

WHITEWATER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
Whitewater Township Hall, 5777 Vinton Road, Williamsburg, MI 49690
231-267-5141 Phone

REGULAR MEETING
APPROVED MINUTES
Wednesday, March 4, 2026, 7:00 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER:

Chair Stratton called the meeting to order at 7:02 p.m.
The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.
A microphone check was done.

Public Attendance On-site: 15 (approximately)
Zoom Attendance: 10 (approximately)

ROLL CALL: Secretary Peltonen called Roll.

Present:

Rene Stratton, Chair
Sadie Merchant, Vice Chair
Denise Peltonen, Secretary
Scott Trumbull, Member
Michael Sherman, Member
Rod Rebant, Member
Randy Mielnik, Township Board Trustee

A quorum was established.

New Planning Commission Member Mr. Rod Rebant was introduced by Chair Stratton.

Absent: None.

ALSO PRESENT: Recording Secretary Kay Held

SET/ADJUST AGENDA:

Delete "Review of ROWG Community Workshop Report" under the ROWG Report heading. This report, generated by the MSUE facilitator, is on the Township website.

Board Action: Ms. Peltonen made a motion to approve the Agenda as amended. Ms. Merchant seconded the motion.
VOTE: YEAS: All. NAYES: None. Motion carried.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

Ms. Merchant recused herself from the Public Hearing on Winery and Tasting Rooms, as she may pursue one in the future, in order to avoid perceived bias.

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mr. Jordan Nevarez, 11206 Munro Road, Williamsburg, MI 49690: In support of wineries and tasting rooms as they would allow for more value per acre beyond solely relying on fruit sales and retaining land and agriculture rather than selling it for development. This is in line with the Master Plan's objective of rural character preservation, agriculture production and agritourism. Value-added agriculture is how modern farming survives. The proposed Ordinance addresses concerns regarding building sizes, setbacks, time restrictions, event attendance and enforceability. It also creates jobs.

PUBLIC HEARING:

Public Hearing #1: ZDA Case #2026-01 – Split-Zoned Agricultural and Commercial:

Open Public Hearing / State Time:

Board Action: Mr. Mielnik made a motion to open the Public Hearing for ZDA Case #2026-01. Mr. Trumbull seconded the motion.

VOTE: YEAS: All. NAYES: None. Motion carried.

The Public Hearing opened at 7:12 p.m.

Request those attending sign attendance sheet:

Chair Stratton requested those wishing to comment please sign the Public Hearing Public Comment sheet.

State date of Public Hearing notice publication and newspaper published in:

The Notice of Public Hearing was published in the Traverse City Record Eagle on February 14, 2026.

State purpose of Public Hearing:

Applicant Jim Maitland spoke, stating his 80 acres was originally split by the new road. It was zoned Commercial for many years, but the zoning doesn't extend to the south end of the property. He referenced a narrow piece of land on the map in his application which is zoned Agriculture. He is requesting the approximate two-acre portion of his property zoned as Agriculture be rezoned as Commercial.

Brief Introductory Presentation (Zoning Administrator, Applicant/Agent, etc.): None.

Read any written comments received: None received.

Receive Public Comment:

Comments in the Township Hall:

Mr. Jeff Scroggins, 5677 North Broomhead, Williamsburg, MI 49690: Mr. Scroggins read aloud a letter of opposition. The integrity of the current 500' wide commercial corridor zoning could be in jeopardy due to setting precedent without concrete reasoning. He inquired whether the PC has or will look at other M-72 split-zoned parcels that may have a similar request. This could give property owners extended control of their preference for vacant land they may wish to part with regardless of impact to adjacent property owners. Other businesses appear to be functioning fine within the 500' limit.

Mr. Maitland is actively selling properties to increase the value of parcels and make them more attractive to a wider range of businesses. However, this is not favorable to adjacent property owners. It is also inconsistent with what other nearby commercial property owners have worked with. A rezoning request should come from a new property owner, making their case for change. There are no wetlands or utilities complicating these particular properties. He believes there is a risk of precedent in approving this request.

