

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
August 15, 2023**

A regular meeting of the Marquette City Planning Commission was duly called and held at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, August 15, 2023, in the Commission Chambers at City Hall.

ROLL CALL

Planning Commission (PC) members present: W. Premeau, M. Rayner, S. Lawry, Vice-Chair N. Williams, D. Fetter, C. Gottlieb.

PC members absent: K. Clegg, Chair S. Mittlefehldt, A. Andres (all excused).

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

AGENDA

It was moved by C. Gottlieb, seconded by M. Rayner, and carried 6-0 to approve the agenda as presented.

MINUTES

The minutes of 07-18-23 were approved as presented, by consensus.

CONFLICT of INTEREST

No conflicts of interest were confirmed.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. 04-SUP-08-23 - 1901 & 1903 Presque Isle Ave. (PIN: 0470480 & 0470470)

Zoning Official A. Landers stated:

Staff has reviewed a Special Land Use Permit application for Light Manufacturing for a distillery located at 1901 and 1903 Presque Isle Avenue. The property is zoned Mixed-Use and Light Manufacturing is a Special Land Use in that zoning district. The Planning Commission should review the Special Land Use Permit application, the Site Plan Review application, and the Site Plan, along with the support information provided in the packet, to determine whether or not the proposal is in compliance with the City of Marquette Land Development Code, specifically with the Special Land Use standards of section 54.1403, the Site Plan Review standards in section 54.1402, and the Light Manufacturing standards in section 54.627. She described and showed on the monitors in the room the Staff Report and attachments, the Special Land Use application, their narrative, the Site Plan Review application, staff comments with their responses, the area map, the block map, existing photos of the site, and the Site Plan set. She also stated that there was no correspondence submitted.

N. Williams stated that he had a question for staff and asked: Is it currently operating under a Special Land Use [permit] for vehicle repair?

A. Landers stated: This building was retail, so it wasn't vehicle repair. I think it is vacant right now.

N. Williams asked: So, no Special Land Use?

A. Landers stated: No, the vehicle repair was prior to the code change.

N. Williams asked if there were any other questions for staff. He then invited the applicant to speak about the application.

Mr. Chris Gale, of 844 W. Bluff St., stated: I moved here in 2003...and began brewing and distilling about eight years ago, for myself at home, and I've decided to turn that into a business.

N. Williams asked if there were any other questions for the applicant.

S. Lawry stated: You communicated no intent to serve on the premises inside or outside, other than the tasting room, but the deck seems kind of large to just provide an entrance. Is that a possible future expansion of your facility?

Mr. Gale stated: It's actually smaller than the first time it was drawn up. It is just for the ramp to get up to the right height to meet the floor on the inside, but in the future, possibly, but it's not very big as it is on the inside so that's not the forefront.

S. Lawry asked: Would that require, if it was outside, a separate license from the state as well as the city?

Mr. Gale stated: Nope, just the city.

C. Gottlieb stated: I'm confused about the tasting room and the number of seats. Can you refresh my memory? I know it's in here but just refresh my memory how many seats you're going to have in the tasting room.

Mr. Gale stated: No seating besides a couple of armchairs - just a coffee table, two armchairs...like a little lounge corner.

C. Gottlieb asked: And the number of parking spots listed was adequate for two customers?

A. Landers stated: It's a retail use and they stated that they weren't serving inside except allowing for when someone's purchasing to taste, and that meets the licensing, so it's not like you're sitting there and you're drinking. You're just tasting to see what you're going to buy. So it still falls under the retail.

C. Gottlieb asked: So, how long are you going to allow people to sit there? Let's say you have a line out the door.

Mr. Gale stated:

We plan on only doing one or two samples, one ounce or even a half ounce.

C. Gottlieb stated:

I guess my concern is realistically how will you prevent people from coming in and tasting for hours, with the number of parking spots provided? Is that a fair question?

Mr. Gale stated:

Yeah, I'm not sure...but we can definitely encourage them to consider purchasing something or ask them what they think, get their opinion and see if they're purchasing a bottle and leaving for the next customer to be able to come in.

C. Gottlieb stated:

My concern really was the parking spots. I know I don't like being rushed through a distillery. So how will you handle that?

