

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
November 15, 2022**

A regular meeting of the Marquette City Planning Commission was duly called and held at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 15, 2022, in the Commission Chambers at City Hall.

ROLL CALL

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

AGENDA

It was moved by M. Larson, seconded by W. Premeau, and carried 6-0 to approve the agenda as presented.

MINUTES

Minutes of 10-18-22 and 11-1-22 with the following change for the minutes of 10-18-22 - Page 19 "any of you" should be "NMU" - were approved by consensus.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Chair J. Cardillo stated she had a conflict of interest for 717 N. Third St.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

06-SUP-11-22 – 300 E. Prospect St. (PIN: 0361110)

A. Landers stated:

Staff has reviewed the Special Land Use permit for a Group Day Care home to be located at 300 E. Prospect St. This property is zoned Medium Density Residential (MDR), and a Group Day Care home is a special land use in this zoning district. Per the Land Development Code definition: **Day Care, Group Home:** *A private home in which more than six (6) but not more than 12 minor children are given care and supervision for periods of less than 24 hours a day, unattended by a parent or legal guardian, except children related to an adult member of the family by blood, marriage, or adoption. Group day care home includes a home that gives care to an unrelated minor child for more than four (4) weeks during a calendar year. All group day care homes shall be registered with or licensed by the Michigan Department of Licensing and Regulatory Affairs or successor agency.* Visuals of the agenda packet were shown and presented.

Chair Cardillo invited the applicants to speak.

The applicants, Taryn Juidici and Emilly Mihelac of 300 E. Prospect St., introduced themselves. Ms. Juidici stated:

The parking issue, there's a couple different, we have a couple different ideas, but we're definitely open to more because we do want safety as one of the number-one priorities. We've got some pictures and it's not, there's not a whole lot of traffic at all in the morning and we thought we could do standard drop off times and pick up times to eliminate everybody at one time being there. Or we could have a certain age, like the infants, come to the front to drop off, and then the older ones (inaudible)...dropped off out by the garage on that side of the street. We're going to be closed for all major holidays too.

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

I think one of the letters of correspondence mentioned a kind of a steep drop off in the front, like a four foot drop off. So are the kids going to, are they like only playing in the side yard, or do you envision the kids in the front yard?

Ms. Juidici stated:

We plan to be in the fenced-in area.

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

To the side then?

Ms. Juidici stated:

Yeah, the side part. And there is a park close by too.

J. Cardillo stated:

So your thoughts are that you'll use both the Prospect Street, which would be like the front door entrance, as well as the driveway on Pine Street?

Ms. Juidici stated:

We could use both, I mean we're willing to; however we can make it work so it's not inconveniencing the neighborhood or anybody.

J. Cardillo stated:

Would it be possible to open the garage and basically have people almost pull in there?

Ms. Juidici stated:

Yes. If we did the staggering times, yes, we could do that, 'cause there's a door inside to the house.

J. Cardillo stated:

So, the side yard is 25.5 feet by 8 feet, and you're comfortable having twelve children in that space?

Ms. Juidici stated:

Yeah, I think it'll be fine. It's not as big of an area as we had hoped, but it's, I mean, there's still, you can still do a lot of different things out there.

J. Cardillo stated:

And you mentioned the playground. Is that something you hope to utilize?

Ms. Juidici stated:

We definitely hope to be able to go do some things over there, absolutely.

J. Cardillo opened the public hearing.

Ms. Jenny Messina, of 316 E. Prospect St., stated:

My concern that needs to be addressed, and I apologize if they did, is the outdoor space, because it looks like they have about 210 square feet marked, and I believe the requirement is 600. I looked at the regulations I found online, for licensing rules for the day care, so I'm just curious as to how that requirement will be met and I previously, full disclosure, I previously lived at that house, so I am aware of the size limitations. It was one of the reasons we moved because the yard was so small for two children. And then with the snow accumulating there in the winter as well, I didn't know that would be impacting the size of the play area, so that was my concern. Parking is also an issue. There's just not a lot of parking on Pine Street and on Prospect Street, with it being on a corner, it's difficult, but I imagine manageable.