Mr. Mike Jacobson, Skegemog Point Road, Williamsburg, MI 49690: This is a small portion of the property to rezone as Commercial. It makes sense for the entire piece to be the same. The Township had a similar issue with AIS Construction where they did not know the zoning on part of their property was different. When they wanted it expand they had a nightmare. This request should be granted.

Comments via Zoom:

Mr. Carl Wroubel: Mr. Wroubel wished to speak before the Public Hearing but was not allowed in. The PC advised him the Public Comment is only allowed during Zoom during Public Hearings, not during general Public Comment portions.

Close Public Hearing:

Board Action: Mr. Trumbull made a motion to close the Public Hearing. Ms. Merchant seconded the motion.

VOTE: YEAS: All. NAYES: None. Motion carried.

The Public Hearing closed at 7:25 p.m.

PC DISCUSSION:

Ms. Peltonen: Rezoning the property would help with continuity of the Commercial District. Addressing split parcels has been discussed in the past; making them one district would provide for zoning consistency in the Township and would alleviate problems for property owners.

Mr. Rebant: No specific comments provided.

Mr. Mielnik: Favorable toward the rezoning. Split-zoned parcels can be problematic; AIS was an example of that. It is a small piece of property to rezone. He generally supports this action in this case and elsewhere.

Mr. Sherman: The fractional area being considered for rezoning is dysfunctional for farming. The owner has a good standing to ask for this change. Because the Commercial District is right there and there are many complications with split parcels, he would support the rezoning application.

Mr. Trumbull: Agrees with PC comments and making this change.

Ms. Merchant: In agreement with PC comments. For agriculture, the small portion is not very useful. There have been complications with other properties. Rezoning this piece of property would make sense.

Ms. Stratton: Agrees with PC comments. Additionally, it is in keeping with the Master Plan and Planning Principles of encouraging economic opportunities. It is consistent with the basic intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance. Split-zoning complicates development and hinders efficient land use. This change would not affect utilities and services. It was created due to a 500' overlay of Commercial District on M-72, which was set without respective property lines.

There would be no impact on traffic or negative effects on aesthetics. It is compatible with the site's property lines. It could potentially increase the property value by simplifying development. Chair Stratton is in favor of this request.

Mr. Mielnik believes these comments and findings should be forwarded in writing to the Township Board for consideration.

Board Action: Ms. Merchant made a motion that ZDA Case #2026-01 – Split-Zoned Agricultural and Commercial, be recommended for approval to the Board based on the comments received at tonight's meetings. Mr. Trumbull seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Rebant-Y, Mielnik-Y, Merchant-Y, Sherman-Y, Trumbull-Y, Peltonen-Y, Stratton-Y. Motion carried.

Public Hearing #2: ZDA Case #2026-02 – Add Winery and Tasting Room Ordinance as Special Use in Zone A:

Commissioner Merchant recused herself from the table.

Open Public Hearing / State Time:

Board Action: Ms. Stratton made a motion to open the Public Hearing ZDA Case #2026-02. Mr. Trumbull seconded the motion.

VOTE: YEAS: All. NAYES: None. Motion carried.

The Public Hearing opened at 7:34 p.m.

Request those attending sign attendance sheet:

Chair Stratton requested those wishing to comment please sign the Public Hearing public comment sheet.

State date of Public Hearing notice publication and newspaper published in:

The Notice of Public Hearing was published in the Traverse City Record Eagle on February 14, 2026.

State purpose of Public Hearing: Chair Stratton stated the Planning Commission is to consider the addition of a Winery and Tasting Room Ordinance as a Special Use in Zone A. The PC has been refining the proposed Ordinance and is seeking public input prior to moving forward. She explained it would allow wineries and cideries adjacent tasting rooms on properties of 20 contiguous acres in the Agriculture District. It would allow food service, retail sales of winery and farm-branded merchandise and beverages produced on the premises and incidental merchandise commonly associated with farm markets. It also provides for promotional activities and events to be held on-site. A Special Use Permit Site Plan Review would be required.

