



Planning Commission Minutes 5/23/22

The Saugatuck Township Planning Commission met May 23, 2022.

1) Call to Order at 6:01 p.m. by Chairperson Israels.

2) Roll Call

Present: J. Ground, D. Webster, R. Israels, K. Butler

Absent: M. Wurth, D. Ihle, J. Helmrich

Also present: L. Wells, Zoning Administrator

3) Approval of Agenda

A **Motion** was made by Webster to approve the agenda as amended with additions. Seconded by Ground. The Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

4) Approval of Minutes

Minutes from 2/28/22 PC Meeting

- Page 2, paragraph 7, correct if to is.
- Page 3, paragraph 2, line 23, remove second MDOT, replace with their facilities.
- Page 3, paragraph 2, line 25, remove 'this is something'.
- Page 3, paragraph 2, line 16, remove 'on'.
- Page 3, paragraph 2, line 30, add 'that'.
- Page 3, paragraph 2, line 31, add '.' After removal, capital 'They'.
- Page 4, paragraph 1, line 3, remove second 'not'.
- Page 4, paragraph 1, line 33, change 'are' to 'the'.
- Page 4, paragraph 1, line 40, correct 'the' to 'they' & add comma after as.
- Page 5, paragraph 3, line 7, remove 'for'.
- Page 5, paragraph 3, line 25, correct 'e' to 'be'.
- Page 7, paragraph 1, line 3, add 'be'
- Page 7, paragraph 1, line 10, correct 'building' to 'buildings' & add 'is'.

A **Motion** was made by Webster to approve the minutes of 3/28/22 as amended. Seconded by Ground. The Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

6) Public Comment

- A. Doug & Deborah West, 2879 Lakeshore Drive. Spoke in support of the Lakeshore Resort development plan.
- B. Bobbie Gaunt, 341 Main Street. Spoke in support of extending the Natural River Overlay.
- C. Roy McIlwaine, 3466 Riverside Dr. Spoke in support of extending the Natural River Overlay on behalf of himself and neighbors Sandra & Travis Randolph, 3442 Riverside Dr. and Scott & Rebekah Wierenga, 6618 Dugout Rd.
- D. Scott Bosgraaf, North Shores of Saugatuck. Spoke against extending the Natural River Overlay.

- E. Nick Wallace, 3524 N. Dugout Rd, spoke on behalf of his extended family in support of extending the Natural River Overlay.
- F. Matthew Bussler, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer for the Pokagon band of Potawatomi Indians. Spoke in support of extending the Natural River Overlay.
- G. John Williams, 3464 Riverside Dr. Spoke in support of extending the Natural River Overlay.

Public Comment Closed

7) New Business

- A. Site Plan Review, Lakeshore Resort Expansion, 2885 Lakeshore Drive, Fennville, MI, parcel: 20-020-033-00, Zoned R3, applicant: Andrew Milauckas, agent: Nederveld

Wells summarized the site plan application, reminding the Commission this is a location that was approved by the ZBA in March 2021.

We have received a request from Andrew Milauckas for a site plan review for the Lakeshore Resort at 2885 Lakeshore Drive, parcel number: 03-20-020-033-00. The applicant has submitted an application, survey, site plan (dated May 2, 2022) and renderings. On March 23, 2021 the Zoning Board of Appeals reviewed and approved the site concept plan to expand a non-conforming use. The parcel is zoned R-3 and is operating as a resort. The resort has been operating for at least 68 years and is a legal non-conforming use. The Zoning Board of Appeals approved the request, which included a requirement for site plan review.

The approved expansion included 4 new buildings, each with two units, for a total of eight new units. The concept plan included square footages for buildings, circulation, buffer areas, and disturbed areas. See below.

The site plan for your consideration is consistent with the ZBA concept plan in the quantity of buildings; however, there are significant deviations, which we outline below.

BACKGROUND:

Site plan review is requested for four new, two-unit buildings at Lakeshore Resort. The resort has been in existence since the 1960s and includes several existing buildings, pool, driveways and parking. The total acreage of the property 20.9 acres. The proposed buildings A-C are 1,300 square feet in area, and the proposed building D (near Lakeshore) is 2,600 square feet. Building D is designed to mimic the look and feel of a single family detached dwelling. All buildings meet the setback requirements of the zoning district, and have met the required parking, which is two spaces per unit.

