



PLANNING COMMISSION

August 19, 2021

A regular Planning Commission meeting was held in the City Council Chambers, Petoskey, Michigan, on Thursday, August 19, 2021. Roll was called at 7:00 P.M. and the following were:

Present: Cynthia Linn Robson, Chairperson
Betony Braddock
Carolyn Dettmer
Rose Fitzgerald
Richard Mooradian
Rick Neumann
Ted Pall (via Zoom), Petoskey, MI, Emmet County
Kent Warner
Charles Willmott

Others: Joe Beattie, 1420 Howard Street
Myron Berry, Mountain Engineering, Inc., Kingsford, MI
Matthew Fettig, 906 Michigan Street
Dr. David Finley, North Central Michigan College
Stephanie Grozner, 1440 Howard Street
Patricia "T" Jones, McLaren Northern Michigan
Paul LeBlanc, PLB Planning Group, LLC, Grand Rapids
Tom Nemitz, North Central Michigan College
Peg Pyjar, 1416 Howard Street
Tom Shanley, Kramer Management Group (Via Zoom)
Shari Schult, McLaren Northern Michigan
Sue Thompson, 1432 Howard Street
Steve Worth, Stratford Group
Dr. Thomas Zeidel, North Central Michigan College

Staff: Amy Tweeten, City Planner
Lisa Denoyer, Administrative Assistant

Upon motion and support, the minutes of the July 15, 2021 regular meeting and July 29, 2021 special meeting were approved. Motion carried 9-0.

**Case#2-21 – Public Hearing on a Rezoning Request
from R-1 Single Family to C- College District for
North Central Michigan College, 1515 Howard Street**

Staff informed the Commission North Central Michigan College (NCMC) had submitted a request to rezone its property south of Atkins Street to the new C- College District. The application includes a master site facilities plan that incorporates the entire College 2019 Master Plan.

A request to rezone property must be consistent with the City Master Plan. The submitted request is consistent with the future land use map that indicates this property as public/quasi-public and parkland, and consistent with Master Plan goals, including:

- Public and private projects honor the heritage of the community as a destination for year-round recreation and entrepreneurial opportunities;
- The natural environment is maintained to provide health benefits to all residents;
- A skilled workforce that can adapt and succeed in changing economic times is trained and retained;
- Education and lifelong learning is supported; and
- Preserve and build upon community assets in a manner that enhances our shared prosperity and well-being.

For a rezoning to the C- College District, a Master Site Facilities Plan (MSFP) is required that meets specified review standards. A MSFP has been submitted that staff believes meets the review standards of Section 3306 of the Ordinance. Those standards are as follows:

1. Existing or planned public facilities such as streets, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, and similar facilities shall be adequate for the proposed development;
2. Perimeter setbacks shall be provided for physical development;
3. Height, bulk, and character of structures shall be considered with regard to scenic views and the relationship of proposed structures to existing structures within 300 feet of the College District;
4. Vehicular, pedestrian, and non-motorized circulation allowing safe, convenient and well-defined circulation within the site and to the site shall be provided;
5. Off-street parking is designed to reduce light pollution and storm water runoff; and
6. Natural, historical, scenic, open space and architectural features of the property in the district shall be preserved, protected, created or enhanced whenever possible.

After holding the public hearing, the Commission may take action to recommend the rezoning of the property from R-1 Single Family to C-1 College District to City Council, as well as adopt the Master Site Facilities Plan that establishes the long-term development plan for the property.

Paul LeBlanc, PLB Planning Group, LLC, gave a brief overview and explained that the current single family residential zoning was written to regulate single family housing, not a college. He explained that the City had suggested that NCMC consider changing the zoning district to meet the needs of the college and future development and that most of the proposed changes to the 2019 Master Plan were additions. For instance, a closed connector has been proposed to allow students and faculty to move from building to building without going outside. Two months ago the college held a neighborhood meeting and the only major comments or concerns were regarding the proposed location of the dormitory. Since then the drawing was changed to meet the 100-foot setback requirement set by the Planning Commission. There are no definite plans to build two dormitory buildings at this time and there have been discussions regarding dormitory placement based on neighbors' concerns. Last month City Council adopted the C- College District and now he is asking the Planning Commission to rezone the college property to the new district and present it to City Council for final approval. Staff agrees that all of the standards for approval have been met and he believes the college has a very comprehensive plan.