Brief Introductory Presentation (Zoning Administrator, Applicant/Agent, etc.): None.

Read any written comments received: Four emails in support of the proposed Ordinance were received from Gabrielle Barber/McLain, Nicki Indish, Lisa Bowerman, Doug Bowerman. Chair Stratton read them aloud.

Receive public comment:

Comments in the Township Hall:

Mr. Jordan Nevarez, 11206 Munro Road, Williamsburg, MI 49690: Reviewed the Master Plan's Planning Principle of preserving the Whitewater Township rural character. It also states to review and update zoning requirements to promote agricultural tourism. He believes it would allow farms to add different revenue streams amidst increased costs. A Winery Ordinance would allow agritourism to thrive. He values the rural character of the community.

Mr. Sam Simpson, 144 North Highland Drive: His family owns and operates several vineyards in northern Michigan/Leelanau Peninsula and tasting rooms across the state.

He provided an historical overview of the family farm and the financial challenges of commodity agriculture. In an effort for long-term sustainability, they added 30 acres of wine grapes. It provided value-added agriculture, wine production, agritourism and direct-to-consumer sales while preserving farmland, producing fruit and keeping the land in agriculture. The traditional model of growing and selling crops wholesale rarely provides income. Wineries, cideries, farm markets and agritourism have become important tools for farmers to remain economically viable.

The highest dollar use of most farmland is development, not farming. Sub-dividing farmland into housing lots almost always generates a higher immediate financial return than farming. Most farmers do not wish to be developers but rather stewards of the land maintaining open space, productive farmland and the natural beauty of Northern Michigan. Their efforts should be supported by the community.

The proposed Ordinance is thoughtful and balanced and recognizes wineries/cideries as a natural extension of fruit farming and rural agriculture character. It establishes reasonable standards and oversight in the planning process.

The PC's responsibility is to ensure the intention to preserve agricultural land evolves with the realities of today's farmer. The policies supporting agriculture must evolve as well. He encourages the adoption of the Ordinance.

Ms. Jenny Doherty, 10806 Elk Lake Road, Williamsburg, MI 49690: Understands keeping agriculture. Disagrees with the 100' setback; 100' from her property line with up to a 7,000 sq. ft. building and 100 people until 10:00 p.m. is close. She asked the PC to consider expanding the distance from the property line.

Mr. Dillon Thompson 10347 Elk Lake Road, Williamsburg, MI 49690: Is from a family of small business owners and has friends in the farming industry; however, many of whom are debating selling their property. If communities don't start adapting changes for farmers, the industry will change for everyone. Farmers and this Ordinance should be supported.

Mr. Matt Foglesong, 9000 Gay Road, Williamsburg, MI 49690: His family owned one of the last operating ranches in Los Angeles, which no longer exists after redistricting and being sold to developers as well as the increasing cost of goods sold within agriculture. That's what happening in this community. Costs to create commodity-based produce continue to rise. We need to create an environment that future generations can also operate in, and create opportunities to offset farmers' operations. The current environment is not sustainable. He and his family wholeheartedly support this Ordinance.

Mr. Paul Hubbell, Williamsburg, MI: Is a third generation farmer who owns a substantial amount of land here; his children are fourth generation farmers. He agrees with the comments this evening and that it is important to keep agriculture going. He previously served on the Whitewater Township Board for 20+years and saw this coming. He has had many ag friends go out of business. He wants to know that his farm will remain in ag long after he is gone. He encouraged the PC to approve this Ordinance.

Mr. Hubbell provided the signatures of 76 people who support the Winery Ordinance and provided it to the Planning Commission for the record.