It should be noted that there are a few departures from the ZBA approved concept plan:

1. The ZBA approved plan included 1,200 sf cottages which are buildings A-C. The proposed site plan shows these are 1,300 sf each, (300 sf of additional area)
2. The ZBA approved plan included a 1,500 cottage at Lakeshore. The proposed site plan shows this building 2,600 square feet. (1,100 sf of additional area)
3. The ZBA approved plan included parking for the cottages (2 spaces per unit), but the proposed site plan includes an additional 9 space parking area
4. The ZBA plan did not include a new driveway to Lakeshore, and the driveways on the concept plan are 16' whereas the proposed drives range in width from 12'-20'

It is the position of the Township Planner that the above deviations are significant departures from the concept approved by the ZBA. The additional driveway to Lakeshore as well as a 9-space parking lot is also inconsistent with the ZBA plan.

A condition has been added that the applicant return to the Planning Commission with a site plan that resembles the approved plan from the ZBA with the following:

- 1. Revise buildings to meet the approved sizes**
- 2. Remove parking lot**
- 3. Remove driveway to Lakeshore; restoration and adherence to buffer per concept plan (note that should the driveway need to remain, then the plan should return to the ZBA for a public hearing).**

4. Note that internal drives shall meet the requirements of the Fire District, therefore it may be necessary that some drives are wider than the 16' width in the concept plan

RECOMMENDATION:

Due to the departures from the ZBA approved concept plan, Staff recommends postponing a decision until a revised site plan is provided that closely aligns with the approved use variance. Additionally, the following conditions or comments are included for future reference:

1. Buildings shall be designed and used for resort purposes, and not short-term rental.
2. Building renderings and floor plans, with height dimensions shall be provided. Floor plans for all floors for each building shall be provided. Height and floor count shall meet the R3 district standards.
3. There shall be no outdoor storage.
4. Parking for each building shall be provided to the Zoning requirements, and not exceeding the count of two spaces per unit.
5. Internal access shall be provided as per the ZBA concept plan, with the width of the driveways approved by the Fire District. Alternatively, the request can return to the ZBA for reconsideration of the concept plan.
6. A wetland delineation shall be provided and included on the site plan.
7. Buffer yards shall be as depicted on the ZBA concept plan.
8. Building footprint shall be as depicted on the ZBA concept plan.
9. Tree buffer areas, which are part of the required setbacks, shall be preserved in their natural state to meet the buffer and applicable landscaping requirements. Tree protection methodologies shall be included in the landscape plan.
10. No construction permits or ground disturbance shall be issued or occur until a permit from EGLE is provided to the Township, if such permit is required. Alternatively, a letter from EGLE stating permits are not required, may be acceptable.
11. The use and structure shall at all times comply with all local, county, state and federal requirements.
12. All fees shall be paid and conditions met prior to issuance of building permit and certificate of occupancy.
13. Any conditions of the Township Engineer shall be complied with prior to issuance of building permit, including items related to grading and drainage.
14. Any other conditions as deemed necessary by the Planning Commission.

Civil engineer, Mike Baker with Nederveld, stated "The conceptual plan did show it was labeled as approximate footprints and approximate building areas, because at that point in the design, it's very much conceptual. And it hasn't been engineered and reviewed and gone through that whole process. So, some of the things that were brought up by Lynee, I'd like to address the first one being the four areas and I think some of the confusion comes in here because of the terminology. Floor area is like an architectural term of like the usable living space inside the structure. We as civil engineers use footprint to kind of describe just like the overall boundary. So, the footprints here are very close to the footprints on the conceptual plan. I created some confusion by putting floor area in the general notes and I think that was an application but if you go with the footprints of the outer walls of the building, we're within like 20 square feet of what was proposed. The front building, the Lakeview building, is actually a little smaller footprint than what we showed with our conceptual rectangle and the ones in the back are slightly, a little bit bigger."