Mr. Gale stated:

The best way possible I suppose. I mean, I don't see very many people just standing there for too long when there's no option to sit down except for two little spots.

C. Gottlieb stated:

In my experience, and I don't have much experience in a distillery, but what experience I've had, I cannot leave.

Mr. Gale stated:

The goal is to expand farther, somewhere else, a bigger building somewhere to definitely have a bigger tasting room, actual seating. For now, the distribution is the main thing.

C. Gottlieb asked, so two chairs, and not a bar?

Mr. Gale stated: Yeah. It's a bar height but it's a retail counter.

C. Gottlieb asked, and the parking does match?

A. Landers stated: That's just what they're applying for. If he turns it into a tasting room, they're going to have to come back and do an expansion at his request and provide (inaudible).

C. Gottlieb asked: And that is mandated by the city?

A. Landers stated: They're only applying for retail use with the small area...they're having people sit there. If we're getting consumption on premises, per our review of everything, then they're going to have a use being added.

N. Williams asked if there were any other questions for the applicant. He then opened the public hearing.

Josh Sharp, of 1829 Presque Isle Ave., stated:

I live just across the street and so I've reviewed the applicant's materials and I'm supportive of what they have asked so far and I guess my only concern would be in the future, if this expands I would be concerned with noise issues and other issues that might affect the neighborhood and my property value. So, for now I'm cool with it, but I just wanted to go on record that if it expands then I would have potential issues with that.

N. Williams asked if there were any other comments. He then closed the public hearing.

It was moved by C. Gottlieb, seconded by S. Lawry, and carried 6-0 to suspend the rules for discussion.

C. Gottlieb asked: What are the hours for the establishment?

A. Landers stated:

Open to the public, Monday through Saturday, 2 pm to 8 pm, light manufacturing Monday through Saturday 9 am to 8 pm.

S. Lawry stated:

Just one concern, not so much with the project as with the language in their ordinance being applied to it with regard to - it's paragraph E under the standards, about a discontinued activity and when an industrial activity is discontinued shall be left in a condition free from hazards and abandoned structures. When a building has been vacant for a while, I don't know exactly how we're defining an abandoned structure but our Master Plan, the Resiliency Plan, whatever supports it after reuse, which is what they're doing with this, and yet we've got a provision that says if we've got an abandoned building because an industrial use shuts down, they basically have to.

A. Landers interjected - The previous use of this building was retail, not industrial.

D. Stensaas stated:

We would go with what was the most recent use. That clause protects the city from an industrial use leaving behind something that's hazardous or dangerous before it can be used again.

S. Lawry stated:

I understand, but at this point I think we're reclassifying it as light industry are we not?

A. Landers said: Light manufacturing.

S. Lawry stated: Light manufacturing, which I guess I'm just trying to make sure that we don't at some point in the future say "okay, they left, they have to tear down the building", which if that's not our intent we probably should look at perhaps modifying that language in the future to be a little bit more lenient to adapting reuse of structures.

D. Stensaas stated:

That is a good point. I guess not every administrator is going to use common sense, but I don't think if we have a problem with it, that isn't the intent of the language.

S. Lawry stated:

Sometimes it's the public who can demand that the ordinance be enforced by the language that's there, and I think it's just something to look at in the future. In this case, you said it's a good adaptive reuse of the structure. Alcohol was sold at this structure for years and years when it was a party store, and it's existed since I guess the 1930s, so I think some of it is recycling back closer to what it was but to meet a little different demand in the city these days, and even though distillery may not be the one that supports public health the most, it's still a good use of the property I think, so I'm supportive of it.

N. Williams asked if there were any other comments or questions. He then began the review of the fourteen Special Land Use standards in Article 54.1403. The Planning Commission found the request would be in harmony with all fourteen standards.

S. Lawry asked: Do we have verification that the underground fuel tank is to be removed from this site?

A. Landers stated:

The fire department has records for that so I would have thought they would have reviewed that.

S. Lawry stated: There was some question of it back when I was still working with the City, but that's a long time ago. I presume it was clarified after that. Just before new paving happens on the site, it might be an expeditious time to check into it one more time.

