OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS OF THE
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION
December 21, 2021

A regular meeting of the Marquette City Planning Commission was duly called and held at 6:00 p.m. on Tuesday, December 9, 2021, in the Commission Chambers at City Hall.

ROLL CALL
Present: W. Premeau, Vice-Chair M. Larson, M. Dunn, S. Mittlefehldt, Chair J. Cardillo,
Absent: A. Andres, E. Brooks (excused).

AGENDA

It was moved by M. Larson, seconded by S. Mittlefehldt and carried 5-0 to approve the agenda as presented.

MINUTES

The minutes of November 9th and 16th, 2021 were each approved by consensus.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST and EX-PARTE CONTACT
None was stated.

NEW BUSINESS
A. 11-SPR-12-2021 Site Plan Review for 2050 W. US Highway 41

Zoning Official A. Landers stated staff has reviewed the proposed site plan for the construction of a commercial building, new parking lot, site grading, dumpster enclosure, landscaping, and site improvements for 2050 W. US Highway 41, and has provided comments regarding the plan. She presented the staff report, with visuals showing the application and attachments, the staff comments and the applicant's responses, the area and block maps, photos of the site, and the site plan set. She also stated that staff has been contacted by MDOT and they said that they don't see any issues with the landscaping in the right-of-way, and that answers one of the zoning staff comment questions. She also stated that they will need to get a right-of-way permit from MDOT.

J. Cardillo asked if there were any questions for staff.

M. Dunn stated that he was wondering about the comment from staff about the interior parking requirement for one deciduous tree and their plans had evergreens, and it sounds like they were going to change them all to deciduous in their response. He also stated that he was wondering why they would want to have a deciduous tree there, and everywhere else in the LDC it says deciduous or evergreen but for this it says deciduous and there's probably a reason for it but I hope they don't change them all to deciduous and it ends up with a bunch of leafless trees there in the winter.

A. Landers said they have to follow the LDC requirement and they'll have to change to meet the minimum for interior parking.

S. Mittlefehldt stated that in relation to the possible requirement to have the US-41/M-28 Corridor Advisory Group weigh in, was there any specific issues that needed more expertise.

D. Stensaas stated that the City is party to a Memorandum of Understanding with MDOT, as a community with frontage along the 41/28 corridor, that we will notify the local MDOT office of any proposed development within 1,000 ft. of the corridor, and the Corridor Advisory Group – which is a group of local community representatives along the corridor – can offer recommendations and opinions on the site plans and sometimes those are helpful in revealing issues with the plans. He stated that it is the MDOT requirements that must be followed and so we always send the plans to them for review.

A. Landers stated that we usually state that as a condition of approval the plans have to meet MDOT's requirements, but in this case we were able to get the plans into MDOT prior to the meeting because it was moved, and they didn't have any access management concerns.

M. Dunn asked if there was sidewalk in front of the site now, with the construction just being done he isn't sure. D. Stensaas stated he wasn't sure, but thought if anything there may be a maintenance strip that can be used as a walkway.

J. Cardillo asked where is the site located for the bank site plan that was approved. A. Landers stated that she would bring up a map. D. Stensaas stated that the bank site plan had expired after a year in April and that there was no request submitted to renew it. A. Landers stated that they did not submit a revised site plan to meet the staff comments, and that they would have to resubmit, and she showed the location of the adjacent parcel. D. Stensaas stated the properties share an access easement and that their site plans don't affect the access for this new site.

J. Cardillo asked if there was anyone that wanted to speak on behalf of the project. Nobody came forward.

J. Cardillo asked if there was any correspondence. A. Landers stated there was not.

J. Cardillo asked if anyone wanted to make a motion or suspend the rules for discussion.

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

M. Dunn stated he thinks it meets all of the requirements and his only remaining question is who is responsible for having a sidewalk installed there. D. Stensaas stated that it is the MDOT right-of-way and they may have installed a maintenance strip, but he was doubtful about a sidewalk based on the location and lack of pedestrian connections. He also stated that he also hopes that all of the trees are not going to be changed to deciduous.