Wells asked if that was with or without the deck? Baker stated "We calculate all without the deck because we don't really look at that as living space. So, it's just the exterior walls of the building. So, the deck would be additional in terms of the circulation and the roadways, so the fire code requires a 20-foot-wide fire lane for anything that has to be a fire line and we need to have a fire lane go to within 150 feet of any of the new buildings. So, after working through that the most efficient and the best emergency access was to create the new fire lane or the new connection to Lakeshore drive. And the applicant being sensitive to that and also wanting to keep the residential character of the development is proposing that we cover a good portion of the fire lane with turf and we've worked through the fire district and they're in agreement to that concept. So basically, what we'll have is the actual gravel will be a little bit wider than the truck of the fire trucks can go on. But the turf will cover some of that so it'll kind of narrow it up and make it look more residential. Now again, when the concept plan was drawn, we didn't have the architectural buildings and we didn't have all the parking figured out with that. So, some of the

excess to get to the parking spaces in the buildings and stuff had to be added afterwards. So that's why it's a little different.”

Mr. Baker went on to explain that only guests staying at the front Lakeview building would be utilizing the new driveway off Lakeshore Drive. The guests to the other 3 new buildings would have access thru the existing resort drive. The new drive would be built to the fire departments standards to hold the firetrucks and then planted over with grass so it will not connect to the other driveway.

Webster asked for clarification on the parking spaces. Mr. Baker stated that, per the ordinance, 1 parking space is required per unit. Webster clarified that it is 1 parking space per sleeping room. The 1-bedroom units will require 1 parking space and two-bedroom units will require 2 parking spaces. The site plan shows an extra 5 parking spaces for guests. Webster asked why the need for 9 additional spaces? Mr. Baker stated that they would be used for visitors of the guests staying at the resort and he would allow the applicant to explain further.

Israels questioned how wide the tree line buffer is? Mr. Baker noted the buffer itself is 15 feet and the actual to the edge of where the gravel begins it is 19 feet from the property line. Mr. Baker also noted there is a screen fence on the property line. The intent is to maintain as much of the existing trees as possible. Mr. Baker stated that in regards to wetlands they have a wetland consultant, Bar Environmental, and Matt McGregor at Bar, who has visited the site, and confirms that there is no regulated wetlands in this development area that needs to be permitted for. It is also not designated critical dune or high-risk erosion and so there is no EGLE permitting required for that. Mr. Baker stated they are agreeable to the recommended conditions of the Township engineer as well as the fire district conditions. In regards to the ACDC a review was received with one condition that they are ok with. The only things they are currently waiting on are ACRC approval for the new driveway on Lakeshore and the Health Department for the septic and water service extensions.

Applicant, Andrew Milauckas, clarified a few things, including the tree buffer well exceeds the ordinance requirements of 12 trees per 100 feet, for the side yard buffer they are providing 20 and the size is much larger than required. Mr. Milauckas also noted they have worked with their neighbors to preserve the site line of the lake for both parties by planting four-foot grasses with a berm and grasses along Lakeshore Drive to keep headlights blocked from the neighbors' view. Also noted was that building setbacks are greater than required when ZBA approval was granted.

Mr. Milauckas wanted to clarify the parking issues, stating the ZBA approved the plan for 16 spaces so they thought they only had a few extra parking spaces, not nine extra spaces. Webster stated “The ZBA didn't really make any conditions in regards to the concept. They just ruled in regards to the ability to expand a non-conforming use, that is all they did. So that is all their minutes show. They didn't even mention your concept plan. So, it is really confusing.” Mr. Milauckas clarified that parking was not discussed at ZBA, and that he was referencing Lynee's report.

Webster questioned the need for two driveways. Mr. Milauckas stated it is due to the drives being one way. Guests will enter using one and exit using another, and also it helps to control the traffic pattern. Webster asked if the guest parking could be relocated. Mr. Milauckas stated it could, but it would cut down on the amount of trees that are able to be kept, and the other proposed location is existing drain field. Webster asked why the applicant felt 11 additional parking spaces were needed. Mr. Milauckas stated they were for visitors. Webster asked how many visitor spaces are available for the current resort. Mr. Milauckas stated 5 or 6. Webster asked how many units are in the current resort. Mr. Milauckas stated 31. Webster asked if they could do with less than the 9 proposed visitor spaces. Wells noted that only 30% above the required number of spaces are required, with 10 required, the maximum allowed would be 13.33, which could be rounded up to 4 additional allowed.

Webster requested clarification of the site plan for buildings C & D. It was noted that building D is the Lakeview cottage and is roughly 2,500 sq ft plus 600 sq ft of upper and 600 sq ft of lower deck space.

