

**OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS  
MARQUETTE CITY PLANNING COMMISSION  
June 18th, 2024**

A regular meeting of the Marquette City Planning Commission was duly called and held at 6:00p.m. on Tuesday, June 18th, 2024, in the Commission Chambers at City Hall. An audio/video recording of this meeting is available online [here](#).

**ROLL CALL**

Planning Commission (PC) members present: W. Premeau, M. Rayner, K. Granger, D. Kaltsas, C. Gottlieb, S. Lawry, Chair S. Mittlefehldt  
PC Members absent: Vice Chair K. Clegg, D. Fetter  
Staff present: City Planner & Zoning Administrator D. Stensaas, Zoning Official A. Landers

**AGENDA**

*It was moved by C. Gottlieb, seconded by M. Rayner, and carried 7-0 to approve the agenda as presented.*

**MINUTES**

The minutes of 06-04-24 were approved as presented, by consent.

**CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

None was stated.

**CITIZENS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE COMMISSION ON AGENDA ITEMS**

No comments were provided.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**A. 03-REZ-06-24 - Rezoning Request for a portion of 446 E. Crescent Street**

Zoning Official A. Landers stated:

The Planning Commission is being asked to make a recommendation to the City Commission regarding a request to rezone the property located at 446 E. Crescent Street which is zoned Planned Unit Development – PUD, to be zoned Mixed-Use - M-U. She showed the Staff Report and application materials, including the area map, block map, photos of the site, and the Future Land Use Map and Proposed Zoning Map from the Community Master Plan, and read an item of correspondence that was emailed to staff earlier in the day by the applicant (appended to agenda) in which the applicant designated Mr. Matthew Treado as his representative.

S. Mittlefehldt asked if the applicant would like to address the request.

Matt Treado, 2915 Parkview Dr., representing the applicant, stated:

He was at the Planning Commission on behalf of Tom Taylor, applicant, to discuss and answer any questions regarding the rezoning case. He said this is the first step of rezoning and lot split process for this property and said there was some confusion with the legal description that needed to be cleaned up and getting both properties within the same Mixed-Use zoning would be appropriate and accurate. Once the rezoning is complete, an evaluation of allowable uses will direct the client on how to use the property best to positively benefit the City of Marquette.

S. Lawry asked Mr. Treado if the two parcels with the same owner are being split into smaller lots.

Mr. Treado said that there is not a current plan to split these parcels into smaller lots. There will be a feasibility evaluation to determine what is the best use of that space.

S. Mittlefehldt asked what the applicant was referring to when they stated “community engagement to gather ideas”, per the letter the PC received from them.

Mr. Treado said he wasn't sure, but he thought it would involve communicating with Planning/Zoning City staff for feedback and what the community's interests and needs might be, with an extensive look into the housing needs and information currently available.

S. Mittlefehldt opened the public hearing.

Ms. Cheryl Kaye, 741 Cedar St., asked what ADA housing was, and what a PUD development is and how it is different from multi-use housing.

S. Mittlefehldt said that ADA is the American Disability Act, and it would create more handicap accessible housing. She said that a PUD is a Planned Unit Development and allows developers some flexibility with what they're doing while working closely with the city for appropriate site use, and that Mixed-Use zoning has standards in the Land Development Code.

City Planner & Zoning Administrator D. Stensaas said PUDs require a contract with the City and very specific with what is allowed to be done on the property, and that there is an agreement that the City signs off on if they agree to the PUD proposal and limits what can be done at that property from that point forward.

A. Landers said the initial reason for the PUD was the property was originally zoned for Multiple Family Residential, but they wanted commercial use over 20 years ago. She also showed an image of the page from the Land Development Code showing the Permitted and Special land uses for the Mixed-Use zoning district on the monitors.

S. Mittlefehldt said, referring to the image, that the left-hand side of the Mixed-Use Zoning table are all permitted uses once rezoned, and that Special Land Use categories are shown on the right-hand side of the table and can be applied for through the Planning Commission's review, also allowing public comment.

Ms. Kaye asked are both columns for PUD?

S. Mittlefehldt said no, both columns are for Mixed-Use, and this district emphasizes how residential and commercial are compatible.

Ms. Kaye said so right now we don't know what is going to be put in there, we're just looking at zoning.

Mr. Treado said there will be an evaluation period then an application will have to be resubmitted to the City for their approval. If it's a Special Land Use, we would have another public hearing and go in front of the Planning Commission for review. This is purely just to change the zoning.

S. Mittlefehldt said, just so you are aware too, e all things allowed under the Mixed-Use category and are good examples of Mixed-Use commercial development that are compatible with the surrounding areas.

Ms. Kaye asked once it's decided what the plan is for the use of the property, is there another meeting where public comments are allowed?

S. Mittlefehldt said if it's something that requires a Special Land Use permit but if it is a Permitted Use, then it's allowed with no hearing required.

Ms. Kaye asked if a bar would be allowed.

S. Mittlefehldt said anything that serves alcohol would be a Special Land Use permit.

Ms. Kaye asked if there are any height restrictions.

