Approved: March 20, 2017

Meeting of January 16, 2017	Record of the proceedings of the Boyne City Planning Commission regular meeting held at Boyne City Hall, 364 North Lake Street, on Monday January 16, 2017 at 5:00 pm.
Call to Order	Vice Chair Frasz called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.
Roll Call	Present: Jason Biskner, George Ellwanger, Chris Frasz, James Kozlowski, Tom Neidhamer Absent: Ken Allen (arrived 5:04 pm), Jane MacKenzie, Aaron Place and Joe St. Dennis (arrived at 5:02 pm)
Excused Absence(s) **Motion	**2017-01-16-02** **Ellwanger moved, Biskner seconded, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**, a motion to excuse the absence of Jane MacKenzie.
Meeting Attendance	City Officials/Staff: Planning and Zoning Administrator Scott McPherson, City Manager Michael Cain, City Commissioners Hugh Conklin and Ron Grunch, Executive Assistant/Harbor Master Barb Brooks and Recording Secretary Pat Haver Public Present: 73
Consent Agenda **Motion	**2017-01-16-03** **Neidhamer moved, Ellwanger seconded, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY**, a motion to approve the consent agenda; approval of the Planning Commission minutes from December 19, 2016 as presented.
Citizen comments on Non-Agenda Items	Derrick Schroeder 910 E. Main St. Wanted to know why the private snow plow haulers must truck in snow during the night and into the early morning, making 900+ trips down the residential streets at 90 seconds apart going at high rates of speed and making a lot of extra noise. Understands that is the best time to remove snow, but why can't they use the double gates off of Brockway Street to enter and drop off the snow at the airport instead of using the residential streets.
Reports of Officers, Boards and Standing Committees and Unfinished Business	None
New Business	Vice Chair Frasz opened this portion of the meeting by reading the public hearing procedures and explained to the audience the way that the meeting would be conducted.
Public Hearing – Boyne City Housing Commission rezoning request	Planning Director McPherson reviewed his staff report that was included in the agenda packet. A conditional rezoning application had been submitted by the Boyne City Housing Commission to rezone a parcel they currently own from Traditional Residential District (TRD) to Multiple Family Residential District (MFRD). The parcel, on Grant St, 15-051-335-084-40 is 7.81 acres in size and is adjacent to the north of Deer Meadows and the Senior Citizen Center. The properties to the north, west and east are zoned TRD, and the property to the south is zoned MFRD and TRD and is used for multifamily and single family homes. The parcel is currently vacant with some mature tree coverage; water and sewer are relatively close and is available to the site from the north and south. The written offer for the conditional rezoning has identified the proposed uses for the parcel to

include up to 64 two bedroom units and 10 single family units which these 10 would have individual access points from Earl Street. The multifamily two bedroom units would be accessed from two different areas, the first off of Franklin Street and the second off of Division Street, the current driveway into Deer Meadows and the Senior Citizen Center. The lack of affordable housing has been a topic of a lot of discussion over the past few months and has been identified and adopted as a goal of the city these past couple years. In the 2015 Boyne City Master Plan, providing housing opportunities for everyone is listed.

Chip Ironside: Progressive Associates representing the Boyne City Housing Commission - The proposal submitted is for multifamily units consisting of 64 2 bedroom townhouse units and 10 single family units running along Earl Street. The townhouses will have access from Franklin and Division Streets, will not be stacked 2 story facilities, and will have 2 parking spaces each. They will have residential style finishes. Yard setbacks along the west side of the development will have a 33 foot buffer, and hope to save as many of the trees as possible to include in the playground area, and will include a community clubhouse. This project will be done in phases with the first being the construction of 32 work force type housing units along the east side of the development; phase II will be the construction of the 32 work force housing units along the west side of the development, and phase III will be the 10 single family houses facing Earl Street. Studies are underway for drainage.

