

**MINUTES**  
**CASCADE CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**MONDAY, June 17, 2024**  
**7:00 PM**  
**2870 JACKSMITH AVE SE**

**ARTICLE 1. Call the meeting to order. Record the attendance.**

Chair Moxley called the meeting to order at 7:01 pm.

Members Present: Noordhoek, Richardson, Bruneau, Moxley, Rissi, Noordyke,  
Rowland

Members Absent: None

Others present: Planning Director Andrea Hendrick, Zoning Administrator

Madison Smith-Jacoby, Legal Counsel Leslie Abdo, and others listed on the  
sign-in sheet.

**ARTICLE 2. Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag**

**ARTICLE 3. Approve the current Agenda**

**Secretary Noordyke made a motion, seconded by Vice Char Rissi, to approve the agenda. The motion carried unanimously.**

**ARTICLE 4. Disclose any Conflict of Interest**

There were no conflicts of interest disclosed.

**ARTICLE 5. Approve the Minutes of the June 3, 2024, Meeting.**

Vice Chair Rissi provided corrections such as wrong members being identified and grammatical errors.

1. Article 7.
  - a. Correction to grammatical errors.
2. Article 8.
  - a. Correct comment related to a smaller building footprint being in article attributed to himself should be changed to Trustee Noordhoek. Changed from Vice Chair Rissi to Trustee Noordhoek.

Member Bruneau provided a list of clarifications and changes that needed addressing.

1. Article 7.
  - a. Clarifying a previous parking variance to case #24-3830 was to reduce parking by 34 spots, not to 34 spots. Changed to say “by 34” from “to 34”
  - b. Correcting an applicant’s address. Changed to 3930 Oakcrest Ct SE from 3930 Cris Court
  - c. Correcting a that the private street would be brought up to county standard prior to construction needed to be changed to what the motion stated that it would be done after completion of construction. Change from “The applicant agrees that private street is brought up to county standard and approved by

Township staff before completion of construction” to “The applicant agrees that private street is brought up to county standard and approved by Township staff after completion of construction.”

- d. Include missing a detail about the applicant being asked to provide information on sewer and water along with a lift station. Changed from “Member Bruneau pointed out that several standard packet items were missing, such as engineering review comments and details on utilities and water main connections.” to “Member Bruneau pointed out that several standard packet items were missing, such as engineering review comments and details on utilities and water main connections including details on the lift station.”
2. Article 10.
    - a. Change to reflect the correct member that supported the density tables was made by Trustee Noordhoek, not Chair Moxley. Changed From Chair Moxley to Trustee Noordhoek.
  3. Article 11.
    - a. Suggested changing "insufficient" to "erroneous" or "error-prone" when describing issues with the May 20 meeting minutes. “The draft minutes from the May 20<sup>th</sup> meetings were found to be insufficient.” Changed to “The draft minutes from the May 20<sup>th</sup> meetings were found to be error prone and erroneous.”

**Secretary Noordyke made a motion, seconded by Vice Chair Rissi to approve the Minutes of the June 3, 2024, meeting with amendments to include Vice Chair Rissi and Member Bruneau’s revision comments. The motion carried unanimously.**

**ARTICLE 6. Acknowledge visitors and those wishing to speak.  
(Comments are limited to five minutes per speaker)**

**ARTICLE 7. Case #24-3839 Public Hearing**  
**Applicant:** Alexandra Livingstone, Bonnie Miller  
**Property Address:** 7140 Oak Brook Street  
**Parcel Number:** 41-19-09-426-027  
**Requested Action:** Special Use Permit for an 8-foot gate with a 6-foot fence in the front yard.

Zoning Administrator Smith-Jacoby presented the staff report for the applicant requesting a 6 ft. fence in the front yard with an 8 ft. entrance gate at 7140 Oak Brook Street. She stated the applicant wanted the increased fence height to keep out neighborhood kids who could get injured on the property, which has a creek and pond. The increased height required a Special Use Permit, and she reviewed the request according to the Special Use standards. She determined the increased height may not impact neighbors but noted the comment from a neighbor stating they felt it would change the aesthetic at the end of the cul-de-sac and might limit access to their backyard, but this would be a civil matter outside the scope of this approval. She recommended denial as submitted, but outlined potential conditions, if approved, to require permits, limit the gate height to 6 ft, and prohibit the gate from being in the right-of-way.

