

Approved:

**Meeting of
September 21, 2020**

Record of the proceedings of the Boyne City Planning Commission meeting held via Zoom on Monday September 21, 2020 at 5:00 pm.

Call to Order

Vice Chair Ross called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m. and discussed the rules and procedures for the Zoom meeting.

Roll Call

Present: Jim Baumann, Larry Chute, Skylar MacNaughton, Tom Neidhamer, Rose Newton, Jeff Ross and Monica Ross
Absent: Nichole Moblo and Aaron Place

Chute moved, M. Ross seconded to excuse the absence of Moblo and Place

**Excused Absences
Motion**

2020-9-21-2

Roll Call:

Ayes: Baumann, Chute, MacNaughton, Neidhamer, Newton, J. Ross and M. Ross

Nays: None

Absent: Moblo and Place

Abstain: None

Motion Carries

Meeting Attendance

City Officials/Staff: Planning and Zoning Director Scott McPherson, Executive Assistant Barb Brooks and Recording Secretary Pat Haver

Public Present: Two in attendance via the Zoom platform

**Consent Agenda
Motion**

Neidhamer moved, MacNaughton seconded, a motion to approve the consent agenda, the Planning Commission minutes from August 17, 2020 as presented.

2020-9-21-3

Roll Call:

Ayes: Baumann, Chute, MacNaughton, Neidhamer, Newton, J. Ross and M. Ross

Nays: None

Absent: Moblo and Place

Abstain: None

Motion Carries

**Citizen comments on
Non-Agenda Items**

None

**Reports of Officers,
Boards and Standing
Committees**

None

Unfinished Business

None

New Business

**Brook Walsh Preliminary
Development Review for
Industrial Park Lots 3 & 4**

Planning Director McPherson gave a brief overview of his staff report. The applicant had shared with staff prior to the meeting that he had a conflict with another meeting, and may not be available for attendance. Due to this fact and that there were no preliminary ideas presented for consideration, the commission, decided to wait until the applicant had an opportunity to share with them his preliminary ideas.

**Review & discussion
housing potential in the**

Planning Director McPherson provided in the agenda packets Zoning Ordinance Articles XIII (Regional Commercial / Industrial District RC/ID) and XIV Planned Industrial

Industrial Zoning Districts

District (PID) for review and discussion for possibilities of housing opportunities in the Industrial Park. Keeping in mind, any plan changes for the RC district will become effective for the ID district also.

Steve Schnell: Charlevoix County Housing Ready Program Director – I want to thank and applaud Boyne City for the efforts in looking at and are willing to help in creating housing opportunities in the area. Annually in Boyne City alone, we could absorb 53 homes that come in under \$225,000 or less and 154 housing units that are for rent at \$800.00 or less. The Industrial Park would be a good place for low impact units relative to industrial uses. Areas that would be attractive were mentioned as along the river front, newly established bike path, and jobs. Young couples or employees are looking for those amenities when trying to determine employment locations. Building attractive high density units for residences could be a priority. There is a market for affordable workforce housing.

Board Discussion

Chute – Are parcels in the Industrial Park at a lower cost than other city parcels and would this be a boon for the developer?

McPherson – I am uncertain how the market rate is determined.

Chute – I could see housing along the fringes to the Industrial Park with a buffer zone

McPherson – Housing would need to be considered as a primary use or an accessory use? A primary residential use in the Industrial Park is not a good idea, but an accessory use as a component of the primary use has some value, like work force/employee housing. To have certain parcels within the park designated as residential only, I don't think that would be the way to go.

Clute – I was intending a possible rezoning along the edges of the Industrial Park.

J. Ross – Would you clarify the difference between accessory use and conditional use in this discussion.

McPherson – Accessory use is designated by right and has to be associated with a primary use. This already allows limited housing for watchmen or caretakers residential options when associated with a business.

J. Ross – Is that an amendment to the ordinance that housing is supplemental to the established business?

McPherson – It would need to be a part of the business already located on the same property.

J. Ross – Then a conditional use would require them to come before the Planning Commission with any development plans.

McPherson – Yes

Neidhamer – To give you historical perspective, discussion had begun in this area as a possible development site prior to Covid. There are over 1,000 jobs in the Industrial Park and employers are having difficulty filling those jobs because of the lack of housing, transportation, day care and wages. Lexamar, one of the biggest employers was beginning to look at possible plans for building employee housing. The schools have opened up classrooms for 3 and 4 year olds, helping to reduce one of the determining factors for child care. In my opinion, I feel that this is on the right track to encourage housing development.

Schnell – I support Scott's assessment that accessory use is more appropriate for housing than conditional use. I would encourage you to look at rezoning parts of the Industrial Park to residential. Possible property transfer deeds with restrictions might be the most appealing way to proceed.

M. Ross – I have several issues with housing in the Industrial Park. A few years back when the pellet plant went into production, the residents were in an uproar over the smoke, and now you are looking at the possibility of having residential units in the Industrial Park? Putting houses close to businesses could cause some potential safety

issues. If you tie a residence to a particular business and they pull out, who would govern the rental units then? I don't feel that housing is appropriate in the interior of the Industrial Park, maybe along M75 with the caveat that it be high density housing and not individual homes. Maybe rezone along the river with pleasing aesthetic looking buildings and landscaping.