N. Williams stated: Does anyone have any further comment or would anyone like to make a motion?

It was moved by C. Gottlieb, seconded by M. Rayner, and carried 6-0 that after holding a public hearing and review of the site plan set dated June 27, 2023, with supplemental documentation and the Staff Report/Analysis for 04-SUP-08-23, the Planning Commission finds that the request meets the intent and requirements of the Land Development Code Special Land Use Standards in Section 54.1403, the Site Plan Review Standards in Section 54.1402, and the Light Manufacturing Standards in Section 54.627, and hereby approves 04-SUP-08-23 with the following conditions:

- 1) *any expansion requires Planning Commission approval,*
- 2) *it is recommended that before commencing renovations that removal of the previous fuel tank be confirmed, and*
- 3) *that an amended site plan is submitted to meet staff comments.*

NEW BUSINESS

A. 12-SPR-08-23 – Site Plan Review – 2401 Lakeshore Boulevard (PIN: 0510891)

Zoning Official A. Landers stated:

Staff has reviewed site plans for three four-story buildings for a total of 98 residential units, new parking lot, site grading, dumpster enclosure, landscaping and site improvements for 2401 Lakeshore Boulevard. On November 9, 2021, the Planning Commission reviewed a site plan for this property and that site plan has expired and they are now proposing a different site plan. Attached to the agenda packet is the Staff Report and attachments, the Site Plan Review application, staff comments with the applicant's responses, the area map, the block map, photos of the site, and the Site Plan set. She asked if there were any questions for staff.

C. Gottlieb asked for staff to pull up page 104 of the agenda packet. He then asked for clarification of what is portrayed on the sheet and which lines were the property lines.

W. Premeau stated:

They're only building one building at this point, right?

A. Landers stated:

The proposal is for three structures. The first phase is one building, the second phase is another building, but they show the phasing on the site plan.

W. Premeau stated:

So, these are condominiums, is that right?

A. Landers stated:

Per the narrative responses.

N. Williams asked if there were any other questions for staff. He then invited the applicant to speak about this project.

Mr. Sal D'Aleo, with D'Anna Associates – the architects for the project, stated: This is a redesign of a former site plan that essentially was an unreliable option, and to address the question just asked, this will be three buildings as shown on the site plan. Phase I is intended to be the southernmost building and then the other two will be built as shown on the site plan. The former site plan was not a viable development, economically, but mainly [not] an ideal proposal for minimizing overall site impact and wetlands disturbances, which we've reduced in this new proposal. A little bit of design logic here...it's based on first and foremost working a little bit more with the natural features of the site, so placing structures and drives to minimize disturbances, providing community integration visually and physically to tie into continuation with views north and south. It's reach is kind of beyond the site bounds, speaking of the conceptual level, as far as what drove our design here, and then obviously beach access. This is designed to take advantage of the beach access through the public right away as well. Obviously, there are structures meant to take advantage of the water views, but again a nod towards a little bit more

community integration. So, the building design itself, yes, is a condominium project. 98 units are planned mixed between 2 and 3 bedroom units, and 1 bedroom units. The exact unit mixture will be based on market conditions and community demand ultimately, but the goal is to obviously maintain a viable unit density while maintaining the lower impact solution for the site and the community. So, for economy's sake, this is a townhome-esque building technology. It's a little bit easier to phase, it brings the units down to the pedestrian level a little bit more as opposed to the previous proposal. I don't know if you remember that design, but it was a podium-type. It had essentially a parking garage at the ground level and the buildings were kind of scattered. This is to work directly with views, directly with the site and leave an open area as much as possible to outreach arms to the lake, if you will. So, the buildings themselves, not to get into the nitty-gritty of the architecture, but they're modulized townhome units so you'll have a more economical building type. You'll have a little bit of difference between the view side or the wall façade facing the lake, and then a lower type of building typology where there's individual garages for the units themselves. So, obviously a lot of porch access. The idea is to give this building a direct life to the grade and ultimately to the beachfront there.

Let's see, site design...basically it's a modulized unit type, a townhome unit type that we can combine and phase, but at the end of the day they will be configured into those three building typologies, or three building types that you see in the plan. Regardless of unit mixture, the goal again will be 98 units. We're maximizing the height of the buildings so there are four stories at the rear side, but we're setting them back as much as possible again to maintain openness on that main frontage and minimize disturbance.