Secretary Noordyke pointed out that two sheds on the property survey appear to be non-conforming based on the lot size. He suggested this could be an opportunity to correct that as well.

Member Bruneau noted the fence itself is proposed at 6 ft with architectural features, while the gate is over 8 ft without the features and asked for clarification on this. Zoning Administrator Smith-Jacoby clarified that the fence around the perimeter would be 6 ft including the top ornamentation/architectural features. The gate has an additional 1 ft. 9 in. of ornamentation on top of the 8 ft. height.

Member Bruneau questioned why the application was recommended for denial when it seemed to pass the special use permit criteria according to the table in the staff report. Zoning Administrator Smith-Jacoby explained that in addition to the standards outlined in the zoning ordinance, she considered the scope of what the Planning Commission has approved for fence special use permits in the past. None of the criteria were outright violations, but there were some concerns, which is why she gave the option for approval with conditions.

Member Richardson asked for clarification on the neighbor's comment about accessing their backyard that was mentioned. Zoning Administrator Smith-Jacoby replied she read the comment and that this would be a civil matter if there was a legal easement, which wasn't shown on the applicant's survey, so it wasn't considered as part of the official review.

Applicant representative Alexandra Livingstone explained the homeowner wants the fence and gate for safety reasons, to deter kids from going near the pond and creek at the end of the cul-de-sac. She showed renderings comparing a 6 ft vs 8 ft gate design and she wanted an aesthetic, organic design and referenced the Blodgett estate.

Secretary Noordyke asked the applicant if she had looked at a 4 ft fence, which would be allowed by the ordinance without needing special approval. Ms. Livingstone stated a 4 ft fence/gate wouldn't provide enough of a deterrent for ambitious kids.

Member Rowland responded that he felt that 4 ft or 6 ft would not make a difference if a kid was inclined to climb over. Ms. Livingstone responded that she chose 6 ft. since it's the max allowed height for side and back yards and felt it would also retain the aesthetics that would match the rest of the fence.

Member Richardson asked for clarification as he felt that maybe the neighborhood children did not understand where the start of the drive was due to the shape. Alexandra responded that was correct and added that cars also turn around in the driveway.

Vice Chair Rissi asked if the applicant found it challenging to locate the specific fence ordinance requirements on the township website or if she had to reach out to staff for assistance. Ms. Livingstone responded that she had reached out to staff directly with questions, such as whether fences were allowed right on the property line, as that information wasn't clear in the ordinance.

Member Rowland felt that if the concerns were with kids riding their bikes in the driveway, that a 4 ft fence across the drive with pillars on either side would

suffice. The applicant responded that the owner wanted to have a fence on the boundaries of the property not only to keep kids out but for safety and privacy as well. Trustee Noordhoek expressed that children are trainable, and a 4 ft. high fence would provide a clear guideline for them not to cross. Trustee Noordhoek was also concerned about setting a precedent and not wanting to see numerous residents coming in seeking exceptions for higher fences due to children being "out of line."

**Motion was made by Vice Chair Rissi, seconded by Secretary Noordyke to open the public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.**

Neighbor Christopher Spain (7130 Oak Brook) lives next door and said the fence proposal feels very sudden to the neighbors. He disputed there being 27 neighborhood kids, estimating only four. He hasn't had issues with his kids going in the applicant's yard and doesn't think a tall fence is needed. He felt the suggested pillars with a gate would suffice. He was also concerned about the aesthetic not fitting the mid-century modern homes and blocking access to his backyard. He prefers a 4 ft. compliant fence, if any.

Member Rowland asked if Christopher was aware of any kids being injured on the property in the past. Christopher responded he was not aware of any kids being injured on the property in the past four years.

**Motion was made by Secretary Noordyke, seconded by Vice Chair Rissi, to close the public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.**

Member Rowland suggested either conforming to the 4 ft. front yard/6 ft. side yard fence rules, or if a 6 ft. fence is desired, placing it only across the driveway, not around the entire yard.

Member Bruneau expressed reservations about the motion to deny, pointing out that an 8 ft. deer fence in a front yard was recently approved. He felt the commission should be consistent in their decisions. Vice Chair Rissi noted the deer fence was in a different context on a major arterial road and 200ft back from the road, while this property is in a residential neighborhood, making the two cases distinct.