Board Discussion
Kozlowski – will it be a mix of one and two story units? **Ironside**: yes
Kozlowski – will the single family units be connected or individual, and will people park in the back? **Ironside**: The single family units will not be connected; the multifamily will have connected units with space between each unit pod.
Biskner – You originally stated that the houses will have individual access points off of Earl Street, now you are stating that they will not be.
Ironside - We will be modifying the single family houses and their access point will be from Franklin Street and not Earl Street.
Neidhamer – will there be basements or garages? **Ironside** – for the multifamily units no; possibly garages for the single family houses.
Biskner – you indicated that there will be a buffer of 33 ft on the west side of the development, what about the east side, will there be a buffer? **Ironside** – we will do what we can for a buffer there.
Ironside – we are aware of the drainage issues and concerns and will address those concerns with onsite drainage ponds.
Kozlowski – what is the proposed square footage of the units? **Ironside** – the single family houses will be 900 to 1200 sq ft; and the multifamily units will be 750 to 1200 sq foot, however, not cookie cutter. It will be a unified development with elaborate porches and different finishes within the same color scheme throughout.
Frasz – Letters from citizens received should they read or recognized? **McPherson** – they were made apart of the packet and are on record there are 5 total

Public Hearing opened at 5:43 pm

Jerry Kelts 315 E. Division St. – My concern is for traffic between Deer Meadows and the Senior Citizen Center; there will be a lot of extra traffic coming off of Division.
April Reycraft 520 S. East St. – My concern is foot traffic, there are not sidewalks available around that block, will fences go up so that people have to go around or will they continue to go through the rest of the woods to get downtown, how will

foot traffic be handled?

Tracy Russold 608 Alice St. – Are there any other sites available? Who is the developer and have they done a project like this in the past? Has an analysis been done to see if the values of the residential properties in the area will go down? Is there going to be any type of assessment to put in sidewalk and sewers to the current homeowners in the area? Is the city capable to handle the 8 to 9% increase in population for the Fire Department and Police Department service calls?

Scott Pearce 617 Earl St. – The personality of Boyne City is 3 to 5 houses total within a block with double lots; I have 110 ft frontage, my neighbors have 115 ft frontage on average on our street. Between 2000 and 2014 there was a 7.3% population increase in people; we are trying to shove more than that in one development. Concerned about pride of ownership. I do like the inside street and would like to see less than 10 houses, will they be unrelated people living in the single family homes, where are they going to park? Will they park on Earl Street that narrows down at the end? What is the time frame to finish each of the phases?

Pam Handy Crumpler 607 Grant St. – I grew up here and have lived in my house for over 40 years, we have 50 ft frontage which goes back a bit. My concern are kids growing up and grandkids coming back with the extra traffic, we have an apartment building down the street through the years, we have had problems with the renters not taking care of animals, not saying there is going to be problems, but in the past the police have been called to this rental, I do not want to have to go through this again with new rentals.

Shannon Pearce 617 Earl St. - We bought our house on 3 lots in 2000; and have invested a ton of time and money to make it our home, we are in a nice stable neighborhood; not much turn around. That wooded area has been used by the neighbors, we know that it is not owned by us; we snowmobile on it to maintain the trails, mow in the summer; we bought for the natural beauty. What are you going to do about green space? Because rentals have no pride of ownership problems do occur and there is trouble; we don't need that kind of headache. Boyne City has a lot of other opportunities for growth and development, I understand that some have more than others but feel this is not a wise choice at this point; there are a lot of better places within Boyne City for development so don't plop down in this good residential neighborhood.

Dennis Deschryver 610 Grant St. – Is there a finished plan available as far as where things will go and sizes? Density of the area, is this a common density in this small space? I agree with what has been said earlier. Changing what exists is a big deal.

Mitchell Klooster 805 Earl St. - Asked for clarification in the size of the multifamily units and the size of the single family house on the lots.

Nathan Minnaar 201 Franklin St. - We moved into the area 8 years ago, you don't see increases in values and people investing in their neighborhoods like this. What support is there for the value of the homes in the area? You are asking us to continue to put money into our houses and yet have this large project. My first thought when I heard about the project, is that it is time to move. What is going to happen when everyone currently living there moves out and bails? I hope you take that into consideration when you make your decision.

April Caverly 522 E. Lincoln St. - There are wetlands in the area on the back of the parking lot with nesting birds, how can you put a proposed road through the wetland? In the spring time that wet area comes out further.