Our wetland encroachment has been reduced on this proposal, so we're also happy about that. And the rest of the site design, as you see from the packet, works well within the LDC and the requirements for that zoning. In fact, when you look at circulation for one, we've reduced the impact. The driveways are kind of working with the site conditions. We've eliminated an approach onto Lakeshore [Blvd.] as well, and so as far as site plan specifics and the comments that were issued to date, we're prepared to comply and provide responses to all of them. I think we've addressed all of them and we will comply to the comments that are in the packet. And the other thing I want to point out is enhancement of this valuable portion of the lakeshore is the goal, so when it comes down to other items such as the utilities or mechanical, all that stuff will not be visible from any of the right-of-way's, the public ways. We have screening...for dumpster enclosures, even down to obviously the metering system, and the buildings themselves will contain all the mechanical equipment, so we're not doing any on-site pad mounted mechanical equipment as well. So that's a synopsis of the project. Obviously we're here for any questions you guys may have so thank you very much.

It was moved by C. Gottlieb, seconded by D. Fetter, and carried 6-0 to suspend the rules for discussion.

C. Gottlieb asked: who owns the property across the street?

A. Landers stated:

That it is owned by the same party, and to the north is City of Marquette park property.

C. Gottlieb asked:

And the current plans, they show no development at all on the beach?

A. Landers stated:

No, the plan is only showing what we've got highlighted here, on the parcel that's highlighted in blue. If you want to build anything on the lake side, you have to get a special land use permit and you have to meet all these requirements. They're not proposing anything on that.

D. Stensaas stated:

They're severely limited on what can be built on the east side of Lakeshore Boulevard.

C. Gottlieb said: I'm wondering if they can build a fence.

A. Landers said: Our Code says any structures.

C. Gottlieb stated:

It's the intent, but I'd rather wait to see what discussion comes out of this before I ask.

W. Premeau stated:

They mentioned it was modular, so they're going to come in in pieces? Just thrown up in chunks, or?

An unidentified member said: That's the way it sounds.

W. Premeau stated:

I will say they have a unique design. I'd hate to come after a few drinks and try to find my apartment.

C. Gottlieb asked for clarification about property use beyond the western property boundary. Staff clarified that the applicant can only build upon or disturb land on their own property, and that they only have a wetland permit for their own property.

D. Fetter said that she has two questions. She stated:

From the recent meetings, I was reading here there is a discussion about an environmental study and I was curious if one had been conducted for this. Maybe this is why some of the change has been proposed here. Also, if the architects or applicant would consider more of a natural setting colors. It gets very gray here in the winter so I'm hoping we might be able to stay away from the whites, blacks and grays.

D. Stensaas stated: We actually have an ordinance in two of our districts that prevent you from using more than fifty percent of color that is in the spectrum from black to white for planning and I think we're going to be looking to the rest of the code for commercial and multi-family buildings in the future so it's a good concern.

Mr. D'Aleo stated:

To your point about the architecture, of course. We're playing with colors right now that would be a common color study that happens and ultimately the goal is to have some diversity in there and I'd obviously pick some warmer tones from the area and integrate that, yes absolutely.

D. Fetter said:

And what about the environmental study, was one conducted?

Mr. Brian Savolainen, Civil Engineer for the project, stated:

Going back 10 years on this project, there have been environmental studies and research done. They've done their Phase I and Phase II. We've been permitted through EGLE. We are going through modifications based on if the site plan is approved here and that being part of the process as well. I met with them last week and went over the plan and they'd like to see the direction we've been going in - trying to reduce as much impact as we can. There will be nothing affected across the ditch that the City has back there. We've been asked by the city to provide easement. We're doing that for them and we're trying to keep that portion as close to natural as possible.

Mr. D'Aleo stated:

One last comment, just to address the idea of modularity. I didn't mean that in a pre-fabricated way. I just meant it as a repetitive building type. So, we're not suggesting any pre-fabricated components to this building, shipped to site. This will be site built, pretty much conventionally, but just a repetitive building type obviously for economy more than anything, and efficiency and density as well.