Dr. David Finley, North Central Michigan College President, commented that the proposed dormitories would be located near the southwest corner of campus near the dining hall and student services.

Chairperson Robson reminded the Commission that any added buildings would have to come before the Commission for site plan approval.

At this time the meeting was opened for the public hearing.

Joe Beattie, 1420 Howard Street, informed the Commission that he lives across the street from the proposed new entrance. He commented that the college emits consistent noise that is quite loud and he believes that more students will mean more noise, which is a concern along with safety due to the increase in traffic. He also commented that the dormitory plan presented tonight was not the same as the one presented at the neighborhood meeting.

Sue Thompson, 1432 Howard Street, stated that she had concerns with the height and bulk of the proposed dormitories and the impact it may have on property values in the neighborhood. She asked what the height restriction would be in the new college district. Ms. Thompson told the Commission that she wanted an answer as to how the neighboring property values would be affected.

Staff responded that the maximum height of the dormitory buildings would be 60-feet total or 4-stories, 45-feet from the midpoint of the street.

Chairperson Robson responded that with the slope of the property and the 100-foot setback a 60-foot tall building would be 45-feet taller than street level and not appear as tall as it actually is.

Peg Pyjar, 1416 Howard Street, asked if the new zoning would create rules specific to the college and commented that most of the houses on Howard Street were built in 1955, 1960, which was prior to the construction of the college.

Stephanie Grozner, 1440 Howard Street, stated that the presentation was great but vague. She stated that she had concerns with how the change would impact property values and homeowner views and asked if the neighbors' words were lost and if they were wasting their time being at the meeting.

At this time the public hearing was closed.

Chairperson Robson stated that the Commission was aware of the noise and are trying to mitigate for future uses and she believes the college has been extremely accommodating to concerns from the neighbors. The purpose of providing the college with its own district is to allow the college to function as such and protect the neighborhood at the same time and the Commission has given great consideration for all.

Commissioner Willmott stated that one concern of the Commission during discussions prior to this meeting was that the public be involved in the discussion and tonight is the first they are hearing about these concerns with the plan.

Ms. Grozner stated that there is a vast difference between being involved and being told.

Commissioner Fitzgerald commented that all of the meetings were published on the City's website, the same as they are for City Council, Zoning Board of Appeals and other City boards and commissions and that while this is a public hearing there is an opportunity for anyone to give input and comment.

Commissioner Braddock stated that she believes the rezoning request makes sense and the college has been good to work with. She was however taken aback that the neighbors were so upset, as the Commission had extensively reviewed the plan and she thought they were ready to move forward.

Commissioner Dettmer commented that she agreed with Commissioner Braddock and that she believes the Commission did a good job reviewing the request. However, the comments received by the public regarding building height and traffic safety do create concerns for her.

Commissioner Mooradian commented that he is in support with rezoning and has no objections to the ring road, however, he too has concerns given the neighbors reactions. He would like to see the college alleviate their concerns.

Commissioner Warner stated that he agreed with Commissioners and that community input is important and he is mindful of that. He does not have an issue with the height as he feels it is a better solution than making the building wider. He believes the Commission has reviewed the plan thoroughly and extensively and have made changes to address concerns that were brought up. Noise and traffic were both addressed in discussions.

Commissioner Neumann commented that it was unfortunate that some of the neighbors decided to leave the meeting prior to this discussion as they missed an opportunity for discussion. He believes that the ring road will cause a reduction in traffic on Howard Street and he agreed with Commissioner Warner on the building height. The college has put their vision into their master plan and the rezoning will give more predictability and protection to the neighborhood than a single family district zoning.

Commissioner Willmott stated that the plan is consistent with the City Master Plan and he believes the Commission should move forward with approval. He voiced concerns with the public involvement during this process and commented that any changes made to the proposed plan would have to come before the Planning Commission for approval.

Mr. LeBlanc commented that the college master plan is not only created to satisfy the zoning district but to also satisfy state requirements. The plan is reviewed every three years and will likely be revised to some extent, which would require them to come before the Planning Commission for approval. He also commented that he was shocked at the poor attendance at the public meeting that was held for the neighbors. Of the neighbors that did attend, there were only concerns voiced regarding the dormitory building and those concerns were discussed by himself and college staff.