Israels stated, “I think the thought initially this evening was questioning whether this project needed to go back to the ZBA because just for the clarity, but I think you know, the overall concept is there. I'm not sure that I would

agree it has to go back to ZBA. And I think one of the determining factors in that is initially we didn't have a lot of input either on this project, and tonight we have the property owners here with us that would be most impacted. And to hear them say they're 100% for this makes me consider that we probably don't have to have a public hearing on this project. I mean, if we can come to the agreement on things and say the fire district and the engineering report and all of those things are doable. You did not say that the report from Lynee was doable."

Wells questioned the total square footage of the existing resort buildings with lodging. Mr. Milauckas stated approximately 20,000 square feet but that included all buildings on the parcel. "When we established the 7000 number in our ZBA application, we never intended that number to include porches when we looked and planned the project and prepared that application. Although it doesn't say it in the application. When we created those numbers. We created them saying that didn't have to include porches because we were talking about interior space and thinking about the walls, not porches. And so, when we created the inventory, of the existing buildings we didn't include our overhangs and porches in that number. So, I know from our planning side we've been consistent is how we look at that 7000 square foot number it was never intended to include porches and these buildings aren't bigger than we intended them to be."

Mr. Milauckas asked if it would be allowed to relocate some of the parking spaces. Wells stated, "I think we need to see a full current parking count with the unit count and you know your whole development to know where you're at with parking today and where you are compared to the ordinance requirements." It was agreed that the required spaces for resort guests had been addressed and accepted, it is only the parking spaces being requested by the applicant for visitors that is in question. All agreed 30% could be rounded from 3.33 to 4 parking spaces for guests in addition to the 10 spaces for the units required.

Mr. Baker questioned if there could be some flexibility in the width of the driveways to allow for two-way traffic to keep the number of vehicles driving past the pool down. This would require the drive to be 4 foot wider. It was determined that the ZBA approval for that drive was set at 16' which would allow for two-way traffic.

A **Motion** was made by Webster to support the site plan for Lake Shore Resort, 2885 Lakeshore Drive, consistent with site plan standards in Section 40-692 with the following conditions:

1. Buildings shall be designed and used for resort purposes and not short-term rental.
2. Building renderings and floor plans with height dimensions shall be provided.
3. Floor plans for all floors for each building shall be provided.
4. Heights and floor area shall meet the R-3 district standards.
5. There shall be no outdoor storage.
6. Parking is per ordinance section 40-647 H-8, which is for a motel, one space per sleeping room, plus four additional guest parking.
7. Internal access shall be provided, with width of driveways approved by the fire district.
8. The East driveway can be no wider than 16 feet.
9. A wetland delineation shall be provided and included on the site plan.
10. The landscape plan must be according to our ordinance, Sec 40-876. Which includes an appropriate privacy fence and Greenbelt associated with your residence to the south.
11. Green buffer areas, which are part of the required setback, shall be preserved in the natural state as much as possible.
12. No construction permits or ground disturbance shall be issued or occur until a permit from EGLE is provided to the township if such permit is required.
13. The use of construction shall at all times comply with local, county, state and federal requirements.
14. All fees shall be paid, and conditions met, prior to issuance of building permits and certificate of occupancy.
15. Any conditions of the township engineer shall be complied with prior to issuance of building permit, including items related to grading and drainage.
16. A letter from a licensed engineer shall be provided indicating that an EGLE permit is not required in regards to wetlands, dune protections, or high-risk erosion.

Supported by Butler.

Roll Call Vote: Ground, yes. Webster, yes. Israels, yes. Butler, yes. Motion passed unanimous.

Israels granted a 5-minute recess.

B. Review Natural River Overlay Factsheet, hear request from Rural Character Committee Representative about amending ordinance.

Jane Dickie, 6108 Old Allegan Rd, spoke on behalf of the Rural Character Committee, asking the Commission to consider amending the zoning ordinance to extend the current natural river overlay now as opposed to waiting for the entire ordinance to be redone.

Webster commented that while she supports protecting the environment and our cultural areas, she questioned if this decision is premature and noted the need to consult with the Township's Attorney on the matter.