S. Lawry stated:

There was quite a bit of discussion in minutes of the previous meeting...about the wetlands mitigation and the way I read it, it left things as undetermined yet at that point whether they were going to be able to use credits from Ms. Butler's deal with the city or whether they were going to have to use credits from a [wetlands] bank near M-95, and I see the blue polygons on this map might be indicating areas of mitigation right now on the property. I'm wondering where the mitigated wetlands, the replacement of wetlands, are going to be, and whether they're onsite or offsite.

Mr. Savolainen stated:

Currently there is a mitigation plan that was part of the original, which is an agreement with the City in the northern part of the industrial area that has a lot of wetlands right now, is part of that option for mitigation. My discuss with EGLE last week was specific about potentially using some on-site, and that's what the blue areas right now are storm water areas, that we're planning to meet the city's zoning ordinance. The issue that I found out about that is that [by] your ordinance we're required to make sure we go in there and maintain it, take sediment out and things like that. If we were to turn that into mitigation, we'd have to provide easements over those and we wouldn't be allowed to go in there and maintain them. So, that takes the on-site mitigation possibility out. But EGLE also gave us additional information on using wetland credits that we can purchase and the order right now is highly considering doing that rather than the mitigation of the City property, so that's still in flux.

S. Lawry stated:

But this owner does not have direct access to those credits on the City property, correct? They have to purchase that from Ms. Butler?

Mr. Savolainen stated:

No, I believe that's part of an agreement.

S. Lawry stated:

Okay, that was what was confusing in the minutes.

Mr. Chuck Conoway stated:

I'm one of the owners, and when we entered into our agreement with Michelle Butler, for part of the new road construction, they needed a piece of that property. As part of that agreement, we worked with Michelle and we gave up that property to be able to have the road cut through it and what we received was the ability to mitigate into those lands that we just discussed. For clarification, we may do that, depending on what the options are. We've also investigated pretty thoroughly going to - directed by all our advisors and staff - through land banking too, through that option also.

S. Lawry stated:

And that doesn't have to be finalized for us to issue the permits that they need?

A. Landers stated:

That will be through EGLE.

S. Lawry stated:

I do have one other question for staff concerning the landscaping requirements and they are showing quite a few areas where the existing wooded area is to remain, but yet you were requiring a specific number of trees. Do they get any credit at all for maintaining existing trees?

A. Landers stated:

If the site plan, he would need to show us, but previously I told him if he would just submit previous landscaping plan that met code is basically what we were getting at. If they have existing stuff that meets our code, they need to provide that and tell us what they're adding.

S. Lawry stated:

So each significant tree would have to be delineated in order to get credit against the required.

A. Landers interjected: When you're dealing with the frontage trees, yep.

S. Lawry stated:

And then on the frontage trees, definitely the farthest one north on Lakeshore Boulevard and perhaps, I couldn't tell for sure, perhaps the further one west of Hawley Street, seemed to block the drainage access easements that the City has on the property, those are there I believe to have the equipment get in there and do the maintenance that Brian was referring to and putting a tree right in the way is probably going to block that equipment access.

D. Stensaas said: They can find another location for the tree.

Mr. Savolainen stated:

Actually, that was one of the comments that Andrea had to Leah. The trees are all a little shifted in the way it plotted, and that is one area that the symbol of the tree is also is a lot bigger but we can clarify that on the landscape plan along with some other items. And some of the area, the entire west end, we intend on utilizing the existing, to the extent we can, we don't want to go over and disturb it, but a lot of the frontage is kind of shrubby and hard to pick up so the decision was let's give a full landscape plan that would be required to do that frontage so that we can clear our sightlines and then make those trees fit with both the screening and with the views from the planned development. So we'll look a little closer into that. Andrea and I have had that discussion and that will get clarified.

D. Stensaas stated:

And if I could, I just want to add that currently we're not requiring a performance bond for landscaping, but that's something that's typically problematic because developers often don't do it in time or they don't do all the items, but we are vigorously inspecting site and trying to avoid these performance guarantees so the sites will be inspected. And so the plan that is submitted to meet staff comments needs to be coordinated with Andrea to make sure it can meet that, and there is a six month period to meet the requirements, but being that we have six months of winter here we can adjust that, but we will be inspecting it.