Kyle Marshall 1214 Nordic Dr. - I am here representing Magnum Hospitality. We are in dire need for labor force housing to hire employees. We have watched a steady decline in the past 2 to 3 years in applications. We pride ourselves in hiring within the community; there is a lack of affordable homes for people in our industry.

Diane Deschryver 610 Grant St. - I'm going to pick on Jane. When she first became the head of the housing commission, she told us that there are very few communities in Northern Michigan that have public housing with federally funded housing vouchers as extensive as the ones in Boyne City in a community this size. My point is I don't think we need to add anymore. I thought Boyne City was in need of middle income housing, I think this is a better place for middle income housing. People moving into the Boyne City area are going to look for family housing and neighborhoods. I oppose the change in zoning.

Sarah Niederpruem 503 Harris St. – Come at this as a resident, and business manager. I live by low income housing and it does not bother me, I have put well over $100,000 into my house, I plan on being there for years to come. I don't think it will be a problem. We have lost a lot of great staff members, as there are no places to live in town, we have them coming from all over Northern Michigan because there is nothing to rent or even buy here in town. The potential and need for affordable housing is great and we need this for our town.

Robin Burke 611 Earl St. - The 10 single homes with the backs facing Earl St. if there are no garages or basements where will they store their stuff? Is it going to be on the back side facing Earl St? Have they looked into other areas within Boyne City or just here?

Arthur Strand 721 Earl St. – I don't want to look at someone else's back yard junk out my picture window. One of the reasons we bought there was the property across the street was residential. This project will overwhelm the density and degrade the rest of the home in the area.

Sharon Harrington 825 Earl St. – I knew the original landowner, Mr. Titsworth; it was his desire that this land not be developed and left as a wildlife preserve. He put it in his will and it was his desire not to have this area developed. He wanted to maintain living in the city and feel like you are living in the country. We work hard and take care of our property and our homes, the home values in the area are $130,000 to $200,000 and you want to put this multiple rental unit development smack dab in the middle of this residential area which will definitely lower the surrounding home values. Have they looked at other areas to develop? I understand that there is a need. There is a large property on the backside of Parkview, is that an option? This is not welcoming to the current owners and not a good idea. To put 10 houses down Earl Street that was not supposed to be developed any further, that number of homes in that small area, will be crammed in. We have large yards and invested money into them; this will change the look and feel of this residential area.

Rod Cortright Business Owner 221 Water St. – I'm in favor of more affordable housing; people can't afford housing in this area to rent or buy. On the site plan, I would like to see some sample elevations of the buildings for both multifamily and single family, what will they look like? Drainage there is a known problem in the area behind the senior citizen center, so care must be taken for the development. Single family homes on Earl St, maybe place some sort of signage for no parking on that side of the street. Sidewalks, I would like to see in this plan, showing pedestrian traversing within the development and outside connecting to other sidewalks in the area.

Scott MacKenzie 847 Division St. - The issue of affordable housing has been going on since we got here in 1999. Change is hard, I understand the concerns. The second part will address all of the specific details. This property has been sitting ready for development and now is the opportunity to do so and address some of our housing needs. Boyne City Housing Commission is the owner and developer of this project and it will be well maintained and taken care of.

Sue Sherwood 604 Grant St. – Brought up another proposed development on the north side of town, and feels that it will adequately address the needs for housing.

Retain wooded area of this neighborhood and the small town feel home town appeal.

Leonard Sherwood 604 Grant St. – Has been a builder for over 48 years, and knows that if a project is not planned right it could be bad. He is against developing this wooded area. During the summer they cannot sleep with their windows open due to the foul language of people walking by who already live in Parkview, this development could increase that problem, and agrees with what the others have said.

Jackie McNutt 623 S. Park St. – Is this the same type of development like Parkview, why can't it be used for more senior citizens. The police have been called to Parkview on several occasions.

Julie McGee 224 Franklin St. – The entrance will be in front of her house, is concerned about the value of her property. She sits in the back yard and watches the deer with her grandkids and has had difficulties with people stealing from her and walking right through her yard. Will the wooded area remain? Does not feel safe

Bob Drap 418 E. Lincoln St. - What is going to be the final cost of the units? Some businesses in town need to raise what they pay their employees in order to afford housing.