Newton – I emphatically echo Monica's points. Our duties as Planning Commissioners is to look at future uses and not current needs. The Industrial Park has the potential for growth. Yes, we do need housing; make it higher density housing in the residential areas to help eliminate some of the safety issues with having houses in the Industrial Park.

Neidhamer – Monica and Rose, would you be opposed to having 2nd floor apartments?

M. Ross – No, but only for caretakers, not as creative housing for the Industrial Park. The interior of the Industrial Park is not appropriate for housing. Have we looked at working with the developer on the Jefferson Street project for higher density? What about the city owned Moyer property near the DPW facility; there is currently an apartment complex in the area.

Baumann – I would like to see or hear what Brook Walsh is thinking about doing development wise. The EDC oversees the Industrial Park, has this concept been brought before that board, and what do they think?

McPherson – No this has not been brought before the EDC board. Brook Walsh has not brought forward any plans, he is looking for feedback from the Planning Commission.

Chute – I agree with Monica and Rose and am not in favor of housing in the Industrial Park unless it is rezoned along the fringes. Keep the Industrial Park as an Industrial Park.

Newton – If you put residential on the second floor of a commercial building, you would have the follow commercial codes, which are highly cost prohibitive.

Chute – It sounds like there are multiple other ways to address the housing shortage.

Neidhamer – Let's hear from the board overseeing the Industrial Park for their thoughts and perspective.

McPherson – I believe that Mr. Brooks will come before you one way or another, and I think that tonight's discussion will be beneficial to him moving forward. He may just decide to bring only the commercial designs to you for consideration. I can't see changing the ordinance based on this discussion anytime soon, may want to reflect on the other comments by possibly changing some of the other districts as other opportunities. Can run this by the EDC/LDFA boards for feedback, staff will get with the City Manager.

5 year review of the Master Plan

Planning Director McPherson discussed the mandatory review of the Master Plan. According to state mandates, the Master Plan must be reviewed every 5 years for updates and/or amendments. Because this is a census year, would it be better to wait for that information in order to incorporate into the chapters where needed? The amendment process is quite lengthy and costly, so to do the amendments at one time would be best. McPherson thought that the census information would be available and distributed in 2021 – 2022 so a thorough review could be done at that time to include that data. With board discussion, it was felt that the goals and objectives were still pertinent along with their sub points. Chapter 3 Future Land Use and Chapter 4 Implementation and Plan Adoption were both overall still accurate; however, for RRC requirements to be met possibly consider a separate document with a listing of potential redevelopment sites in the city that can be reviewed annually and have the document mentioned in the Master Plan. It may be worthwhile to come up with at least 10 sites to consider as some of the sites currently listed have already been developed. Several suggestions to consider for redevelopment were brought up; some of them were privately owned and the owner must be willing to participate in the program. The core downtown is the location that is targeted for redevelopment locations. Questions were brought up about the language changes that have been made in the Zoning Ordinance

this past year. Grammatical corrections and terms can wait until the time the full revisions are done. During this process it would allow for community input at the time of making revisions.

Staff Report

- The City Commission has adopted the IMPC and it will become effective September 29, 2020.
- Lakeview Village has received their approval from the State for the additional sites, and staff has been working with them for finalization of the interior sidewalks and landscaping
- Although it is in Wilson Township, wanted to advise that IMI is beginning a major expansion project for additional building space of 37,000 sq. ft. adjacent to their current building. They have reacquired ownership of Lot 5; so possibly may have additional plans in the future.
- October 22nd is the date for the upcoming housing summit. This year it will be a virtual event. If you would like to attend, please contact the city front office before this coming Friday to get the “early bird” reduced registration fee

Good of the Order

- Chute - What is the status of the Jefferson Street project? The 1st reading has already been held with the City Commission, and the 2nd reading is scheduled for October 13th at 7:00 pm
- Chute - What is the status of their FOIA request? Staff has not had any further contact.
- Chute - Short term rental ordinance, what is the status of those discussions? With no hotel in town homes are being purchased that are second or vacation homes, which is counterproductive to our housing shortage dilemma. The city needs to make this a priority to look into and get developed. There are areas in town that have several vacation rentals within the same block, and that is not appropriate. I personally feel that they are commercial enterprises and that is not allowed within residential areas.
- J. Ross – What is the status of the Lofts on Lake Street? McPherson – They intend to continue to move forward
- Newton – What is the status of the house purchased by Northern Homes on Main Street? McPherson – They are currently obtaining a survey for the lots, to look at exactly what kind of area they have to develop.

Adjournment

**Motion

The next regular meeting of the Boyne City Planning Commission is scheduled for Monday, October 19, 2020 at 5:00 p.m.

Newton moved, Chute seconded a motion to adjourn the September 21, 2020 meeting at 6:18 pm

2020-9-21-10

Roll Call:

Ayes: Baumann, Chute, MacNaughton, Neidhamer, Newton, J. Ross and M. Ross

Nays: None

Absent: Moblo and Place

Abstain: None

Motion Carries

Vice Chair Jeff Ross

Recording Secretary Pat Haver