S. Lawry asked: will that be six months after their Phase III completion?

A. Landers stated:

Six months from the initial occupancy. And just to be clear, we're talking about the frontage trees is from the front of the building towards the front lot line. So this existing wooded area wouldn't account for frontage trees and that's the side of the line.

S. Lawry said:

There is an area along Lakeshore Blvd. and again in front of the center of the building.

A. Landers stated:

Yeah, like he said, they're removing those. This is the frontage area here and they are putting all new in.

C. Gottlieb stated:

That begs the question of Phase I would start approximately when versus Phase II? I would assume Phase I would be occupied prior to Phase II and III, but what kind of timeframe are you looking at between the Phases?

Mr. Savolainen stated:

The intention is to keep moving. We're hoping to potentially break ground again and get rolling on the first part of Phase I via that southern building yet this fall. Realistically, until we get our official EGLE things worked out it may be too late, so it would be first thing in the spring, but the intent is to continue building right throughout the, we anticipate it's a two to three year build on this, cause it is all on-site, stick built type planning, so the idea would be moving from Phase I, having the circular drive put in for access to that, we want that for emergency vehicles as well anyway. We'd be moving to the middle of- to start Phase II somewhere. We can start on either end just continue to build and then as long as the market is still there and strong and things are moving forward, we'd be moving right into Phase III provided there's some sort of slowdown in housing maybe, or something like that, they just want to reserve that ability to pull the plug for a little bit if they need to. I mean, just like anyone else would want to, if all of a sudden you can't afford to build the rest because no one's buying it, it's just the way it's going to be. So, knowing too that there's timeframes on site plan approval - that only lasts so long - we're laying out- we're trying to lay out that phasing plan as best as we can. It's not a project that can be done in one season.

C. Gottlieb asked for clarification on the phasing as it applies to each building and the order for development.

Mr. Savolainen stated:

What you see on the screen right now would be Phase II. Phase I is to your left looking at the screen. Phase II is the larger building. Phase III is the one for this.

C. Gottlieb asked: so, Phase II, you anticipate building in that order?

Mr. Savolainen stated:

That's the intention yeah, so hopefully as we get through with Phase I that we're able to at least get enough foundations in by the end of next summer to continue working through the winter on those Phase II buildings.

C. Gottlieb asked:

For clarification about the access road to Lakeshore Boulevard, is it gated access??

Mr. Savolainen stated:

Yeah, that's not meant at all as an access drive. It's emergency access for fire, hospital, usually the development, we have a lot more housing or requests to have two access points, so the idea is that's a path out to the existing white path, but the base of it is being built large enough, it'll have a solid gravel bottom if an ambulance or fire truck needed to pull in there and would get there. We'll be talking with the fire department also. They wanted a 20 ft. white paved area. We're going to ask can we still keep it narrower but have a gravel base, but that'll be in discussions, if we have to put the 20 ft. wide in there we'll do that, but we'll have one of those double gates where you can't drive through it, where you've got to zigzag around on your bike or as you're walking.

C. Gottlieb asked: It will be locked?

A. Landers said:

It will use a Knox Box. That's what they usually do for these things.

Mr. Savolainen stated:

It's no different than any other emergency access gate or anything else that emergency services have access to.

C. Gottlieb asked: would the paved go across the bike path onto Lakeshore Blvd. the way it's indicated?

Mr. Savolainen stated:

The intent was not to initially but if that's required we would gravel, and improve that base. In there, we do have a utility light that's tied into it, so we're going to have a portion of that disturbed anyway and that's why we picked that location and we can pave that. We'll do whatever the city requires us to do at that location. And that's the way we address that kind of thing.

C. Gottlieb stated:

I would hate to see that unlocked and access for vehicles get in the bike path. It would scare me, being a biker on the bike path.

Mr. Savolainen stated: We'd prefer to just have one.

C. Gottlieb asked:

Has the city assessed the anticipated car traffic across the bike path on Hawley Street? And what would be required from the developers to assure bike and pedestrian safety on the bike path? Can the city mandate stop signs?