Jeff Ross 718 S. Park St. – I agree with what has been said earlier. I have 3 young kids that can't play out in the front yard; I am scared to death for their safety. The proposed entrance off Franklin St will be a traffic nightmare. Traffic is not monitored at this end of town now; people are always speeding in front of our houses.

Patricia Drap 418 E. Lincoln St. - Who will be responsible for the care of this project with upkeep, landscaping and snowplowing?

Sherry Munday 315 E. Division St. - Concerned for the additional traffic down Division St past Deer Meadows and the senior center. There is a lot of crime at Parkview across the street; what would happen between the senior citizen and low income residents when this project is completed?

Pat Carey 626 Grant St. – I am the owner of the rental that everyone has talked about, the church. If you have a problem with one of my renters, call me directly and I will take care of it. Why would you plan a development when 3/4s of the surrounding area is residential? Laundry facilities need to be established in Boyne again. People are driving up and filling my dumpsters with trash that does not belong to my renters; cars are pulled off of the roads and are in designated parking areas. If I have a problem with my renters, they are thrown out. I feel that it is a poor choice for this area.

Cindy McCort 850 W. Dietz Rd. Boyne City Housing Commission program manager - The BCHC owns this land along with Litzenburger and Deer Meadows and we will be the ones to maintain, plow and upkeep the property. We currently have 109 rental units, and that is not enough as we have a waiting list of 105 people for Boyne City only. This affordable housing development will address some of the shortages in affordable housing and the renters will have rules that will need to be adhered to because of Mshda regulations. If the current renters do not follow the rules they have to leave. This will not be another Parkview. A lot of these two bedroom units will only have 2 people in them not more than 4.

Deb Neer 615 Grant St. – Does not want to see any developments in this area and does not want to see Grant St opened up to go through. Concerned about the lack of sidewalks in the area. We do need more affordable housing, but not in this residential area.

Dave Sandin 629 East St. - Just moved into the area and a development is not the reason they purchased their home; understands the need for workforce housing, but would like it someplace else other than this wooded lot.

Shannon Pearce 617 Earl St. – Everyone is talking about working class and affordable housing; we are that working class. This development does not need to be at the cost of us; I understand that rentals are needed, but other areas are being looked at for development.

With no further comments, the public hearing was closed at 6:40 pm

Cliff Ironside was asked about the income levels to qualify for renting. In the area of $10,000 to $42,000. Depending on the family makeup, there are certain wage limits that can be made to qualify for renting. Wanted to reiterate that the front of the house will be facing Earl Street on the single family homes and they will be using a drive in the back of the houses for parking.
Ellwanger – I agree with what has been said here tonight and sympathize. Is the density a little high, I don't know. I don't have a final site plan to make my determination and I want to make the right decision for all involved. I do believe that it will be well maintained.
McPherson – What was submitted for review is a conceptual design only. Density, access, orientation of houses, building elevations will all be a part of the application and written request for the final site plan. Final site plan review is where everything must be identified.
Frasz – Can the Planning Commission recommend the rezoning change with a condition on what this commission believes density amount could be?
McPherson – Can't add conditions or limits. Can't be any greater than what was submitted in their written offer which was worded as "up to 64 multifamily units and 10 single family units", if this were approved that is only what could be developed.
St. Dennis – wanted clarification that nothing will be accessed from Earl St. and that the front of the houses will face Earl St. What about storm sewers?
Ironside – that is correct, the single family houses will be accessed off of an alley type drive at the rear, and the fronts will face Earl St. The wetland is not big enough to regulate, however we will be utilizing the city's storm water/sewer system and will have drainage ponds.
Board had discussion on increased traffic and the areas that will be impacted, the lack of access points into the development is concerning to some members. A traffic study has not been done, and the standards of parking and roads must adhere to the current city street standards at the developers cost. Sidewalks were discussed and they have not been drawn up yet. Can the development handle increases in the infrastructure?
McPherson – There has been a recent larger development that Mark Fowler has indicated our infrastructure handled the increase in usage and believes that this development will also be handled by our current infrastructure.
Biskner – Are there any other areas that can be developed?
Ironside – The housing commission already owns this piece of property, and will keep it contiguous with Litzenburger and Deer Meadows. Can't speak to any other available locations.
Biskner – What is the time frame for the phases in development? **Ironside**: There are only two rounds for funding in the spring and in the fall. The applications are point based applications for funding so could be a couple of years or a couple of months before funding is available. Once that occurs, Phase one which will be 32 units will take anywhere from 8 to 12 month to complete as actual construction time, however, there can be a couple of years between each phase depending on available funding.