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

I am familiar with Pine Street and Prospect, that's where I walk from Magnetic Street up to Hewitt, which is where Parkview was, so I'm familiar with that part of the world. There's a lot of traffic on Pine Street and there's not a lot of room to move the snow around. And when I say that, we've already had difficulty walking my dog for the last four days just because of the small amount of snow we've had. We also (inaudible)...meetings where we had a desperate need for day care in the City of Marquette, so you've got two conflicting realities. You have a not perfect site and you have two people who want to alleviate some of the need. My compromise suggestion is that you limit the children to infants and

toddlers and limit them, instead of twelve, you limit them to a smaller number, maybe we'll have more control because they'll be inside more than outside and the drop off will not be getting as many children over the banks. It'll be handing off kids which is a different challenge. And I don't make this casually. I raised a child, I know the issues of taking care of a child in and out of a house. I simply know that a compromise of starting with a smaller number of children and restricting age to a certain level where they wouldn't be inclined to wander as much might be a good way to get this started and then see how it affects the neighborhood, which is what the neighborhood comments have been about. That's my comment, thank you.

J. Cardillo closed the public hearing.

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

A. Andres stated that he didn't have a comment at the moment, he just wanted to move things along.

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

I guess just speaking of a creative solution, I think Margaret Brumm actually did a really nice job of summing up the tension here. We obviously have a demand, or a need for childcare in our community, so I think a lot of us younger parents would love to see something like this happen, but there is definitely a real issue around traffic and parking and the size of the lot. I forget your name, but Jenny, to your comment, our job is to approve or not approve the zoning of it, and I think what you pulled out was a state level licensing. So...it has to go to the state level and I think that's where they get into the size of playgrounds and things like that. When I looked through our Land Development Code, I didn't see any requirements on play space for a day care center. But it's possible that the state will have that.

I kind of agree with Commissioner Cardillo that it does seem like a small outside space for twelve kids, but yeah, I think that there's probably something at the state level licensing that might be able to address that piece of it. But I think getting back to this idea of maybe staggering the drop off times, which the applicant suggested, I think that's a great idea - if every 15 minutes people are assigned times - 7:15, 7:30, something like that to help reduce the traffic issue. That seemed like a good creative solution to the tension that I think we're dealing with here.

M. Larson asked the applicants what ages of children they will serve.

Ms. Juidici stated:

School age

J. Cardillo stated:

I guess I'll just chime in with my opinion, thoughts on this. I want to start with there's a huge need and I mean there's a desperate need, and so my instinct is to bend over backwards to try to figure out how to make this work. When I did walk over there, it's a really small side yard and just to really clarify our jurisdiction versus the jurisdiction of the state - our responsibility sort of is to balance your rights to operate within this property and then your neighbor's rights to enjoy their property. And I have to say, I'm a bit concerned with the idea of twelve kids in that side yard, so I do think, potentially there is some creative solutions and I want to sort of restrict you as little as possible while also sort of addressing this. So my thought is could we restrict the number of children in the side yard and that way if you have twelve kids, you have to go to the playground that day. I want to keep it confined to the things that would actually cause a nuisance. And these are classified as urban roads, it's somewhat of an urban condition. This neighborhood still has the need for childcare, so I don't want to let that hinder us. I think that if you can manage that carefully, I'm willing to be okay with that. But I do think, I would be open to other commissioners' discussions on potentially restricting the number of children in the side yard only. I don't know if that's something that would be a reasonable condition to make. Could we say no more than six in the outdoor space, so that's something we could discuss. The other thing I guess I wanted to ask and maybe this is a question for staff, is the neighbor next door mentioned that they have a drop off on their property to their driveway. Liability wise, if a child were to fall from there and hurt themselves on that

person's driveway, would they be liable for that? The next-door homeowner, or would that be the responsibility of the daycare? Do we have any idea about that?

D. Stensaas said it depends.

J. Cardillo stated:

I'm talking about like the children's parents. If they're in the front yard and a child wandered off and fell off that onto that person's driveway and they broke their wrist by falling onto that person's driveway. Could that parent sue the neighbor?

D. Stensaas stated I wouldn't think so.

J. Cardillo stated:

Okay., because I'm saying is like they're creating a situation where now there's all these children that could potentially fall. We could require a fence there.

