

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
November 16, 2021**

A regular meeting of the Marquette City Planning Commission was duly called and held at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, November 16, 2021, in the Commission Chambers at City Hall.

ROLL CALL

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

Absent: E. Brooks

AGENDA

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

NEW BUSINESS

A. Draft Planning Commission Bylaws

D. Stensaas stated that he made one change since the last meeting, and that he would review the document and the Planning Commission should hold a vote to approve the draft Bylaws tonight. D. Stensaas showed the document on the monitors while going through the proposed amendments.

M. Dunn stated that he has a question about public notice and he knows this isn't relevant to changing the Bylaws, but since there have been several citizens that show up saying that they were not notified – even though I know it's happening correctly - is there something we can have placed on the city website, maybe the same thing we put in the paper, that is easy to see from the homepage. He also stated that there were some announcements in a submenu of a page that isn't easy to find.

D. Stensaas stated that this is a tough issue because different staff members have different opinions on the issue and that it's up to staff outside of the Community Development department to implement those changes and ideas that he has suggested about announcing scheduled public hearings during City Commission announcements time on their agendas was shot down by other staff members that would be responsible for bringing that idea to the Commission for discussion.

M. Larson stated they could draft a memo to suggest changes to the City Commission. M. Dunn stated that he would work on that if that is the direction they want to take. J. Cardillo stated that would be okay.

D. Stensaas stated that as far as the Bylaws and the LDC go, the noticing requirement is set by statute and that is all this needs to reflect.

S. Mittlefehldt stated that in the "Members" section on page one, there isn't much information about how applications to serve are handled, and she asked what vetting occurs before an appointment is made. D. Stensaas stated that he didn't know exactly, but the vetting portion is the responsibility of the Manager's staff. S. Mittlefehldt requested that criteria and any other details about the process be provided, and that maybe it should be in the Bylaws for transparency. The topic was discussed among the members and they requested that staff provide more information about the application submission and review process. D. Stensaas stated he would find out more for them and bring this item back at the next meeting, and the item was set aside for action at another meeting.

CORRESPONDENCE

A. Planning-Zoning Division Monthly Report

D. Stensaas asked if there were any questions about the report. M. Dunn asked for clarification on the Planning Commission item. D. Stensaas stated that the way it was written was incorrect, and the decision was to have all outdoor activity halted altogether, not just by 10 p.m., for the term stated.

WORK SESSION

A. Draft Land Development Code Amendments

The Planning Commission discussed the staff proposal for revising the requirements for Preliminary Site Plans, and continued the discussion begun at the previous meeting about possible residential building height changes for residential zoning districts. The Planning Commission members stated that they would return to the Site Plan requirements later to determine the method of approval for incomplete site plan items that could be reviewed conditionally and administratively after a Commission decision was initially rendered. The Commission also discussed the possibility of requiring massing renderings for projects of a large size or scope, and agreed to revisit the topic later. The Planning Commission reviewed renderings of different residential building heights and discussed options at length, and then agreed to move forward with recommending increasing the principal structure height in the two single-family zoning districts to 41 feet and to propose a similar increase to 44 ft. in the Multi-Family zoning districts, while keeping the 36.5 ft. limit of footnote M in Article 54.403 for parcels adjacent to specified zoning districts.

COMMISSION AND STAFF COMMENTS

S. Mittlefehldt stated that she had been in touch with City Commissioner Evan Bonsall and Mayor Smith to discuss a joint work session related to housing policy that could be integrated into the Land Development Code, and also revisiting the need for a Lakeshore [Blvd.] corridor study. She stated that Mayor Smith indicated that a work session may be possible in January.

A. Andres asked D. Stensaas if he had any updates on the transit project. D. Stensaas stated that he had talked to MarqTran appointee Taylor Klipp about the fact that the outgoing Director of MarqTran has been uncooperative in setting up a meeting with the Planning Commission transit work group and that Mr. Klipp was going to request that an item be added to the MarqTran board meeting in December for an appearance by our work group. He also stated that wasn't ideal, but that is not a bad thing because it will let their entire board know what the City is interested in and that we are ready to start working on this project.

D. Stensaas stated that he was disappointed in the tenor of the discussion, the way things ended, with the decision on the project approved at the last meeting. He stated that if a stranger had walked into the room after the vote they may have thought what was approved was a slaughterhouse or a pig farm, it had such negative overtones and we don't have to agree with each other, but the community benefits that came out of that project are unlike anything we'll probably see again for a long time when you consider Clark Lambrose Park and over 15 acres of wetlands were restored for a development that has 96 dwelling units that are four-story buildings with parking underneath. He also stated that it was supported by our Community Master Plan because it supports dwelling units of all kinds, and the 2016 Target Market Analysis showed the City of Marquette could support almost 2,000 more dwelling units in a 5-year period. He stated that he understands that people want elements brought in for affordability, but we don't have those policies in place now, and so decrying the project because it didn't meet policies that don't exist seemed unfair to the property owner and the developers to make it sound like they just got a pig farm approved in the city. He also stated that there isn't anything mutually exclusive about wanting and getting a policy in place for affordable housing approved and having that kind of development approved also. He stated there were a lot of generalizations and misrepresentations made by members of the public, especially that these type of developments are for out of town fat cats that don't care about locals, when he knows several people that were public employees that live in the same waterfront condos that were mentioned as for out-of-towners.

M. Dunn stated that he didn't know the background of the park and the other pieces, and that he made his judgements based on the proposal and even though he thought it was a good, responsible project, that is a narrow strip of land and there is wildlife there and we are creeping in on a special, natural area. He said did what he needed to do and said what he needed to say, but his problem was that I didn't think it should have been zoned multifamily, and he wishes there had been more community input and thought put into the zoning years ago.

D. Stensaas stated that the City could not have successfully rezoned that property to something else because the zoning has been in place since the 1990s at least and the owner has intended to develop housing there since the late '90s, when a bigger project with tennis courts and much more surface parking

was proposed but wasn't approved because of various issues with city codes, and the wetlands were probably part of the issue with the development then.

S. Mittlefehldt stated that she felt there were so many unknowns, we didn't know the background on the zoning, and it felt like it was being rushed. D. Stensaas stated that he acknowledges that staff could have done better with some of the background material, but the zoning history didn't come up as relevant with their preparation.

J. Cardillo stated that she felt confused about the lack of response to staff from the developer on one of the questions, and she was concerned with it being such a big project it was important to have all the developer acknowledging the staff requests and doing everything they have to do. D. Stensaas stated that he thought they did a good job explaining things when they answered questions in the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Chair J. Cardillo at 9:05 p.m.

Prepared by:

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "David Stensaas". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

David Stensaas, City Planner and Zoning Administrator
Planning Commission Secretary