**Motion was made by Secretary Noordyke, seconded by Trustee Noordhoek to deny Case Number 24-3839, based on staff recommendations that the Special Use be DENIED for the following reasons:**

- 1. The applicant has not provided sufficient evidence to indicate that an increased height is required for any unusual circumstances on the property.**
- 2. An exception to the maximum height standard is not recommended as building in compliance would accomplish the same goal, and granting permission would set precedence.**

**Supported:** Moxley, Richardson, Rowland, Rissi, Noordyke, Noordhoek

**Opposed:** Bruneau

**Motion Passed 6 to 1**

**Applicant:** Andrew Somsel, Michelle Firlit  
**Property Address:** 2549 Linda Ave SE  
**Parcel Number:** 41-19-08-328-031  
**Requested Action:** Special Use Permit for an 8-foot fence in the front yard.

Zoning Administrator Smith-Jacoby presented the staff report for the applicant's request to build an 8 ft. privacy fence in the front yard at 2549 Linda Avenue. She stated the applicants wanted the taller fence for privacy due to a new garage and home addition on the neighboring properties. She reviewed the request according to the Special Use standards. She determined the 8 ft. height could visually impact neighbors, change light/ventilation, and was taller than what had typically been approved for front yards in the past. She recommended denying the 8 ft. request, suggesting the applicants could build in compliance with the 4 ft. front yard and 6 ft. side and rear yard allowances.

Member Rowland clarified with staff that, even though the proposed fence would run along the side of the house, it's considered to be in the front yard because it extends past the front plain of the house.

Zoning Administrator Smith-Jacoby confirmed that the ordinance defines a front yard as the property between the right-of-way and the front line of the house.

Chair Moxley noted there is a driveway easement on the neighboring property to access a rear house at 2562 Linda. Zoning Administrator Smith-Jacoby confirmed that the owner of 2562 Linda submitted an email saying they do not object to the proposed fence. She also clarified that the driveway easement is with 2568 Linda.

Member Bruneau asked for clarification on which neighboring house (2562 Linda or the one with the new garage) submitted the email saying they do not object to the fence. Zoning Administrator Smith-Jacoby clarified it was the owner of 2562 Linda (the rear house) who submitted the email, not the adjacent neighbor with the new garage (2568 Linda).

Applicants Drew Somsel & Michelle Firlit (2549 Linda) explained they wanted the 8 ft. fence for privacy and seclusion from the neighboring garage at 2568 Linda and home addition at 2562 Linda that were recently built. He stated he had originally planned to landscape with arborvitaes, but that wouldn't work due to heavy shade and deer. Mr. Somsel felt an 8 ft. fence would block the view of the garage, headlights, and commercial vehicles/materials often parked next door. Mr. Somsel decided on a horizontal wood fence in darker stain to blend with the natural area. Mr. Somsel wanted to position the fence 40 ft. back from the road to be courteous to neighbors, as well as to not obstruct views. Mr. Somsel felt 4-6 ft. wouldn't provide enough screening due to the 2 ft. grade difference between properties. Mr. Somsel would like an 8 ft. fence in the flatter area then stepping down to 6 ft where the grade was higher.

Member Bruneau asked if trees would need to be removed to install the fence. He also clarified that the applicant understood that the fence would need to be constructed with the posts facing the applicant's property. Mr. Somsel clarified no

trees would need to be removed to install the fence. He was open to having fence posts facing his own property as required.

Member Rowland questioned why the proposed fence extends so far in front of the house. Ms. Firlit explained the fence needs to start that far forward to block the view of the neighbor's commercial vehicles, trailers, and work materials. These are visible from their porch and rooms on that side of their house.

Trustee Noordhoek asked how the neighboring garage ended up in the applicants' front yard. Zoning Administrator Smith-Jacoby clarified the garage is compliant and in the neighboring property's side yard. It visually appears to be in the applicants' front yard because their house is set further back.

**Motion was made by Vice Chair Rissi to Open public hearing, seconded by member Richardson. Motion carried unanimously.**

Neighbor Kathy Sturdevant (2520 Linda) Supported the 8 ft. fence due to the elevation change between the properties, stating it would give the applicants more privacy on the side where their bedroom is located. She stated it would block the frequent activity around the neighboring garage that is in the applicants' front yard view.

Neighbor Daniel Vaysberg (2545 Linda) lives adjacent to the applicant and supported the taller fence to block his view of the commercial vehicles and materials frequently parked next door to the applicant's. He agreed the fence position wouldn't impede traffic sightlines.