D. Stensaas stated:

If that's a legal question, then, there's numerous rabbit holes you can go down with the scenario. I would like to point something out, Joy. This is a special land use because it's a childcare or daycare group home which allows up to twelve. In the same district, a childcare or daycare family home allows less than seven minor children and that's a permitted use in this district. So I didn't know if everybody was aware of that, that situation exists as a permitted use.

J. Cardillo stated:

Right. So just to be clear, my sort of main concern is twelve children in that space which comes out to about 20 square feet per kid which is 4 feet by 5 feet.

D. Fetter stated:

I have a question for the applicants. Would you mind elaborating a little bit more on the drop off times and pick up times and where that might actually be on your property, or in the street?

Ms. Juidici stated:

Well, we figured like from 7:00 to 7:15 we could have, I'm thinking like assigned times or just have like parents drop off and then 7:30 to like 7:45 and like just do the same thing at pick up time.

D. Fetter asked:

Would they be pulling into your driveway or would they be parking on the street?

Ms. Juidici stated:

We haven't decided. We don't know what the best way to do it and we won't know until we try. We can do whatever, I mean, whatever you guys have concerns one way or another, we can do whatever you'd like us to do. But until we begin, we don't know what's going to work. We haven't opened. We were already thinking, we were trying to decide where the best location to have drop off was going to be and if that's going to be on the top, or if we were just going to be in the basement and trying to figure out with breakfast and, with kids in snow clothes and along those lines. So lots of things we were thinking about.

W. Premeau stated:

I'm curious. It's not like a school where they take the entire grade out to the playground. You got twelve kids from 2 and up. How many have to go out the back there at once? Do they all have to go out at once? I don't see why they would...some kids aren't going to want to go out.

Ms. Juidici stated no.

J. Cardillo stated:

Well I think that's a really good point and I guess that maybe goes to my idea. Even if you have twelve kids, could we put a condition that says no more than six kids in the side yard at a time? You could just stagger the times and it just gives the neighbors the comfort of mind to know that it's not going to be twelve kids out there for six hours, which we're not looking to, but I do think that could be a way to deal with it. So even if you have all twelve kids, it doesn't mean you have to go to the playground, you could just stagger it for the outside time.

M. Larson stated:

I guess because it's regulated and if the state comes back and says it's 20 square feet or whatever, whatever the calculation works out, can we still put zoning regulations on how many kids are in the outdoor space, is that going to make sense?

J. Cardillo stated:

It's a good question and I'm curious to hear what Dave thinks, but my thought is that we're here, our role is to look at it from a nuisance perspective and so we could say, as relates to their neighbors, we think this is a more fitting number in that space. I have a feeling they, I don't know what that document looks like and I know there's a lot more stuff in there than you have to show to us, so my guess is that their criteria is higher so I don't know how that's going to work for you, but that's again not our jurisdiction.

D. Stensaas stated:

I think their criteria is not going to consider the City's decision on this other than it was approved and those conditions that you set are going to be enforced by the city. So, it's going to be very self-regulating because to enforce this is going to be a situation where somebody's going to have to document that there is a violation. We're not going to be keeping track.

A. Andres stated:

As with other nuisances, don't we wait until there's an issue and then regulate as the issue becomes apparent. We've done it with a whole bunch of other entities, I don't see why this would be any different than any other. I'm sure they aren't going to let the children roam free and possibly get hurt and be liable and all that stuff. They're going to put their best foot forward and do what they can to make sure that the children are safe and responsible.

D. Stensaas stated:

That comment about letting things happen and then regulating it after nuisances is exactly what we don't want to do. Planning is to anticipate problems and so we're not doing planning and honoring our Master Plan if we're going to do things and then address the problem. That's why we have people here tonight with the situation that happened with Superior Culture. We didn't anticipate the problems and there were significant problems. The decision let that whole situation unfold and become a big mess for a while. If there's going to be problems, you have a decision to make.

J. Cardillo stated:

What we're trying to do here is to sort of project if twelve children in that space is reasonable.

W. Premeau stated:

I grew up when there were nine kids in the family and they didn't have a yard, so I don't see the big problem. So stagger them, you don't have to put twelve kids out there and upset the neighbors.

J. Cardillo stated:

I agree with you in a sense, but like we need to mostly let common sense, I think with the parking it's like I'm hopeful that common sense and just reasonable behavior will control that. I still feel a little bit like twelve kids in that side yard is a lot to ask of a neighbor.

