and he said that we could produce all the energy we needed by going into the mines and use the power of the water dropping from one level to the other, it has perpetual power, and I see they're kicking that idea around again.

D. Stensaas stated:

There is a rezoning request on the docket for the next meeting, a request to add parcels to the Third St. Corridor District.

A. Landers stated:

We've received two requests that will be on the agenda for the first meeting in September.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Vice-Chair M. Larson at 7:30 p.m.

Prepared by:


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