Mr. Mike Jacobson, Skegemog Point Road, Williamsburg, MI 49690: Agrees with nearly every comment tonight. The Master Plan supports retaining agriculture and the rural setting. Cherry farming is in decline. This Ordinance would allow farmers to expand. He has past experience sitting on the PC; many people in this room and community support the Planning Commission supporting agriculture. He fully supports this Ordinance and would have signed Mr. Hubbell's document given the opportunity.

Ms. Sadie Merchant, 10961 Elk Lake Road, Williamsburg, MI 49690: (Ms. Merchant had recused herself from this portion of the meeting.) She is speaking as a private resident, not a Member of the Planning Commission. She understands concerns of neighboring properties with regard to the 100' setback in the Ordinance; i.e., noise, parking, etc. The Ordinance addresses noise via the Township's Noise Ordinance and specifically states it must be quieter than a verbal conversation at property lines. In an agricultural district, all types of equipment can be operated during any hours, right up to the property line. Large buildings can be built and animals can be housed.

The proposed Ordinance sets clear restrictions with the setback and noise concerns and requires an individual Site Plan Review. This Review allows the PC to set Conditions. Township and MLCC (Michigan Liquor Control Commission) requirements and restrictions must be met and maintained. The approval process is on an individual case basis.

Comments Via Zoom:

Ms. Heidi Vollmuth/Greater Good, 8388 Winnie Lane, Williamsburg, MI 49690: Explained concerns about setbacks of 100'; marihuana setbacks are 300'. She asked for consideration of extending beyond 100'. Believes there could be some noise disturbance to neighbors.

There is no Civil Infraction Ordinance, and the Noise Ordinance is very weak and difficult to enforce. She is concerned with attendance of 100 people as many events are higher attended. Also has concern with an 11:00 p.m. end time of event operations and promotional activity. Understands the PC can place Conditions at a Site Plan Review. Neighbors should be protected.

Mr. Carl Wroubel: Was on the Planning Commission until January, 2026, and involved on the Master Plan and this proposed Winery Ordinance. He highly supports it.

Close Public Hearing:

Board Action: Mr. Sherman made a motion to close the Public Hearing. Mr. Trumbull seconded the motion.
VOTE: YEAS: All. NAYES: None. Motion carried.

Note: The Public Hearing closed at 8:09 p.m.

PC Discussion:

Mr. Trumbull: There is overwhelming support from the community. While setback issues have been brought up, the PC has researched and discussed this matter in-depth, prior to his appointment to the PC.

Ms. Stratton: She referenced verbiage in the proposed Ordinance about an accessory use to a winery, brewery, distillery; she suggested adding the definitions of breweries and distilleries. She also proposed wineries and tasting rooms be separated by a minimum distance of one mile. She agrees that the Site Plan Review offers the opportunity to consider concerns of neighboring properties. The discrepancy between the hours of promotional activity and events should both be 10am-10pm (not one 10-10 and one 10-11). Any items in the proposed Ordinance not covered in the Noise Ordinance should be **included** added. One of these is to specify noise volume to be at 60 decibels or less. She suggested all 20 acres must be zoned A1, referencing issues with split-zoned properties. She supports this Ordinance; it is in keeping with the Master Plan in maintaining rural character by offering support to farmers. It promotes economic progress, follows noise and fire codes, and encourages economic feasibility of farms.

Mr. Sherman: Although relatively new to the Planning Commission, he participated in past workshops and Master Plan sessions, and believes steps were taken to learn what the community wanted. Surveys showed the most support for agritourism. The PC has studied this Ordinance in-depth. This is a Special Use approval, which gives the approving body latitude to make recommendations.

Concerns about noise and proximity of a large structure would be considered when reviewing the Site Plan and looking at how they impact the surrounding area. The Special Use nature of this Ordinance allows for review and setting Conditions if deemed necessary. He supports this Ordinance.

Mr. Mielnik: He is generally in favor of the Ordinance. Any concern involves noise and reliance on Ordinance #39 is problematic. The issue of noise is compounded by amplified noise and entertainment. He does not see the connection between outdoor amplified music and the noise from agriculture production. More work needs to be done regarding noise concerns.