M. Larson stated:

One more question for staff is, if this were granted, does that change any requirements for parking.

A. Landers stated:

No, daycare doesn't require additional parking, so it just makes it the same legal-nonconforming situation at this point.

M. Larson stated:

One more thing is that, as Dave pointed out, permitted use allows up to six right now and I mean I suppose if we wanted to, you could say six are allowed outdoor at that time, because right now they could do six, up to six at a time. Maybe that is a reasonable condition.

D. Fetter stated:

I think there needs to be a stronger plan when it comes to the traffic flow. As our report states that proposed or estimated vehicular (inaudible) traffic volumes and patterns, particularly children as well as vehicular turning movements do not negatively impact traffic flows, intersections, which this is on a corner, it's an intersection, sight distances, and safety. So, my main concern is that what was mentioned, parking does not meet requirements and one of our listed requirements here for this special land use is that it wouldn't impede on traffic.

J. Cardillo stated:

Do you have a proposal to that end? We're able to put conditions on a special land use, so like I'm suggesting the condition of only six children outside at a time. We could an additional condition potentially that says the parking or the drop offs must be staggered, and like Dave said, they're not going to police them, but if the neighbors should receive consistent abuse, they have grounds to come back to say look, this is really a problem and there's some teeth to it.

D. Fetter stated:

Would there be a specialized drop off location, something that would have a sign, some sort of signage that would show that it's for drop off?

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

That's what I was thinking. We should discuss that. I think that it sounds like they're still kind of trying to figure it out and want to work with us to get a sense of what could be a more detailed plan and I think , Pine Street was mentioned, but it gets pretty fast and there's quite a bit of traffic on that street, there's bus routes, and a lot of children walk to the school. So I wonder if it would make sense for people to turn into Prospect Street, but then leave that driveway open as like the walking entrance where people would walk around. I'm just talking through this, I don't have perfect sense of what would be best. But I think we should, to your point Commissioner Fetter, I think we should try to think about okay, it should have a condition of staggered parking or staggered drop off times...every 15 minutes between 7:00 and 8:00 or 9:00 or whenever. And then maybe a requirement of drop offs, people would park on Prospect and walk around to the garage. I don't know what you guys think would be best, you have a sense of the interior space.

Ms. Juidici stated:

I was just thinking, just because like our capacity is twelve...generally there's like siblings a lot of times, so we don't know that there will be twelve cars dropping off. We just don't know yet. But I guess if it's not working, I'm sure we'll find a way to make it work. I mean, we're not going to do something that's not working right or for anybody around us.

D. Fetter stated:

I'm just trying to find ways that this would meet the requirement of a special land use permit, so one of them being the vehicular and pedestrian circulation.

J. Cardillo stated:

So, on the table there's a drop off, do we think just drop off or do we also want to...

Ms. Juidici stated:

There's a consistent thing, everybody knows we go to Prospect Street to or whatever it is.

J. Cardillo stated:

However we want to word it, no more than one person every 15 minutes or like two people every 15 minutes. I'm trying to think how we can do this.

M. Larson stated:

I feel like that would be appropriate if you were saying that they were only going to use that driveway. But, per Wayne's point, if I were bringing my children somewhere, if I had to park a block away and then walk them down, I could also get there at 8:00 when everybody else is getting there at 8:00, even if I'm walking from a block away. I'm just thinking of those staggered drop off times. If you're only using that parking space on Pine Street, if that was like a pull in, I could see staggered drop off times. Do you see what I'm saying? Because it's right on Pine Street. I'm just suggesting that I think it's more of an issue if that's the main drop off point. But otherwise, if you parked a block down Prospect, because that's where you were able to find a spot that was open, and then you walked your children up.

J. Cardillo stated:

Are you proposing that we restrict parking to just Prospect?

M. Larson stated:

I don't exactly know what I'm proposing fully. I'm just saying that...encourage them to do a staggered drop off plan if using that driveway on Pine Street.

J. Cardillo stated:

I do feel like a lot more comfortable with Prospect just because it's a really awkward driveway.