D. Stensaas stated:

That's a good point. I can say I'm not aware that we've studied that particular facet of the traffic impact, but that brings up a good point. Wherever you have a driveway crossing the city sidewalk or multi-use path, it needs to be left to where the sidewalk is in place after the driveway is put in, the sidewalk needs to be replaced so the pedestrian priority is there. This is a bike path area, so we may end up doing something at that driveway since it's a bike path, with painting ladder or piano keys across that driveway area where the bike path crosses it, and possibly doing some other on-the-path "stop" warning, or some other type of warning for people using the path, that there's a driveway crossing there.

C. Gottlieb said:

I just know that there are two driveways to the west of there that are problematic, where people won't stop, cars do not stop and do not obey the existing traffic signage.

D. Stensaas stated:

So, the city will need to consider putting those things when we do painting, line painting in the summer probably. The developer could put a stop sign there for people coming out.

Mr. Savolainen stated:

The intent is to have a stop sign there.

N. Williams asked if anyone had any comments on any of the Site Plan Review standards in section 54.1402.

N. Williams stated: Does anyone have any further comment or would anyone like to make a motion?

It was moved by M. Rayner, seconded by W. Premeau, and carried 6-0 that after review of the site plan and the supplemental documentation dated 7-18-23, and the Staff Report for 12-SPR-08-23, 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.

C. Gottlieb stated (before voting):

Given what is presented we need to approve it, but I'm sad to see this site being developed the way it is. But I have to vote for it because it meets what we have agreed on.

TRAINING

A. Article – 5 Reasons Why Office-to-Residential Conversions Are a Serious Challenge, Strong Towns website - Ben Abramson, May 12, 2023.

The Planning Commission and staff discussed the online article.

COMMISSION AND STAFF COMMENTS

W. Premeau stated:

I got a kick out of reading that they were missing one tree. I think we should do away with that planning ordinance. We talk about trying to make things cost effective and giving the homeowner a break, but when you add all these things, there's so many things in our ordinance that I think we can definitely do without. Those plantings run anywhere between \$12 and \$18 grand, and if we're thinking about all this climate change crap then maybe we should change our plantings, seriously, to palm trees and cactus, because they'll survive in cold weather and fit perfectly into the weather that's coming here apparently. And I thought site plan review was site-plan-review, but now we're talking about picking colors? I think we should leave things up to the builders. These guys are coming to town, they're gambling millions of dollars and they may not be able to sell these things for a half-million to \$600,000 each, which they're going to have to get to break even. Then we tell people "you need one more tree", I got a kick out of that.

S. Lawry stated:

Much like Commissioner Gottlieb, I guess I hate to see this site developed the way it is, with architecture that doesn't seem to blend in very well with what's going on at the hospital and most of the buildings you find in Marquette County. But we really have to leave some of that expression up to the developers and not mandate everything. You don't end up with a variety of architecture unless you do allow some freedom for that. I guess I can accept that, and this site plan that we viewed for this meeting tonight is a whole lot different, a lot less intensive, and a lot less encroaching on the environment than what was proposed back around [year] 2000 by the Islander Beach and Tennis Club for condos, for this same site, which was even bigger at that time. So things do evolve in an approved way over time if they take some time to do that, but it was nice to see something that has less impact on the environment even if its going to have a visual impact.

D. Fetter stated:

This is off-topic of today's discussions, it's about parking and traffic safety. I noticed something when I was on vacation a couple weeks ago - back-in diagonal parking. I don't know if its ever been considered

up here, I haven't seen it before and it makes a lot of sense because instead of backing into traffic you're going with the flow of traffic. I just wanted to bring that up as a potential consideration if we're looking to any kind of changes to parking in Marquette.

S. Lawry said that we used to have it on East Washington Street.

D. Stensaas updated the Planning Commission on the status of the Community Master Plan Renewal project and the Resilient Marquette project. He informed the Commission that the Superior Watershed Partnership has collaborated with him and the consultants for the Resilient Marquette project to use the recently provided Resiliency Assessment and Climate Action report as the basis for a Letter of Intent to apply for a federal grant for a project involving communities throughout Upper Michigan on the Lake Superior shoreline, using Marquette's planning as a model to develop management plans and policies to guide their communities, and even help us improve on ours, through collaboration with tribes, other local units of government, universities in the UP.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Vice-Chair N. Williams at 7:15 p.m.

Prepared by: kw/iMedat

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