Neighbor David Guthrie (2540 Linda) stated he had lived in the neighborhood for 22 years and has no objection to the fence. He wants the neighborhood to remain close-knit.

Neighbor Tom Howard (2547 Linda) lives on the other side of the applicants and can see the back of the neighboring house. He supported the taller fence to block headlights shining into the applicants' windows early each morning.

Marfil Sanchez (2568 Linda) stated he has no problem with the proposed fence. He understood the applicant wanted to block the view, and apologized if his work vehicles have bothered them. He clarified that he comes and goes from his garage like anyone else and supported the applicants' fence. Mr. Marfil stated he was also building a 6 ft. fence in his side yard.

**Motion was made by Secretary Noordyke, seconded by Vice Chair Rissi, to close public hearing. Motion carried unanimously.**

Member Rowland asked if building a berm and putting a 6 ft. fence on top to achieve the height would be allowed. Staff clarified that the fence height is measured from grade.

Vice Chair Rissi suggested the applicants look into landscaping options like tall grasses in the front yard rather than installing a taller fence. He expressed concerns about setting a precedent that could lead to other residents wanting 6-8 ft. front yard fences. He also asked staff if the township had approved an 8 ft. fence in the backyard in the past.

Member Richardson pointed out many of the applicants' concerns stem from past township approvals that negatively impact them.

Member Rowland stated he thinks this is what a Special Use permit is for, and he understands they don't want to set precedent.

Vice Chair Rissi asked Legal Counsel Leslie Abdo if approving a taller fence in the front yard for this case would set a precedent that other applicants, like the one from the previous case, could use to seek approval for similar fences in the future.

Legal Counsel Leslie Abdo explained that the Planning Commission should consider the circumstances under which Special Use permits have been granted for similar requests in the past when making a decision. She noted that the commission needs to consider the unique factors of each property and request, including any specific physical or locational characteristics that may warrant a deviation from the norm. She advised that the Planning Commission should strive to be consistent in the types of approvals and denials they issue for similar requests. If they deviate from a previous decision, they should clearly explain the unique factors that justify the different outcome. She emphasized the importance of the commission being clear in its justification for whatever decision is made.

**Motion was made by Vice Chair Rissi, seconded by Secretary Noordyke, to approve case 24-3835 for a special land use permit with the exception for an 8 ft. fence in the side and rear yards and a 4 ft. fence in the front yard with the set back as presented in the site plan.**

**Supported:** Moxley, Rissi, Noordyke

**Opposed:** Noordhoek, Richardson, Bruneau, Rowland

**Motion Failed 3 to 4.**

Member Rowland proposed allowing an 8 ft. fence from the front corner of the house to the rear property line, and a 6 ft. fence from the front corner forward to the 40 ft. road setback. He asked the other commissioners for feedback on this idea. Trustee Noordhoek noted he didn't believe an 8 ft. fence should be allowed in any residential area and believed they should follow the code in the front yard. Trustee Noordhoek made a motion to deny the request to encourage building the fence in compliance with the code.

**Motion was made by Trustee Noordhoek, seconded by Vice Chair Rissi to DENY Case Number 24-3835 for the Special Use permit based on the ordinance only allowing for 4 ft. in the front yard and 6 ft. fences in the side and rear yards.**

**Supported:** Moxley, Rissi, Noordyke, Noordhoek

**Opposed:** Rowland, Richardson, Bruneau

**Motion Passed 4 to 3.**

Member Richardson voiced concern that there was not enough discussion and made a motion to reconsider to allow for more discussion.

**Motion was made by Member Richardson, seconded by member Rowland to reconsider to allow for more discussion.**

**Supported:** Moxley, Rissi, Richardson, Bruneau, Rowland

**Opposed:** Noordyke, Noordhoek  
**Motion passed 5 to 2.**

Member Bruneau questioned if this case is like a previously approved 8 ft. fence which was in a rear yard but blocked what he believed to be a front yard of the neighbor. This was in response to Trustee Noordhoek's comments about 8 ft. fences in a residential front yard. Zoning Administrator Smith-Jacoby noted that a rear yard fence was approved for 8 ft. last year, but that Member Bruneau's recollection was incorrect.

Member Rowland asked the applicant if he would be okay with a 6 ft fence for the entire length of the fencing. Mr. Somsel responded that he would be fine with that as it was better than nothing.