Ground questioned where the current overlay stops. Ms. Dickie stated it ends at the I-196 expressway over the river. Wells and Israels stated that was not correct, that the overlay is noted on the zoning map as a dotted line and that it is further to the east than the I-196 bridge. Webster asked for clarification that the request is to extend to the river mouth. Israels confirmed that the new overlay is proposed to extend from where it currently ends to the river mouth. Butler asked if his property would be included in the new overlay. Ms. Dickie confirmed it would. Butler stated the reason for his question is to point out that the new overlay does not just pick on properties owned by North Shores of Saugatuck.

Wells pulled up a map from the DNR that showed the areas the State of Michigan has designated as 'wild-scenic river' which coordinates with the existing Natural River Overlay area under the current Township ordinance. Israels stated that she would hesitate to extend further than the states designation at this time. Israels questioned Ms. Dickie as to what is the urgency in extending the overlay now as opposed to waiting until the entire ordinance is reviewed? Ms. Dickie responded, "There are several properties that potentially could come on the market that are along that area that would go right down to the river. That could lead to much better conservation development of those properties. If this were in place, if this natural river overlay were in place, I think that's really the main urgency, to try to make sure that any development that happens within the next year or two, or sales that occur within the next year or two, would comply with maintaining the rural character."

Israels stated, "I think I would recommend to this commission that because we already have EGLE involved in the mouth of the river area and looking at that, that we stay away from that at this time." Wells noted working with the State of Michigan would be recommended. "If our overlay's based on the State's map of the wild- scenic river. What are the characteristics of wild and scenic natural rivers that caused them to stop in that location? And can that be extended at the state level, so if there were an overlay to be changed, I think you would want to have the basis, the base characteristic, or the base designation at the state level to mirror ours." Wells stated that currently the Township has a 75-foot setback from the river's edge, and there are two districts that have a 25-foot buffer along the river's edge. When asked about tree protection along the river Wells quoted the ordinance "A strip 25 feet in width bordering the water's edge of the applicable body of water shall be maintained in its natural state or shall be planted and maintained in grass trees, shrubs or other plants."

Butler noted a Representative from the City of Saugatuck was present in the audience and asked if this river overlay protection was being brought to them as well? Ms. Gaunt stated yes. Butler asked when that would happen? Ms. Gaunt stated, "Probably within the next 60 days."

A **motion** was made by Butler to at least have this issue referred to the township attorney as to the issue raised by the May 23. letter from Mr. Gabrielese. Seconded by Ground.

Roll Call: Butler, yes, Ground, yes, Webster, no, Israels, no.

Motion failed.

Webster recommended the Township staff take this to the Township attorney to have them review it when staff feels it is necessary.

8) Old Business

A. Committee Reports Priority Lists

a. Rural Character & Conservation

Jane Dickie gave a briefing to the commission. Barry Lonneke, president of Tree More Ecology and Land Services made a presentation on how to create easement conservations and agricultural easements. Working on creating a development historicization project, using a geographic information system, which taking data that is already available in the county we can watch the growth in our township, we could get a look at 1990's, 2000's, 2010's & 2020's. And it will just show us visually where development is happening and help us think ahead to where is it going to be going and what do we need to be doing in terms of as we think of things, the direction of developments going.

b. Economic Development – Emailed from Jon Helmrich

Israels shared from Helmrich's report: April 19. Gary Wruble, presented UNESCO Global Nutrition Program, which is manufactured right here in Saugatuck Township. It's a really neat process. He gave an overview of a new food processing technology being used to convert otherwise discarded produce into a dry nutritious powder for distribution to indigenous American communities. I (Israels) asked why he didn't do it for rural communities in Allegan County too. But right now, it's just indigenous American communities. Local farms are actively involved in supporting this program. MEDC has resources to support and improve development planning. That is a process online. And he has Sarah Dinero from MEDC joining in May for a presentation but she had to cancel. The May meeting did not have a quorum so they had to cancel.

c. Attainable Housing

Nothing to report.