The map of Whitewater Township agricultural properties was projected on the screen showing Ag properties of 20 acres or more. There are many split zoned parcels. For clarity, it would be ideal if an entire parcel was zone for one district.

Mr. Rebant: Likes the direction the PC has taken on this project for agriculture and farmers. They can't always count on local fruit supply. The 100' setback may be on the fringe of a problem; he suggested this be further debated by the PC. He supports this Ordinance.

Ms. Peltonen: Has concerns about the maximum footprint of a 7,000 sq. ft. property and the 100' setback. She calculated maximum occupancy rates of facilities of different sizes, considering 25% allocation for a tasting room. Other concerns include noise and parking. There is no parking allowed in the setback. Potential events every weekend could be problematic for residents. She calculated required parking spaces based on potential number of attendees.

A survey is being planned for Short-term Rentals. She would like to ask for more community input on wineries/cideries and suggested investigating whether questions regarding this subject might be included in the STR survey.

Extensive group discussion followed including Definitions, on-site production requirements, origin of grown fruit products, minimum amount of product grown by the licensee and Special Use aspects. Mr. Sherman offered to conduct research about these topics and create specific language. Legal counsel has reviewed the proposed Ordinance in its current form; several items were noted.

The PC acknowledged Mr. Simpson and inquired about his related experience in writing similar Ordinances. He stated he has assisted with the development of three Ordinances in the state and opened 24 locations.

The PC also discussed grow and processing requirements, collaboration among growers, Site Plans and enforceability with Mr. Simpson. Noise concerns are addressed through a Nuisance/Noise Ordinance; 60db is the common maximum level. The largest setbacks he has witnessed were 120'. He suggested the Ordinance be of a broader nature and the more specific issues are addressed via a Special Use application. The proposed Ordinance is very similar to what he has seen in other Townships.

Some changes will be made to the proposed Ordinance; i.e., Definitions and hours of operation suggested by Chair Stratton, and specifying maximum noise decibels. Mr. Mielnik stated the Noise Ordinance needs to be reviewed and amplified outdoor music should not be allowed until there is an approved Noise Ordinance.

Commissioner Merchant rejoined the PC at the table at the end of this discussion.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Regular Meeting Minutes of 2/4/26: Amendments: Yes. A minor clarification was identified.

Board Action: Mr. Sherman made a motion to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes of 2/4/26 as amended. Ms. Merchant seconded the motion.

VOTE: YEAS: All. NAYES: None. Motion carried.

CORRESPONDENCE:

Chair Stratton noted correspondence that had been received during the Wineries Ordinance Public Hearing.

Township Clerk Hoeksema received an email from Acme Township providing a link for the distribution and 63-day review period of their proposed Master Plan. Mr. Mielnik noted some issues that may need clarification on Existing/Future Land Use. He will prepare information for the next meeting.

REPORTS / PRESENTATIONS / ANNOUNCEMENTS / COMMENTS:

Zoning Administrator – Deb Graber: ZA Graber’s report was in the meeting packet. She additionally reported she attended the “Stand by Your Plan” presentation by Jill Bahm of Giffels Webster this evening. It was a very good program and emphasized the importance of having a good Master Plan and Ordinances that reinforce the Master Plan. She left a copy of the Stand by Your Plan packet in Chair Stratton’s office mailbox.

February was a slightly slower month for Zoning. There is one pending Land Division. There are no ZBA appeals scheduled at this time. At the advice of the new attorney, she will be including complaints in her report once they are closed out. A court date is scheduled on 3/13/26 regarding the Elk Lake Trail Short-term Rental suit.

Planning Commission Chair – Rene Stratton: Ms. Stratton noted Mr. Trumbull’s research on the Noise Ordinance, a potential Storm Water Ordinance, and Events. He will be distributing this information to PC Members via email. These topics will be revisited.