**Motion was made by Member Rowland, seconded by member Richardson, to approve case 24- 3835 for a special land use permit with the exception that it would be a 6 ft. tall fence the entire length and set back as presented in the site plan.**

**Supported:** Moxley, Richardson, Bruneau, Rowland

**Opposed:** Rissi, Noordyke, Noordhoek

**Motion Passed 4 to 3.**

## **ARTICLE 9.**

**Case #24-3844**

**2024 Master Plan Review & Recommendation**

**Applicant:** Cascade Charter Township

**Requested Action:** Recommend Adoption of Master Plan  
by Township Board

**Motion was made by Secretary Noordyke, seconded by Vice Chair Rissi, to remove case 24-3844 (2024 Master Plan review and recommendation) from the table. Motion carried unanimously.**

Planning Consultant Danielle Bouchard explained that comments from Vice Chair Rissi and Member Bruneau were incorporated into the latest draft. Changes that were made and not made based on their feedback were outlined in the meeting packet of 6/17/24. She noted the plan highlights include preservation and targeted redevelopment throughout the township. Some photos were also updated but may not all be in the current draft due to quick turnaround. Also stating if the commission is comfortable, it would be a good opportunity to move the plan forward, even if some additional minor photo changes are needed later.

Member Bruneau asked about an inconsistency between the Future Land Use table which lists "Farmland Preservation & Rural Residential" and the Future Land Use map which shows "Rural Preservation." Planning Consultant Bouchard stated the map labeling "Rural Preservation" instead of "Rural Residential" was likely an export issue that will be fixed.

Member Bruneau noted the cemetery at Kraft/52nd is still there but not shaded correctly on the Future Land Use map. Planning Consultant Bouchard thought that change was already made in the map but will double check as there may have been an export glitch.

Member Bruneau recalled that in a previous meeting, the commission voted to extend the open space area on the Future Land Use map to Kraft Ave rather than stopping at 36th/Thornapple River Dr as currently shown.

Member Rowland and Secretary Noordyke confirmed that Rissi's original request to stop the industrial at 36th was not supported, and a subsequent suggestion to extend it to Kraft was approved 7-8 months ago and was adopted by the Township Board.

Planning Consultant Bouchard apologized for not being aware of that previous Future Land Use map amendment and said she would have come with an updated map if she had known. Secretary Noordyke and Vice Chair Rissi voiced that they would like to retain the current Future Land Use map instead of what was presented due to the work previously put into it.

Member Bruneau believed 2900 Thornapple River Dr was previously designated as park/open space but is now shown as cemetery on the map. Secretary Noordyke & Vice Chair Rissi discussed that the property in question is vacant land owned by the township, not the same as the nearby pet cemetery. Planning Consultant Bouchard determined it should likely be shaded as public/semi-public on the map, based on the comments from members.

Member Bruneau recalled a previous vote to include the properties at 2890, 2920, 2915, 2923 and 2965 Thornapple River Dr in the village category, but the parcels are still shown as residential, which seems to contradict the language about the village core being at Cascade Rd/Thornapple River Dr. Planning Consultant Bouchard said direction was given by the Township Supervisor, Manager and steering committee to keep those properties as residential on the map given their single-family character. She apologized for not explaining that discrepancy. She felt the intersection can still be considered the village core and activity hub even if those few residential parcels to the southwest are not included.

Vice Chair Rissi expressed concern that the utility service boundary shown on the map may not be accurate compared to what was previously discussed and approved, particularly the southeast corner near Whitneyville Road. He asked staff to double check it. Member Richardson thought the utility boundary was supposed to stop at Buttrick/Whitneyville per previous discussions but is shown differently on the map. Planning Consultant Bouchard did not recall the utility boundary being discussed before and expressed concern about making changes to it now without additional public input. She encouraged commissioners to reach out anytime with questions/concerns so issues can be addressed prior to meetings.

Planning Director Hendrick summarized the master plan review process and steps taken by staff and the consultant to incorporate edits from commissioners since February. She expressed additional changes to the Future Land Use map were not brought up during the 63-day comment period. Vice Chair Rissi apologized that some of the mapping concerns were just noticed during this discussion and had not been raised earlier.

Member Bruneau felt the staff and consultant insinuated the commission missed their chance to request changes. He pushed back on that, noting the length of the document means new things may be noticed each time it's reviewed.