S. Mittlefehldt said 44' is the maximum height and A. Landers confirmed that figure.

Ms. Kaye asked, because they live next door, will there be another notification once things start moving along?

S. Mittlefehldt confirmed only if a Special Land Use permit is required.

*It was moved by M. Rayner, seconded by D. Kaltsas, and carried 7-0 to suspend the rules for discussion.*

M. Rayner had no comment.

S. Mittlefehldt said the future Land Use Plan identified this area as a Mixed-Use area and we've seen success with other Mixed-Use developments in this neighborhood.

C. Gottlieb asked how the 2015 Master Plan identified this site.

D. Stensaas said the confusion is the Land Use map should have shown both those parcels as PUD, and that it looks like two parcels but legally it's described as one parcel. He said an error was made in the *Zoning Map* regarding the portion east of the railroad corridor, the west side of Lakeshore Blvd, and it was designated [on that map] as a Mixed-Use parcel. He also said that the *Future Land Use* map showed Mixed-Use for both parcels, and that the future land use map is what is consulted when someone proposes a different type of use on the property, namely through the rezoning process.

C. Gottlieb asked if the error was in 2019.

D. Stensaas said yes, when the Land Development Code was adopted, and that the portion on the west side of Lakeshore Blvd. and east of the railroad corridor was erroneously coded as Mixed-Use on the Proposed Zoning Map, which then became the law after it was adopted. He also said that the PUD contract is still in effect on all of that land because it's one parcel. He said that it was a minor error because that portion of the parcel is undeveloped, and it didn't have any affect on anything actually being done there as far as land use.

S. Mittlefehldt said the main consideration should be if it's an appropriate location for Mixed-Use development. Referring to the zoning map, she discussed the zoning districts in the surrounding area, with Mixed-Use to the east and west and residential to the north and south.

D. Kaltsas said Mixed-Use is an appropriate use as it is in the Future Land Use Map, and that will allow for other uses than just residential.

K. Granger said a concern is the labeling as the same parcel because they are very far from each other and the one on Lakeshore Blvd is quite small. She asked how do we [the Planning Commission] look at as one parcel as they are split so far apart?

S. Mittlefehldt said that related to K. Granger's question, she was also wondering asked A. Landers to confirm the Mixed-Use zoning district allows a zero-foot front yard setback and that the extent of that would be all along Lakeshore Boulevard.

A. Landers said the portion of the parcel on Lakeshore Blvd. has frontage on Lakeshore Blvd. as well as frontage on Crescent St., and that it is the same thing with the portion of the parcel to the west, which has frontages and Crescent St. and Cedar Street.

S. Mittlefehldt said that is something to consider in a Mixed-Use area because we want to create and maintain a pedestrian friendly environment. She also noted that approval would include setbacks,

permitted uses, everything.

Mr. Treado said speaking to the proximity to Lakeshore Blvd. and impact of the proximity a building may have to sidewalks, as the survey stakes show, the edge of the property is pretty far in off of Lakeshore Blvd., as you can see from the location of the property line [indicating aerial photo-maps shown on the monitors]. He said that a building would not go up to the sidewalk as the property line is set back quite a bit from the sidewalk, so the zero front setback does allow to have some building space for an unorthodox development but given the amount of setback of the property from Lakeshore Blvd. it should not be much of an issue concerning any impacts on pedestrian pathway.

S. Lawry asked Mr. Treado is Quick Trophy exiting the building?

Mr. Treado said Quick Trophy is in the process of updating their lease and it's still a possible Light Industrial zoning and that might have to come back to the Planning Commission for Special Land Use upon the approval of Mixed-Use zoning.

D. Stensaas said one of the proposed LDC amendments would allow Quick Trophy would meet the use and standards of Low-impact Light Industrial as a permitted use if LDC amendments are approved by the City Commission, so a Special Land Use permit would not be required. He said that the nature of uses there has changed quite a bit over time, and it was first approved for the PUD, there were injection molding machines being used in that building – producing nasty gases, smells and loud noise - but that Quick Trophy is now just assembling parts with hand tools and doing some 3D printing, so the impact has changed quite a bit over the years.

S. Lawry asked staff if there had been any discussion at the city level about vacating the railroad corridor in the future. D. Stensaas said no.

S. Lawry said one of the reasons Mixed-Use and the PUD were permitted here is because it was originally an industrial hub, including Consolidated Fuel and Lumber Co., Cyr Bottled Gas, and Department of Interior - Fish & Wildlife all bordering this parcel at the intersection. He said that the parcel has evolved into uses much more compatible with a residential neighborhood and would like to see it continue in that direction.

C. Gottlieb said rezoning this site to Mixed-Use, for both sides, would be compatible with the 2015 Master Plan, which we are currently still operating under until the new one is adopted. It also meets the requirements of the Land Development Code. He asked staff for confirmation.

D. Stensaas confirmed that Mixed-Use zoning would be compatible with the Future Land Use map.

C. Gottlieb said in the Master Plan [revision] being presented now, the development of the east side of 446 E. Crescent St. is compatible and it might be desirable to have some retail there, similar to where Fred's Pack-n-Ship is [505 Lakeshore Blvd.].