Commissioner Neumann commented that he believes the fact that the drawing presented tonight was different from the drawing that was shown at the neighborhood meeting shows the college's efforts to address those concerns.

Commissioner Pall commented that a 35-foot tall building with a 60-foot setback looks similar in height to a 60-foot tall building that is 45-feet at the midpoint of the street with a 100' setback. He stated that he was happy with the traffic circulation and flow.

At this time the meeting was opened for more public comment.

Ms. Grozner asked if neighborhood property values would change and stated that she was upset with the process as she only saw one notice for a meeting and did not see any publication in the Petoskey News Review. She felt as though neighbors were being told what was happening and not being included.

Chairperson Robson responded that the Commission has no way of knowing how the rezoning will impact neighborhood property values.

Commissioner Neumann commented that he is not a realtor or appraiser but believes that improvements to the community asset would enhance the neighborhood.

Ms. Gronzer stated that she believed that the college was tax exempt and asked if she was correct.

Staff responded that the college is tax exempt and that the Planning Commission looks at zoning to enhance both the college and the community. She believes that the ring road extension would improve traffic circulation and reduce traffic on Howard Street and that a high quality institution tends to increase property values.

Commissioner Pall commented that the Planning Commission cannot put a number on property values and that their job is to do the best they can to improve the community.

Dr. Finley commented that the college is looking to double or triple their current dormitory population of approximately 100 students and they are working hard to draw youth to the community. Petoskey has a shrinking K-12 demographic and housing is hard to find. Seasonal housing is currently provided by the college and additional dormitories could help with the city's workforce housing issue.

Commissioner Willmott asked what phase of the proposal the dormitories were under.

Dr. Finley responded that they are potentially in the next two to five year plan.

Ms. Grozner commented that she believes in the college, however, she dislikes the placement of the dormitories near residential homes and asked why they could not be placed on the other side of campus. She also voiced concerns with traffic.

Dr. Finley responded that the existing dormitory was built in the late 60's, early 70's and if the new dormitories were built on the northeast corner of campus it would require students to walk across campus to eat, study or access student services.

Commissioner Neumann commented that the landscape requirements will help soften the image of the buildings.

Dr. Finley commented that the Planning Commission had been very thoughtful in regards to building heights, traffic and noise and that he was sorry that Ms. Grozner had not received notice, however, the college sent invitations for the neighborhood meeting to everyone within ¼ mile of the college.

The meeting was closed for public comment.

At this time Commissioner Willmott made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Warner, that the request to rezone 1515 Howard Street and all identified properties owned by North Central Michigan College and the State Building Authority from the R-1 Single Family District to the C- College District be recommended to City Council for approval based on the facts presented due to the finding that the request is consistent with the City Master Plan, Future Land Use Map and Zoning Plan; the uses and development standards are compatible with surrounding uses; the site is of sufficient size to accommodate the uses; the rezoning will not adversely affect surrounding properties; and that the Master Site Facilities Plan submitted be approved based on the finding that the review standards for a Master Site Facilities Plan in the C- College District are met. Motion carried 9-0.

**Case #53-21 – Introduction on a Special Condition Use Request
for a Medical Marihuana Provisioning Center at 403 West Mitchell Street**

Staff informed the Commission that the special condition use request is for the third provisioning center located at 403 West Mitchell Street, a 5,700 square foot parcel adjacent to US-31/ West Mitchell Street, Ingalls Avenue and Madison Street. The proposal is to use the existing building with changes to exterior materials and interior layout.

A special condition use requires a public hearing before action can be taken and the Commission should clarify any questions or concerns with the request before scheduling a public hearing for the September 15 meeting.

Myron Berry, Mountain Engineering, Inc., informed the Commission that there would not be many changes to the interior of the building and exterior changes would include new siding, removal of the existing awning and concrete steps to the south, and the addition of landscaping, benches and bike racks.

Commissioners asked if the site would be adequate for recreational marijuana should the proposed use change in the future and inquired about a lighting plan, security, additional landscaping and if there was a need for a dumpster.

Commissioners voiced concerns with the lack of on-site parking and safety concerns with parking at the northeast corner of the building, specifically spaces 5, 6 and 7.