Township Board Representative – Randy Mielnik: Mr. Mielnik reported the Township is working on its budget and will be holding a Public Hearing. There has been mention of scheduling a Joint Planning Commission/Township Board meeting to discuss the Short-term Rental issue and potential survey. No dates have been discussed yet.

ZBA Representative – Scott Trumbull: No meeting. No report.

ROWG (Resident Outreach Work Group) – Community Workshop Review: Chair Stratton stated new PC Member Mr. Rod Rebant will be taking over the lead role in the ROWG and the Capital Improvement Plan. The April meeting was cancelled in order to give him and Chair Stratton time to get up to speed on the matter. They will also be working on a road map for the possible STR Ordinance. She asked that the Joint Planning Commission/Township Board meeting be scheduled sooner than later in order to move forward with the STR survey. The ROWG would like to hold their second community workshop in June when snowbirds are back for the season.

She updated the White Papers on Michigan townships and their current STR Ordinances with further information on General and Police Ordinances. It has been added to the White Papers notebook and is available for public review.

Additional Items: None.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Giffels Webster – Zoning Ordinance Review:

Planner Andy Aamodt and his associate Ian Hoag joined the PC remotely to review the draft changes as of 2/4/26. Previous reviews and discussions were held on 10/1/25, 11/24/25 and 2/4/26.

The PC and Planners reviewed in detail the changes; i.e., edits, additions and deletions in the following sections:

-PUD Section Update

-Development Process

-M-72 Corridor Overlay District ((formerly Corridor Overlay Planned Unit Development – COPUD)

-Condominium Development Standards

-PUD Section Update: Reviewed changes from the last meeting. Additionally, they added information to Modifications to the Zoning Ordinance, PUD Amendment, Development Agreement and Expiration of a PUD. They also discussed PUD Map information and Density and Clustering. Other minor edits were made throughout the document. There was extensive discussion.

-Development Process: Reviewed changes from the last meeting. Additional focus was on Definitions, verbiage under Site Plan Review Requirements and Procedures, Standards for Decisions, Failure to Initiate Construction, Accessory Buildings, Land Use Permits, Application and Fee, Hearing and Decision, Duration of Land Use Approval, Transfer of Special Use Permit, Construction Code Permits and Land Use Permit Review. Other minor edits were made throughout the document. There was extensive discussion.

Board Action: Ms. Peltonen made a motion to extend the meeting beyond the three-hour mark. Mr. Rebant seconded the motion.

VOTE: YEAS: All. NAYES: None. Motion carried.

Note: A five-minute break was taken at 10:02 p.m. The meeting resumed at 10:08 p.m.

-M-72 Corridor Overlay District ((formerly Corridor Overlay Planned Unit Development – COPUD): Reviewed changes from the last meeting. Additional focus was on the Delineation of the M-72 Corridor Overlay District, General Requirements, Screening, Access Management, Landscaping Standards, Signage. There was also Map discussion and review. Other minor edits were made throughout the document. There was extensive discussion.

-Condominium Development Standards: Reviewed changes from the last meeting. Additional focus was on PUD Applicability, General Requirements and numerous sections in Standards and Design for Site Condominium Developments. Other minor edits were made throughout the document. There was extensive discussion.

Additional Discussion: The PC discussed receipt of a clean copy for the April meeting and planning for a Public Hearing in May to present the first bundle of the proposed Amended Zoning Ordinance to the public. During discussion, Mr. Aamodt commended Zoning Administrator Graber for her work in Zoning.

Private Roads Ordinance Update: Mr. Mielnik stated the draft Ordinance has been forwarded to the Township Board and they have sent it to legal counsel for review.

By-Laws Update: The 2/4/26 amended version of the PC By-Laws was in the meeting packet. Chair Stratton suggested a minor correction in Section 3(j) under Sub-Committee Operations, item (d) where it states “Minutes of meetings shall be prepared in the same format.....” to state: “Minutes and Agenda of meetings shall be prepared in the same format....”

Secretary Peltonen will make this correction.