S. Mittlefehldt asked if anyone had more questions or would like to make a motion.

*It was moved by C. Gottlieb, seconded by S. Lawry, and carried 7-0 that after conducting a public hearing and review of the application and Staff Report for 03-REZ-06-24, the Planning Commission finds that the proposed rezoning is consistent with the Community Master Plan and meets the requirements of the Land Development Code Section 54.1405 and hereby recommends that the City Commission approve 03-REZ-06-24 as presented, with the following conditions - that the rezoning is approved when the PUD is terminated via proof of an affidavit that the termination of the PUD has been recorded in the property deed after the City Commission hearing.*

## **PUBLIC COMMENT ON AGENDA ITEMS**

Patty Gagnon, 745 Cedar St., said this is a very residential area and a store is not a very good idea. She said that we do need more small housing in Marquette and if you looked at the lot, it's residential.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **A. Administrative Site Plan Review Update**

D. Stensaas stated that when the LDC amendments were adopted last year, it limited quite a bit of what comes before the Planning Commission for site plan review, and staff promised to bring the Planning Commission regular updates on site plan submissions reviewed and approved administratively.

A. Landers said she has set up a table with site plans that the Planning Commission has approved and site plans that have been approved administratively since January of 2024. A. Landers also included a separate category for site plan submissions pending revisions for administrative approval.

S. Lawry asked if 2023 approved plans are having trouble meeting staff comments or economic problems as to why they're not starting yet.

A. Landers said the 1502 W. Ridge St., site work has been started, the 420 N. Third St. plan is waiting on approval of an LDC amendment, the distillery plan and a few others are no longer active or expired. Funding has also played a part in some of the plans coming to fruition.

D. Stensaas some of the bigger projects have been delayed due to higher interest rates and material costs than initial projections.

S. Mittlefehldt asked if there were any other questions on the Administrative Site Plan Review.

## **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

There were no comments provided.

## **TRAINING**

### **A. Climate Adaptation Task Force, Project Marquette 2049, Learning Circles #1**

D. Stensaas said that the County Climate Adaptation Task Force (CATF) has been more than ten years running but the group didn't have anything really proactive happening until this year with the launch of the Marquette 2049 project. The idea was to bring people together from across the County to start raising awareness of what our future is going to possibly look like, whether we do or don't do certain things. It was determined by the Steering Committee, which D. Stensaas is a volunteer for, that a way to begin the process would be to help people learn more, starting with deciding what we need to know more about and to learn from each other before we can make good decisions. He said that the initial meeting invited over 100 people from across the county, including county-wide local government, municipalities, NMU, and from some private sector entities. He said seventy people showed up to the January meeting and the focus was to survey the group on issues they feel they need to know the most about, and that CATF member Jess Thompson from NMU's Business School - now the Assistant Vice President for Sustainability - suggested the learning circles process and coordinated the meeting. He said that opportunities to participate in the learning circle forums are open to the Planning Commission and some members have come to the sessions. He discussed the summary that was provided of the first learning circles workshop on Community Food Systems, and said he would provide similar materials for the second workshop on Trash and Recycling that was recently held, as soon as a summary was available. He said that the sessions will continue in September and do through December.

K. Granger said after reading the material, she thought that putting some sort of food resources in the 446 E. Crescent St. corridor might be interesting.

D. Stensaas said he had a conversation with S. Lawry regarding tonight's case and that 446 E. Crescent was shown platted in the Ely Park Addition around 1904, which he looked at and found that from Hewitt Ave. along the shore to Fair Ave., both sides of Lakeshore Blvd. was platted as 25' lots. He said that the City would have looked a lot different had the Shiras Foundation not purchased and then gifted over 3,000 ft. of that shoreline property east of Lakeshore Blvd. to the City.

S. Lawry said that changes aren't new. Due to climate change, erosion or other circumstances, some of the parcels D. Stensaas was referring to being platted over 100 years ago are now underwater, or part of the lake.

S. Mittlefehldt asked if there are any other thoughts or comments.

### **COMMISSION AND STAFF COMMENTS**

C. Gottleib said he may not agree with all uses that will be allowed per the rezoning motion, but following the rules of the zoning ordinance is the job of the Planning Commission.

S. Mittlefehldt said that Arts and Culture Center manager Tiina Morin gave a presentation at the City Commission meeting about the Cultural Trail project recently, and that she would like the Planning Commission to take more opportunities to see arts and culture emphasized in the planning process.

D. Stensaas discussed the Draft Community Master Plan presentations and open house meeting on June 25<sup>th</sup> at Citizen's Forum, Lakeview Arena.

D. Stensaas said there is no business for the July 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting, and recommends the meeting be cancelled.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned by Chair S. Mittlefehldt at 6:53 p.m.

---

Prepared by D. Stensaas, City Planner and Zoning Administrator, Planning Commission Staff Liaison, and A. Cook, Community Development Dept. Administrative Assistant.