7:05 pm - Due to an alarm going off, the board took a brief recess until 7:15 pm and the recorder was turned off.

Meeting reconvened at 7:15 pm; recorder was turned back on

McPherson – The general process for a conditional rezoning which is very specific in details will be to the Planning Commission first (tonight's meeting), if recommended it will go to the City Commission for a 1st and 2nd reading, and there must be no less than 30 days between those reading, the City Commission will not be able to put any conditions on the proposal, must be a "take it or leave it" application. If they approve the request, it comes back to the Planning Commission for site plan review, this is the step that everything must be laid out and a lot of the criteria must be met. As it is a use by right, can't deny the request because you don't like the use, if there were an issue that could not be mitigated you can put in all of the details for the site plan review.

Neidhamer – I am in favor of the rezoning request. The various goal setting sessions that have been held, over 400 people responded that housing diversity is the number 1 goal. This campus is already owned by the housing commission, and their desire is to use all of the available tools to create affordable housing. There are already units on this campus that are very well maintained and I feed that this new project will also be well maintained. I understand that Franklin Street and some of the other local streets will be impacted, and I am in favor of no access off of Earl or Grant/Morgan Streets. Change is hard; I remember other high density developments such as the trailer park, Harborage Park, the Harborage, Court and Silver Streets and even Division St that people were concerned about. We have to remember without a zoning change they could build 32 duplexes, what they are proposing is 64 units double of what could be placed there now. Wetlands and water retention will need to be looked at and addressed. We have been told that the fire, police and ambulance services can handle any additional capacity and workloads. Unfortunately, I do not have the paperwork with me, but high quality neighborhood developments can actually improve the value of surrounding homes.

Allen – I appreciate the audience participation, and sympathetic with many who have spoken; it sounds as if a lot of people indicated that this development was a surprise. The original plan appears it could be a long way away for site plan approval and I would like to see something different. I'm concerned about the infrastructure. Are we locked into this concept if approved or do we do separate site plan review for each phase?

McPherson – You do the site plan review for the entire site and identify each phase, which is all reviewed at once.

Allen - How did the BCHC obtain title to this property? Can they trade the property, or does it have to be developed? Wetlands, nearby mud lake and the Boyne River are all nesting areas for birds, eagles and waterfowl. What could be the impact to those? The senior population has a connection to this wooded space.

Frasz – Really difficult balance of taking into consideration the goals of the city, what the ordinance allows, what the Master Plan has stated, and the current feeling of the residence who are impacted directly or indirectly. For me it is a big decision and I need to take time to think, sit with my decision and consider all the possibilities for the residents and it will give the residents time to think of the possibilities for this site.

The Planning Commission began to review Section 2.50(C) due to the proposed request for a change in a mapped zoning district. These are guidelines to help the Planning Commission with their decision.

For amendment requests to change, create, extend or reduce a mapped zoning district, the Planning Commission and City Commission shall use the following as a guide:

1. The proposed zoning district is more appropriate than any other zoning district, or more appropriate than adding the desired use as a conditional land use in the existing zoning district. ***The board was not sure if the words "more appropriate" were fitting as the adjacent area is TRD on three sides; however, there are already two other buildings on adjacent property under the same ownership.***
2. The property cannot be reasonably used as zoned, and the applicant cannot receive a reasonable return on investment through developing the property with one (1) of the uses permitted under current zoning at the time of purchase or at the time of securing legal control of the property. ***This property could be used as traditional single residential however; there have been multifamily requests because the need of additional housing is great.***
3. The proposed zone change is supported by and consistent with the goals, policies and future land use map of the adopted City Comprehensive Plan, including any sub-area or corridor studies. If conditions have changed since the Comprehensive Plan was adopted, as determined by the Planning Commission, the consistency with recent development trends in the area shall be considered. ***It is consistent with our current goals of increasing affordable housing diversity and is consistent with the adopted Future Land Use Map.***
4. The proposed zone change is compatible with the established land use pattern, surrounding uses, and surrounding zoning in terms of land suitability, impacts on the environment, density, nature of use, traffic impacts, aesthetics, infrastructure and potential influence on property values, and is consistent with the needs of the community. ***By building on this campus it is creating its own neighborhood ~~and would not adversely impact the surrounding neighborhood property values.~~***
5. All the potential uses allowed in the proposed zoning district are compatible with the site's physical, geological, hydrological and other environmental features. ***It must meet all applicable codes and adhere to all zoning features and requirements.***
6. The change would not severely impact traffic, public facilities, utilities, and the natural characteristics of the area, or significantly change population density, and would not compromise the health, safety, and welfare of the City. The Planning Commission may require a general impact assessment in accordance with the requirements of this Ordinance if it determines the proposed zoning change could have a negative impact upon traffic, public facilities, utilities, natural characteristics, population density, or other concerns. A traffic impact study in accordance with the requirements of this Ordinance shall be required if the proposed rezoning district permits uses that could generate one hundred (100) or more directional trips during the peak hour, or at least one thousand (1,000) trips per day more than the majority of the uses that could be developed under current zoning. – ***Note: a review of the proposed uses and the existing allowed uses shows that the number of trips generated by the proposed uses do not exceed the majority of existing allowed uses by more than 100 directional trips per peak hour or 1,000 trips per day.***
7. The rezoning would constitute and create an isolated and unplanned "spot zone" granting a special privilege to one landowner not available to others. ***No spot zoning would be created as it is contiguous with the other properties with the same owner and MFRD is indicated on the approved Future Land Use Map***
8. The change of present district boundaries is consistent in relation to existing uses, and construction on the site will be able to meet the dimensional regulations for the proposed zoning district listed in the Schedule of Regulations. ***Appears it will meet & fit all dimensional regulations.***
9. There has been a change of conditions in the area supporting the proposed rezoning. ***There is a need for affordable housing as stated by recent goal setting sessions and economic conditions have changed.***
10. Adequate sites are neither properly zoned nor available elsewhere to accommodate the proposed uses permitted in the requested zoning district. ***There could possibly be other sites available; however, the Boyne City Housing Commission already***

owns this piece of property which could be used for the purpose of creating additional housing.

11. There was a mistake in the original zoning classification. ***No***
12. The request has not previously been submitted within the past one (1) year, unless conditions have changed or new information has been provided. ***No***

With additional discussion from the board, and their concerns about the lack of time to consider not only the packet information, but the opinions from attendees at tonight' meeting and were uneasy about possible impacts they would like additional time to consider all of the opinions and the agenda packet information.

****Motion**

Motion by Neidhamer to recommend approving the proposed conditional rezone as submitted; with the houses not accessed from Earl Street, and submit an amended site plan written offer. *This motion failed for a lack of support.*

****Motion**

Motion by Neidhamer, seconded by Ellwanger to postpone this item until the February 20, 2017 Planning Commission meeting for further review and study.

2017-01-16-7A
Roll Call:
Aye: Allen, Biskner, Ellwanger, Frasz, Kozlowski, Neidhamer, and St. Dennis
Nay: None
Absent: MacKenzie and Place
Motion Carries

Public Hearing Group Day Care Ordinance Review

Planning Director McPherson reviewed his staff report that was included in the agenda packet. Staff was tasked with drafting amendment ordinance language based on earlier recommendations by the Planning Commission. Make group day care home a use by right in the residential and central business zoning districts as opposed to a special use, eliminate minimum lot size, and reduce minimum size area for a fenced in play area. Articles 3, 4, 5, 6, 10 & 11 will be impacted and will need to be amended with additional language:

Group Day Care Home.