Fence Ordinance Memo: Mr. Mielnik reported at the last meeting, there was consensus among the Planning Commission regarding proposed Zoning Amendment 2025-05 on Fence Standards for him to prepare a written recommendation to forward to the Township Board.

He authored and distributed a detailed memo for the PC to review. It will be sent to the Township Board outlining the proposed Amendment, Public Hearing and position and concerns of the Planning Commission. No action has been taken by the PC at this time, and the PC would like to work on the complex matters related to fence regulation in order to develop a more complete Amendment.

Board Action: Ms. Stratton made a motion to recommend denial of Zoning Amendment #2025-05 on the Fence Ordinance for reasons listed in the 3/4/26 memo and forward the recommendation and information to the Township Board. Mr. Trumbull seconded the motion.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Trumbull-Y Merchant-Y, Stratton-Y, Mielnik-Y, Sherman-Y, Rebant-Y, Peltonen-Y. Motion carried.

Annual Budget: In the meeting packet. PC Members reviewed the edited 2026-27 proposed budget and discussed changes and variables such as professional services (Giffels Webster, Gourdie Fraser, LIAA, Eagle View, Recording Secretary), surveys and the second STR community workshop. Anticipated costs for surveys and proposals received to date were also discussed for budget consideration. Each budget center was reviewed.

Annual Report: In the meeting packet. PC Members reviewed the Annual Report, and discussed edits and additions. They also reviewed 2026 goals in the report and made additions. It was suggested an Executive Committee be formed, comprised of Members of the Planning Commission, to perform quarterly budget reviews. Chair Stratton will make the final edits.

Board Action: Mr. Mielnik made a motion to forward the 2025 Whitewater Township Planning Commission Annual Report to the Township Board as amended. Ms. Peltonen seconded the motion.

VOTE: YEAS: All. NAYES: None. Motion carried.

NEXT MEETING: Planning Commission Regular Meeting: **Wednesday, April 1, 2026, at 7:00 p.m., Township Hall**

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Mr. Mike Jacobson, Skegemog Point Road: The rural farming community is a reason many people move to this area. The amount of people who have moved here has unintentionally changed the community. He encouraged the PC to pay attention to what the gentleman from Good Harbor Vineyards said. He is correct that over-regulating a Winery and Tasting Room Ordinance is the wrong direction. Let Special Land Use work where it is needed. Ms. Merchant's comment about the 100' setback is correct. Farmers work at all hours, make noise, and get along with their neighbors.

He disagrees with the PC's decision that people are not allowed to comment via Zoom. The PC utilized it to communicate and conduct business with the Planners tonight. Both are manners of conducting business via a computer. Citizen input is important; many people are snowbirds or elderly. Zoom comments should be allowed.

PC DISCUSSION / COMMENTS:

Chair Stratton noted the MSU Extension report on the recent STR community workshop is in the meeting packet. She asked Commissioners to review the report, and it will be discussed at the next meeting. It will also be posted on the Township website.

Ms. Merchant believes the PC should consider returning to Special Meetings dedicated to Giffels Webster Zoning Ordinance bundle reviews as the original purpose was to avoid extensive lengthy Regular Meetings. The very late hour of this evening's meeting makes it difficult to properly address all items on the Agenda. There was group discussion; the PC will return to Special Meeting formats when the next bundle review begins with Giffels Webster.

PC Members looked at potential dates in the event a Joint Planning Commission/Township Board meeting is scheduled in April or May. Available April dates are: April 13, April 16, April 20, April 22, April 27 and April 29.

CONTINUING EDUCATION:

Citizen Planner In-person Workshop: Mr. Trumbull, Ms. Merchant and Ms. Stratton will be participating in the in-person Citizen Planner workshop. Mr. Rebant is taking the online program.

ADJOURNMENT:

Board Action: Ms. Stratton made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Peltonen seconded the motion.
VOTE: YEAS: All. NAYES: None. Motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 11:09 p.m.

Submitted by: Kay Z. Held, Recording Secretary