M. Larson stated that he believes it meets all the requirements and has no problem moving it forward.

> *It was moved by M. Dunn, and seconded by S. Mittlefehldt and carried 5-0 that after review of the site plan and the supplemental documentation dated 6-7-21, and the STAFF REPORT/ANALYSIS for 11-SPR-12-21, the Planning Commission finds substantial compliance with the City of Marquette Land Development Code and hereby approves the site plan with the following conditions:*
> *1. That an amended plan is submitted to meet staff comments.*
> *2. That if after review from the US-41/M-28 Corridor Advisory Group, the Group provides any comments to revise the plan, these comments must be met.*

B. Community Master Plan - Update for AHHC Report

D. Stensaas stated that he had explained this it to the PC members by email, and in summary the City Commission held a Special Meeting to consider next steps regarding the Draft Final Report of the Ad-Hoc Housing Committee, and that the Commission voted unanimously for the Final Report to be incorporated into the Community Master Plan (CMP). He stated staff has taken that direction and began the process of updating the Plan by of notifying adjacent communities of our intent to update the CMP, and that the draft amendment to the Plan is on our website, on the Community Planning Division page. He also stated that after a 62 day comment period for the public and a 95 day comment period for the County we will hold a public hearing to adopt the amendment, either the Planning Commission or the City Commission will adopt it, depending on if the City Commission chooses to assert its right to adopt amendments to the CMP through the approval of a resolution to do that. He also stated this is straightforward, its just the adoption of the AHHC Report as an appendix to the CMP and that alone increases the size of the CMP by about a half of the current size. Laughs all around! A guffaw was also heard.

J. Cardillo asked if there was any action that the Planning Commission needed to take now. D. Stensaas stated that no, although the action of updating the Land Development Code to implement recommendations of the Report is going to take place and we'll talk more about that in our work session. He also stated that the PC incorporated some of the AHHC's recommendations into the last update of the LDC, although they hadn't yet been put into a report, and so they are a little ahead of the curve.

C. Planning Commission Bylaws - Amendments

D. Stensaas stated that they were looking at this at the November 9th and November 16th meetings, and that some revisions were made after the Nov. 9th meeting. He stated all of the changes that were made are shown either as strikeout of text for deletions or as highlighted text for new language. He stated this hasn't been done for almost three years and there are several items that can stand to be updated. He also stated that at the last meeting there was one additional request to add a bit more information about how applications are vetted in the Member section, in section C on page one. He stated that the Assistant City Manager provided a detailed list regarding how applications are vetted and that it is extensive enough that a summary in the Bylaws stating that the process is managed by the City Manager's staff is probably appropriate for the Bylaws.

S. Mittlefehldt stated that she is satisfied with the summary statement.

J. Cardillo asked if they needed to vote on this tonight. D. Stensaas stated yes. J. Cardillo asked if anyone wanted to ask any more questions or make a motion.

> *It was moved by M. Dunn, seconded by S. Mittlefehldt, and carried 5-0 to adopt the amendments to the Bylaws as presented.*

WORK SESSION

A. Planning Commission Annual Report to the City Commission

The Commission and staff worked on the report and determined the concerns and next steps for the coming year. Commission membership and communication issues were discussed at length. J. Cardillo stated that she would review further changes that were discussed to be updated with D. Stensaas via email prior to the next meeting.

B. Draft Land Development Code Amendments

The Commission discussion focused on revisions to the Woodland Conservation subsection of Article 8 that was repealed in 2019 and determined changes that could be made to the problematic portions of that subsection.

COMMISSION AND STAFF COMMENTS

S. Mittlefehldt wished everyone Merry Christmas and good breaks.

J. Cardillo stated that she participated in a housing webinar hosted by the Lake Superior Community Partnership last week that was really good, with a lot of concrete information, including information about the County Land Bank, what the state is doing, and a non-profit developer that has created attainable housing in Michigan and it was all helpful. She stated that she will send out a link to the webinar once she gets it.

D. Stensaas stated that he seconded Joy's comments on the webinar. He also thanked the members for their volunteer time and that the staff appreciates their work.

ADJOURNMENT
The meeting was adjourned by Chair J. Cardillo at 8:00 p.m.

Prepared by:

David Stensaas

David Stensaas, City Planner and Zoning Administrator
Planning Commission Staff Liaison