1. Shall have a fenced outdoor play area of at least 1,200 sq ft located behind the front building line of the home.

and Article 25.10 Conditional Use requirements would need to be amended with the deletion of language:

Group day care homes.

1. *Sites shall have a minimum lot area of 20,000 square feet.*
2. *An on-site drive shall be provided for drop-offs and loading. This drive shall be arranged to allow maneuvers without affecting traffic flow on the public street.*
3. *There shall be a fenced, contiguous open space with a minimum area of 5,000 square feet provided on the same premises as the group day care home. The required open space shall not be located within a required front yard.*

Public Hearing was opened at 8:28 pm; with no comments it was closed at 8:28 pm

Board Discussion
These requirements would exceed what is already required by the State for licensed day care facilities.

St. Dennis – I can't think of a home occupation that offends the neighbors more than a group day care. We don't allow for a whole lot of noise or traffic with pick up and drop offs or deliveries in any of the other home occupations in the city.

The board then went through Section 2.50(B) Amendment Criteria:

B. For amendment requests to change or to add additional regulations or standards to a district or a use, the Planning Commission and City Commission shall use the following as a guide:

1. The proposed rule, change or addition helps to reinforce the Comprehensive Plan. ***N/A***
2. The proposed rule, change or addition is in keeping within the spirit and intent of the Ordinance, and with the objectives of the zoning district.
3. The problem or issue which the change is intended to address cannot be accomplished in another, more appropriate fashion. *This is relaxing the rules for this use*
4. The proposed amendment would correct an error in the Ordinance. ***N/A***
5. The proposed amendment would clarify the intent of the Ordinance. ***N/A***
6. Documentation has been provided indicating problems and conflicts in implementation or interpretation of specific sections of this Ordinance. ***Yes***
7. The proposed amendment would address changes to county, state or federal legislation. ***N/A***
8. The proposed amendment would address potential legal issues or administrative problems with this Ordinance based on recent case law or opinions rendered by the Attorney General of the State of Michigan. ***No***
9. The proposed amendment would promote compliance with changes in other city ordinances and/or county, state, or federal regulations. ***N/A***
10. The proposed amendment is supported by the findings of reports, studies, or other documentation on functional requirements, contemporary building practices, environmental requirements and similar technical items. ***N/A***
11. Other criteria as determined by the Planning Commission or City Commission which would protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public, protect public and private investment in the City, promote implementation of the goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan, and enhance the overall quality of life in the City. ***N/A***

****Motion**

After board discussion, **motion by Allen seconded by Ellwanger**, to recommend approval of the proposed ordinance amendments as presented.

2017-01-16-7B
Roll Call:
Aye: Allen, Biskner, Ellwanger, Frasz, Kozlowski and Neidhamer
Nay: St. Dennis
Absent: MacKenzie and Place
Motion Carries

Recreation Plan Amendment – Marina Plan Amendment

Harbormaster Barb Brooks reviewed her memo included in the agenda packet. To remain competitive and meet certain requirements for continued DNR and Waterways Commission funding, certain elements must be included in the City's 5 year Recreation Plan so a Harbor/Marina Facilities Recreation Plan will be created based on staff and public input to be included in the City's current Recreation Plan. It has already gone before the Parks and Recreation Commission and public input will be taken for the next couple of weeks before it goes to the City Commission for approval.

Staff Report

- Joint Boards and Commission meeting is scheduled for tomorrow January 17, 2017 at 6:00 pm; encourage everyone to attend.

- A training pamphlet has been included in your agenda packet. A couple of local municipalities are working on getting additional training options for Site Plan Review closer. Coordinate with Pat if you would like to attend.

Good of the Order

The Housing Task Force Committee is still being assembled.

Adjournment

The next regular meeting of the Boyne City Planning Commission is scheduled for Monday, February 20, 2017 at 5:00 pm in the Honeywell Meeting Room.

****Motion**

2017-01-16-10
Kozlowski moved, St. Dennis seconded, PASSED UNANIMOUSLY a motion to adjourn the January 16, 2017 meeting at 8:58 p.m.

Vice Chair Chris Frasz

Recording Secretary Pat Haver