Staff responded that the on-street parking had been in place for many years for this location, however, under a special condition use the Planning Commission likely could require that the ordinance standards be met. She will check with the City Attorney whether the Commission could approve use of the existing on street parking or if a variance would be required by the Zoning Board of Appeals for 100% of parking requirements – or more than allowed by the ordinance for on-street parking.

Mr. Berry responded that he believed the site would be adequate for a recreational marijuana facility, lighting is planned for under the new canopies, however, a lighting plan could be provided, and security is required by the State of Michigan. The facility would have cameras on the inside as well as the outside of the building that would be monitored 24/7. He stated that he was unsure if a dumpster would be necessary and would look into rollaway bins. He commented that, per their attorney, the applicant would be allowed to use on-street parking as it has been in place since the 1950's.

At this time, the Commission agreed to postpone scheduling a public hearing pending attorney opinion and additional site plan information, including a lighting plan.

Case #3-21 – Amendment Request for Crestview Commons PUD Signs

Staff informed the Commission that Harbor Village Apartments were included in the original Crestview Commons PUD. Their request is for new free-standing signs, which require Planning Commission approval according to the PUD ordinance.

The existing sign is eight feet wide, two feet tall with an overall height of four feet and the proposed sign would be 6.7 feet wide, 2 ¼ feet tall with an overall height of 3 ½ feet with an additional seven square feet of information.

Steve Werth, Stratford Group, informed the Commission that they are changing and upgrading their facilities and would like to update their signs to make them more attractive as well. The proposed signs visually appear to be the same size as the existing signs with a slightly wider base.

Commissioners asked about vegetation around the signs, what the difference in width was from the existing signs to the proposed sign, and if lighting would project downward.

Mr. Werth responded that native plants would be used and placed along the ends of the signs, not in front of them, the existing sign is eight feet wide and the proposed sign would be approximately

10 feet wide. Typically their lighting is upward facing, however they could explore the options of down lit lighting.

Commissioners agreed that the signs presented were compatible with the PUD and liked the overall changes.

At this time Commissioner Neumann made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Dettmer, to approve the sign request as the proposed signs meet the intent of the sign ordinance and the standards are met, with the condition that the lighting be down lit. Motion carried 9-0.

**Case #2-17 – Continued Review and Action on an
Amendment to the Campus Sign Plan for the
McLaren Northern Michigan Master Site Facilities Plan**

Staff informed the Commission that a revised donor recognition sign and donor sign plan had been submitted based on Commission comments at the July 29 Special Meeting. The sign size had been reduced from 163 square feet to 49 square feet and located at the Surgery Center entrance above the ground floor entrance.

The applicant submitted the following sign plan language on exterior donor recognition for lead gifts:

Periodically, McLaren Northern Michigan (MNM) renovates or constructs facilities on an existing or new property. Philanthropic gifts typically fund part or all of these projects, and recognition appropriate to the size of the gift, as determined by MNM and Foundation leadership, is offered to the donor.

Lead gifts to a project may be recognized with exterior signage, defined as any signage placed on the exterior of a building or structure, or on/in any MNM campus space that is outdoors.

Lead exterior donor recognition will:

- Be architecturally appropriate for the renovated/new construction – consistent with and appropriate to its immediate building and landscape context, while maintaining reasonable consistency in approach (materiality, font, supports, etc.) across the MNM campus
- Reflect McLaren Health Care brand standards
- Be sized in proportion to the space – letters not to exceed 36” in height
- Include wording appropriate for the specific donor(s)
- Not include corporate entities – corporate giving will be recognized with internal signage

Potential Future Locations for Exterior Signage on the MNM Petoskey Campus

- New Cancer Center (location tbd) – Karmanos sign at top of building; lead donor recognition lower on building

Commissioners agreed that the new proposed size and location of the Martin and Lisa Sutter Pavilion sign was a vast improvement from what was presented at the last meeting.

Shari Schult, McLaren Northern Michigan, thanked the Commission for their review of the previous plan and informed them that the new sign was amended based on their comments and that it was also acceptable to the donor.

Commissioners thanked Ms. Schult for taking their comments to heart and implementing them into the new plan. They appreciated that the new location does not impact the neighbors, the street or Little Traverse Bay.