S. Mittlefehldt stated:

I think I still like the staggered arrival, even if it is parking on Prospect too, just for the neighborhood. I know that maybe there will be some plans, but like theoretically twelve cars show up at 7:00 and they're all parked on Prospect Street. That might be a nuisance or problematic at least for some of the neighbors on Prospect, so maybe we just leave it up to like some kind of staggered pick up and drop off time to alleviate parking and then let them figure out what that exactly looks like, and saying maybe encouraging the parents to drop off on Prospect Street.

M. Larson stated:

I think that maybe that works and only adding that you can up have to six, right now, permitted. So if they were, if they wanted to operate, they won't necessarily need a special land use and you have six vehicles that could potentially pull in at that same time right there, so maybe there is a, just a two prong, a two prong window or something like that, if you wanted to suggest staggered drop off. Without the special land use, they could have in theory those six folks pulled in at once. Do you see what I'm getting at?

J. Cardillo stated:

I just don't know how we...I don't want to make it too complicated. So we're talking about adding a condition that would say with the condition that pick up and drop off times would be staggered so as to prevent vehicular congestion.

W. Premeau stated:

I can understand what you're trying to do, but I would say let them try it, they'll have to work it out and some people might even have two kids. They don't all have one kid and then four years later have one kid. Some people have two really close together and they both have to go into daycare and I don't know, I just see it.

D. Fetter stated:

I have another question. How many vehicles are currently at this location?

Ms. Juidici said just one.

S. Mittlefehldt stated that she is ready to make a motion.

It was moved by S. Mittlefehldt, seconded by W. Premeau, and carried 6-0 that after review of the STAFF REPORT/ANALYSIS for 06-SUP-11-22, the Planning Commission finds that the request meets the intent and requirements of the Land Development Code Section 54.1403 Special Land Use Review and Section 54.608 Group Day Care Home, and hereby approves 06-SUP-11-22 with the following conditions:.

1. That the applicant provides the City proof of license as a group day care home by the State of Michigan and abides by all state regulations.
2. The applicants restrict outdoor time in the outdoor play area on the east side of the home to six (6) children at a time.
3. That parking for pick-ups and drop-offs are staggered in 10-15 increments in morning and the afternoon.
4. The applicants will work with the neighbors to define a system of pickup-and-dropoff that doesn't create traffic congestion in the area.

CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION ON AGENDA ITEMS

Linda Popovich, 216 W. Hewitt Ave., stated:

I live behind the Superior Culture. I thought overall the summer was good. The Friday night noise level was much smaller than it had ever been before. The only thing I noticed...was that sometimes the lights were on longer than 10:00. Everything was supposed to shut down at 10:00 and I had four instances...four that I saw that were after 10:00, 10:15, the lights were still on when there were people out, but overall it wasn't a problem because it wasn't loud, so it didn't really bother me that much. But I just wanted to mention that. When it's inside [music] in our house, where we live on the back, you can't really hear it that much. I've walked down Third Street when they were playing and it was really loud out that way and it would go out through the neighborhood, but where I live it wasn't an issue for me, so I never called any complaints in, but that one noise complaint would have been backed because it was a Thursday night. I know they typically have music throughout the week as well, but it's inside, which is perfectly fine. I didn't have a problem with any of that. So I just wanted to commend everybody for doing a good job and keeping the noise down on Friday nights. We really appreciate it. It was acoustic, it wasn't really loud and it started on time, it ended on time, I was very happy with all of that too, so I just thought it was worth saying.

Sandy Gluski, 212 W. Hewitt Ave., stated:

Yes, I think he's been very respectful and we are thrilled not to have to hear what we were hearing before. I hope the committee realizes that it's not always just the music, this is not going to make or break his business, because we, I certainly wouldn't want to interfere with that and I'm all for music. But to make sure you consider the neighborhoods too because he is surrounded. He is such a small little space and it's surrounded by residents and they are all the way down to Fourth. So we're happy the way things are going now, but I hope in the future that you remember it's a 50/50, residential and business. So for that, I appreciate it.