Secretary Noordyke retracted his comment about changing the utility boundary after Vice Chair Rissi confirmed it matches what was approved in a previous meeting.

Member Rowland acknowledged the consultant's and staff's hard work on the plan but emphasized the importance of the commission catching any errors to make it the best possible, as it has significant long-term impact on the community.

**Motion was made by Secretary Noordyke, seconded by member Richardson, to approve recommendation of the 2024 Master Plan to the Township Board for adoption with the following changes.**

- 1. Update 52nd/Kraft to be a cemetery with correct shading.**
- 2. Revert to the version of the Future Land Use map approved a few months ago.**
- 3. Change the shading of 2900 Thornapple River Dr to public/semi-public.**
- 4. Change the language on Future Land Use map to reflect rural residential from rural preservation on map**

**Supported:** Moxley, Richardson, Rowland, Rissi, Noordyke, Noordhoek

**Opposed:** Bruneau

**ARTICLE 11. Acknowledge visitors and those wishing to speak.**

No one wished to comment.

**ARTICLE 12. Other Business**

Secretary Noordyke said that he has been working with staff to streamline the minutes approval process. He proposed having commissioners send their amendments to him by the Sunday before the planning commission meetings so he can compile them and send them to the Planning Director on Monday morning for the final version to be ready by the meeting. Member Bruneau expressed concern about having to review minutes twice under the proposed process, since the packet version may differ from the final version sent after compiling amendments. Vice Chair Rissi noted that legal counsel previously advised against deliberating on minutes outside of public meetings. Suggested sticking with the current process since significant amendments have only been needed at the past two meetings. Planning Director Hendrick clarified that the discrepancy between packet and final minutes is because the packet isn't changed after being sent, but draft minutes are sent separately the week before to the secretary. Member Bruneau estimated that 80% of his past minutes amendments have been grammatical, while 20% have been substantive corrections to motions or missing information. Planning Director Hendrick stated that staff is implementing new practices like verbally confirming who made/seconded each motion and using more roll call votes to minimize potential minutes errors.

Member Rowland congratulated the Class of 2024. He expressed concern that commissioners are jumping to motions too quickly and stifling discussion. He suggested the township should push back on Kent County Road Commission using Cascade roads for experimental paving. He felt the township should communicate disappointment to Forest Hills Schools for selling a building without giving Cascade first right of refusal. Planning Director Hendrick noted Member Rowland's comments are not Planning Commission matters and encouraged him to communicate with the Township Supervisor about those issues instead.

Vice Chair Rissi asked if staff could include excerpts of relevant zoning ordinance sections in the meeting packets when cases involve those regulations, to make it easier for commissioners to reference. He questioned whether there is a definition of "gate" in the ordinance, as the recent fence discussions raised that issue. Zoning Administrator Smith-Jacoby confirmed that the fence ordinance does address gates/gatehouses but acknowledged the definitions may need to be updated for consistency. She stated staff is working on ordinance amendments.

Trustee Noordhoek suggested the density tables that were removed from the master plan should be added in to provide guidelines for future decisions. Secretary Noordyke agreed the density concepts are helpful but questioned if it must be in the Master Plan or could be a separate Planning Commission document. Planning Director Hendrick explained the process and timeline for tackling Zoning Ordinance updates and revisions now that the Master Plan is close to adoption. Staff will bring the new ordinance table of contents and use tables to the July meetings for commissioner input. Work sessions will be scheduled to allow commissioners to review and provide feedback on each draft ordinance chapter.

Member Bruneau asked if the ordinance drafts will clearly show the proposed changes compared to current language. Planning Director Hendrick confirmed that additions and deletions will be marked, but noted some reorganization will also occur so not everything will be a direct comparison.

Chair Moxley asked for an update on the farmland preservation program. Planning Director Hendrick mentioned staff has begun meeting internally to review past work on the program. A meeting with county staff is pending. A local farmer was recently connected with the county farmland preservation program as a first step. The township program will aim to coordinate with the county and target areas that may not fit their criteria but are still a priority for Cascade with potential funding mechanisms being explored. Zoning ordinance updates will also address related issues like landscaping, tree preservation, and open space requirements. She estimated another 6-8 weeks before bringing a more detailed plan to the commission.

## **ARTICLE 13.**

### **Adjourn**

**Motion was made by Secretary Noordyke, seconded by Member Rowland, to adjourn at 9:26pm. Motion carried unanimously.**