B. Township Board Update – Emailed from Jon Helmrich

C. Staff Update & Annual Report

- a. Wells stated, "We issued the Request for Qualifications, it was due today, we received one submittal. We published it in a newspaper for general circulation. It was on the township website. We also sent it to another zoning firm in the Grand Rapids region. So, we do have one response. I've worked with David Jirousek for quite a while. He's very well regarded for his zoning work. He is a person that loves zoning. He loves making ordinances. He just really thrives when it comes to zoning. He's set out an approach for us to consider. We have a sealed fee, or bid from him on file here at the township. We worked in our request for qualifications to lay out a process that involved the committees. I think having one early checkpoint with the committees, as well as, later checkpoints with them. We provide him the priority list that the committees developed. And then, I think, certainly from my experience, I would recommend Dave, but I encourage you all to review this as well as the township board. They are the ones who are going to be making the recommendation but we only have one."
- b. Wells reported, "Last year the Township had four special uses, five site plans, rezoning, private road, some text amendments, and long-range planning activities that we did last year. I expect this year to continue to be busy."



June meeting has been cancelled as no applications were received by the deadline. We are still waiting on Dollar General to come back with revisions.

Webster asked the status of Top Grade. Wells noted they did submit, but it was too conceptual and she requested more detail. They were given a list of detailed items that we are looking for, and then they know what our submittal deadline is. Butler asked if a deadline was given. Wells stated they have the submittal deadline. It was not stated when their decision was postponed but we are in a situation where we can start enforcing their special land use. Israels noted they did get permission to get water from the Ravines, so they will not need to dig deeper, and the Ravines could be able to be looped, which could make the Fire District happy. Webster asked if can bring it to the July agenda noting they were going to return in January and it is now seven months later? Butler asked if we can require them to have something for the July meeting? Wells stated that they have been working and in communication with herself and the Township Manager and that she would email them that they needed to be prepared for the July meeting.

Butler noted that Parks & Recreation will be adopting a set fee for the memorial benches at \$1500 plus the cost of the lettering in June. Israels asked about the track updates. Butler noted they met with the engineer last week and toured the north area of the dog park and they are hopeful to have a conceptual plan this week.

9. Adjourn

A **Motion** was made to adjourn the meeting at 8:35 pm by Butler. Seconded by Webster. Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Next P.C. meeting: Monday, July 25th, 2022 at 6:00 pm.

Motions:

A **Motion** was made by Webster to approve the agenda as amended with additions. Seconded by Ground. The Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

A **Motion** was made by Webster to approve the minutes of 3/28/22 as amended. Seconded by Ground. The Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

A **Motion** was made by Webster to support the site plan for Lake Shore Resort, 2885 Lakeshore Drive, consistent with site plan standards in Section 40-692 with the following conditions:

1. Buildings shall be designed and used for resort purposes and not short-term rental.
2. Building renderings and floor plans with height dimensions shall be provided.
3. Floor plans for all floors for each building shall be provided.
4. Heights and floor area shall meet the R-3 district standards.
5. There shall be no outdoor storage.
6. Parking is per ordinance section 40-647 H-8, which is for a motel, one space per sleeping room, plus four additional guest parking.
7. Internal access shall be provided, with width of driveways approved by the fire district.
8. The East driveway can be no wider than 16 feet.
9. A wetland delineation shall be provided and included on the site plan.
10. The landscape plan must be according to our ordinance, Sec 40-876. Which includes an appropriate privacy fence and Greenbelt associated with your residence to the south.
11. Green buffer areas, which are part of the required setback, shall be preserved in the natural state as much as possible.
12. No construction permits or ground disturbance shall be issued or occur until a permit from EGLE is provided to the township if such permit is required.
13. The use of construction shall at all times comply with local, county, state and federal requirements.
14. All fees shall be paid, and conditions met, prior to issuance of building permits and certificate of occupancy.
15. Any conditions of the township engineer shall be complied with prior to issuance of building permit, including items related to grading and drainage.
16. A letter from a licensed engineer shall be provided indicating that an EGLE permit is not required in regards to wetlands, dune protections, or high-risk erosion.

Supported by Butler.

Roll Call Vote: Ground, yes. Webster, yes. Israels, yes. Butler, yes. Motion passed unanimous.

A **motion** was made by Butler to at least have this issue referred to the township attorney as to the issue raised by the May 23. letter from Mr. Gabriele. Seconded by Ground.

Roll Call: Butler, yes, Ground, yes, Webster, no, Israels, no.

Motion failed.

A **Motion** was made to adjourn the meeting at 8:35 pm by Butler. Seconded by Webster. Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

Respectfully,
J. Drew, Recording Sec.

I Denise Webster, Planning Commission Secretary, certify that these minutes were approved on May 23, 2022 by the Township Board.

Planning Commission Secretary

Date