Alex Rowland, 717 N. Third St., stated:

I am the owner of Superior Culture. I was just going to address the one complaint. It was the music on Third Night. That music ended at 8:00 outside. We did have a band play from 8:00 to 10:00. By the time the police did show up, the band had been done for quite some time. At this point, I was actually there that night and I specifically remember that. I was there until the band had shut down and everything was cleared out, the back yard was all closed down. I am not entirely sure what happened at that point, but it came after the fact. But yeah, I think we've done a really good job of mending this year. Once again, I'm

not there 100% of the time, but I definitely am there most of the time and if I'm not there, the manager is always there. As far as lights out, it's something we're going to keep reinforcing and making sure that's not an issue.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Follow-up RE Superior Culture - 717 N. Third St.

Chair J. Cardillo left the room due to having a conflict of interest with this case due to past work performed for the property owner. Vice-Chair M. Larson assumed the role of Chair.

A. Landers stated:

On Tuesday, July 19, 2022, the Marquette City Planning Commission held a follow-up review from April 19, 2022, of Special Land Use Permits for Outdoor Entertainment and Community Events (granted on 6-21-21) and the expansion of Outdoor Food and Beverage Service (initially granted on 5-07-19, approved for expansion on 6-21-21) to Superior Culture LLC at 717 N. Third St. and on a 5-0 vote, the Planning Commission approved two motions. The city has received one noise complaint since July 19, 2022. The Planning Commission should review the information provided in this packet, and discuss if the applicant is still meeting the conditions of approval. If the Planning Commission determines that the property is in compliance with the conditions of approval stated in its relevant motions on 7/19/2022 then no further action is required. If the Planning Commission determines that the application is violating the conditions of approval, then they would need to ask Staff to schedule a public hearing to consider revoking the permit.

The complaint was shown, and PC discussed that it was for a Thursday and a *Music on Third* night, and indoor music.

M. Larson asked if this was the only complaint that was received.

A. Landers stated yes.

M. Larson stated that he would welcome Commission discussion on this, but from his point of view it seems as if the conditions set forth are currently working and no further action is necessary at this time. We can move on to a motion if there is no further input.

It was determined that the property is in compliance with the conditions of approval stated in the motions on 7/19/22, so the Planning Commission decided no further action is needed.

M. Larson thanked everyone for their comments.

Chair J. Cardillo came back to the room.

NEW BUSINESS

2023 Planning Commission Meeting Dates

It was moved by A. Andres, seconded by S. Mittlefehldt, and carried 6-0 to approve the 2023 meeting dates as presented.

Planning Commission member on BZA

It was moved by S. Mittlefehldt, seconded by A. Andres, and carried 6-0 to nominate N. Williams to be the PC member on the BZA.

CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

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

The last Planning Commission meeting I attended was the kickoff meeting for the Community Master Plan and I was very enthusiastic about what I heard, and I heard a lot of people stand up with a lot of reasonable concerns that they had that they wanted the consultants to address. I have taken my next concern offline to the City Commission and that neither of the two city commissioners that were named to the steering committee or the civilian member, Jim Koski were present at that meeting and therefore, there was no real voice for anyone not affiliated with a group, and I had asked the city commission to appoint me as a nonaffiliated member of the steering committee and they had declined my offer. So, that night I went to the consultants and requested contact information for them, and they were nice enough to give me their card and I had shared several matters with them. But, I would encourage you to go back to the city commission and appoint not just me, but up to ten citizens not representing any particular group, but who are willing to serve as part of the steering committee because my biggest concern about the community master plan is not that it's going to be done - it's going to be done and it's going to be done well - but when it is done, there's going to be things that fall through the cracks because of non-affiliated people aren't part of the meetings.

I asked about the city commissioners why they didn't attend and the city manager said something to the effect that it wasn't appropriate for them to attend because they're city commissioners and it's the Planning Commission. Well, they missed a huge opportunity, and Mr. Koski was also not present and he's the civilian historian, I would say. And I don't mean to demean, I really don't, I have a great deal of respect for Mr. Koski, but he's the only non-affiliated person. So, I'm requesting that you consider appointing a group of volunteers who want to be part of the process who are not necessarily affiliated with any particular group. In addition, for the record, my latest contribution is I've sent the consultants some of the history of the Cliffs-Dow site, especially since it's a hot topic on the commission agenda, where they're trying to get a grant from the EPA, and I have historical record of that site along with some pictures. I also took the city manager on a walk on Lakeshore Boulevard from Picnic Rocks to McCarthy's Cove and back and we walked on the lake side going down and we walked on the other side coming back and to make the point that the community master plan for some parts of the city should have a different recital for each side of the street.