At this time, Commissioner Warner made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Mooradian, to approve the amended sign request. Motion carried 9-0.

T. Jones, McLaren Northern Michigan, informed the Commission that they had done research on signs at different hospital campuses and it appeared that each hospital had its own sign plans. She stated that donor signs will be no larger than 36-inches, donor naming will be on a case-by-case basis and will be kept consistent within the campus.

Ms. Schult stated that they do not want corporate names on their buildings other than their own.

Commissioners reviewed the proposed sign plan for lead gifts and suggested that the wording on future locations for exterior signage be changed as follows:

Any future locations for exterior signage on the MNM Petoskey Campus shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission using Sign Ordinance Standards.

At this time, Commissioner Willmott made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Dettmer, to approve the amended sign plan for donor recognition, with the Commission's recommended changes. Motion carried 9-0.

Review and Acceptance of the 2022-2027 Capital Improvements Plan

Staff gave an overview of the six-year capital plan expenditures, 2022 Street Projects, 2022 Parks, Parking and Electric System Projects, 2023 Major Projects, and 2022-2027 Capital Improvements Plan.

The Planning Commission is charged with reviewing the six-year CIP to ensure public projects are consistent with the City of Petoskey Master Plan. Staff recommends acceptance of the plan based on the planned projects' progress implementing the following Livable Petoskey Master Plan goals:

- The park system is integral to the unique sense of place and is a known asset for community-wide health and wellness.
- The valuable natural resources that are the foundation for our high quality of life are managed and protected.
- Our high quality public spaces are preserved for future generations.
- Long-term resilience of infrastructure is considered in all projects.
- Petoskey is a leader in use of green technologies for energy, infrastructure, and transportation.
- High quality community infrastructure and facilities provide services to City residents, customers and visitors in a reliable, efficient, environmentally-sound, and cost-effective manner.
- An overall transportation system is provided that enhances the community's social, economic and natural capital, and promotes public health and energy conservation.
- Use of rail corridors for non-motorized transportation is maximized.
- Roadway maintenance and construction utilize best management practices to minimize potential adverse environmental impacts.
- Pedestrian amenities are improved and expanded.
- Neighborhood tree canopies and streetscapes are enhanced.
- Neighborhood parks are enhanced.
- Downtown Petoskey is maintained and enhanced as the regional economic and cultural center of the community.

Commissioners commented that they felt it was a great plan, inquired about timelines and funding for various projects and briefly discussed revenue and expenditures. Commissioners also discussed

the role that the Planning Commission has in the process per the Planning Enabling Act and agreed that they would like to take a more active role.

At this time, Commissioner Pall made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Willmott to accept the plan as it is consistent with the goals of the Master Plan and forward to City Council for approval. Motion carried 9-0.

Continued Discussion of the Zoning Ordinance Amendments to Address Housing

Given the late hour, Chairperson Robson asked Commissioners if there was anything they felt comfortable moving forward with and asking staff to prepare final language for.

Commissioner Pall commented that he would like to have more discussion on building height and that he did not understand the need for so much height on the first floor.

Matthew Fettig, 906 Michigan Street, commented that he is working on a project in the B-2A District and believes he could build a three story house using the maximum 33-foot height, however, it would be boxy and would not fit in well with neighboring houses. He also commented that there are neighboring houses that are three stories and taller than what is allowed and that he had recently spoken with an architect who was not very happy with the 40-foot height restriction in the Central Business District (CBD).

Commissioners agreed that they would like staff to work on final language for eliminating density in the business and industrial districts and amending private street standards.

They also agreed that more discussion was needed on building height for three story buildings, allowing residential uses in the rear and lower level of buildings in the CBD, two-unit dwellings as a permitted use in the single family districts, and accessory dwelling units (ADUs).

Public Comment

The meeting was opened for public comment. No public comment was received.

Updates

Staff informed the Commission that the September meeting agenda will likely include a concept plan for 202 East Mitchell Street (Mitchell Street Market) and that the old Chase Bank property located at 624 Charlevoix Avenue had been sold to Bay Street Orthopaedics who currently plan to keep the previously approved site plan with one tenant occupying the space. The approved site plan will expire in February 2022.

The meeting was then adjourned at 10:07 P.M.

Minutes reviewed by Ted Pall, Vice Chairperson/Secretary