And I know that sounds really, really picky, but the difference between the lake side of the street and what we saw, the fact that the bike path there was tremendously overcrowded with people enjoying it, there's nobody doing anything wrong, but I was explaining to the City Manager that I could not walk my dog on the bike path and right then and there, there were four cross country skiers with those really fast wheel things going, and they were two abreast, so there were four of them and flying away and then behind them, I think there was a coach on a bicycle and they just ran by. They had to be going 45 miles an hour on the bike path. And I said that's the reason why that path can't be used by people like me. I can't get my dog out of the way in time. And we had a discussion about whether the city needed to expand the trail system on Lakeshore Boulevard to have one side for walkers and slow people and one for wheeled vehicles.

On the other side of the street, we noted the difference is palpable, it's an end of a residential neighborhood and very different from the east side. And I just came from the traffic meeting and they cited for getting across to McCarthy's Cove a huge amount of people crossing that street, trying to get to the beach and the fact that a lot of them are unaccompanied minor children. So, I'm imploring you to reconsider the steering committee and put out a call for volunteers for people not affiliated with existing groups and then I also implore you as we get these nuggets of feedback, that you add it to what goes to the consultants because I learned something showing the city manager Lakeshore Boulevard, and I walk that quite a lot. But she was horrified at the amount of garbage, we went back to, the community master plan has got to stop letting people throw stuff from vehicles. I know I've gone longer than three minutes. I took advantage of your good will. Thank you very much.

Sue Schauland, 975 Lakeshore Blvd., stated:

I am the owner of Nestledown Bed and Breakfast and I'd be happy to sit on any committee and especially in regard to Lakeshore Boulevard, or just the master plan and Land Development Code and their reworking of it. So I'm just coming to meetings as I'm able and hearing how things go and I do

appreciate the education from Dave on zoning and land use and housing and it's just all very interesting. I'm happy to chip in as I can and attend more meetings, but definitely I feel a strong need to protect Lakeshore Boulevard for the next generations, to be careful with it and protect it and keep it a scenic corridor for visitors and residents.

TRAINING

Article – Zoning's Future (Planning, Fall 2022)

The Planning Commission and staff discussed the main idea presented in the article, which is the "Neighborhood Residential" zoning district that Walla Walla, WA adopted and that allows up to 75 dwelling units per acre, and how a district like that might be feasible in the city.

D. Stensaas said that he has discussed this with the Community Master Plan consultant Russ Soyring, and also the idea of creating a "Zoning Subcommittee" of Planning Commissioners to work with staff on potential land use map and zoning district changes, as well as changes to the standards in the existing zoning districts. The Planning Commission discussed this and was favorable to forming such a subcommittee.

S. Mittlefehldt asked when that subcommittee might be formed and start working.

D. Stensaas stated that it would be good to begin after the holidays, but he will report back next month with more information after discussing this with Director Stachewicz and the consultant team.

COMMISSION AND STAFF COMMENTS

W. Premeau asked about the composition of the Steering Committee for the Community Master Plan process and how it came to be what it is. A brief discussion followed.

J. Cardillo stated that there was good presentation at NMU's recent Sonderegger Symposium about heritage tourism and its potential for significant economic development, and said that she would send a link to the group.

S. Mittlefehldt stated that our species hit a major milestone yesterday, with the human population topping 8,000,000,000 - eight billion – on the planet. She said that climate refugees are real and she knows three families that moved here because of our access to nature and she thinks we will continue to see our population grow because this is a desirable place to be.

D. Stensaas stated that in every presentation he gives he talks about population growth, and because the numbers are hard to visualize he uses city sizes. He said every year we add about 80 million people globally, and that is equal to ten Chicago metro areas – so picture the Chicago area and multiply it by ten. That is what we are adding each year. In the US we are adding one Baltimore metro area each year, and that means each three years we are adding another Chicago metro area. That is a lot of new infrastructure and pollution, and it is totally unsustainable and the biggest sustainability challenge that we have. Climate change imposed on the population growth is pretty depressing, and it's all the more frustrating because nobody wants to talk about population growth.

A. Landers stated that we will have a December 6th meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Chair J. Cardillo at 7:40 p.m.

Prepared by:

David Stensaas

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