

## MINUTES

Cascade Charter Township  
Planning Commission  
Monday, June 7, 2021  
7:00 P.M. Hybrid Meeting  
2870 Jacksmith Ave SE

**ARTICLE 1.** Chairman Rissi called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.  
Members Present: Katsma, Noordhoek, Rapin, Deering, Rissi, Moxley, Korstange, Meurlin, and Noordyke  
Members Absent: None  
Others Present: Director Steve Peterson, Planner Brian Hilbrands, and those listed on the sign-in sheet

**ARTICLE 2. Pledge of Allegiance.**

**ARTICLE 3. Approve the current Agenda.**

**Motion was made by Member Noordyke to approve the current Agenda. Supported by Member Deering. Motion carried 9 to 0.**

**ARTICLE 4. Approve the Minutes of the April 19, 2021 meeting.**

**Motion was made by Member Katsma to approve the Minutes of April 19, 2021. Supported by Member Noordyke. Chairman Rissi asked for a typo correction on page 4, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph down (single sentence) of "is" to "if". Motion carried with this correction 9 to 0.**

**ARTICLE 5. Acknowledge visitors and those wishing to speak to agenda or non-agenda items.**

Mr. Mark Rohde (3087 Thornapple River Drive) came forward to state that he is an adjacent landowner to the Roundhill project, and expected to be invited to the meeting tonight as landowners adjacent to a possible PUD amendment should be notified in writing two weeks prior to the meeting. Mr. Rohde expressed his concern that there is a retaining wall up to 16 ft high without a guardrail on the Roundhill property and believes this to be a safety issue. Mr. Rohde also expressed his concern that there is a retaining wall shown in the middle of a property line setback. Mr. Rohde stated that he does not have a problem with a pool going in, but would like to see it done correctly and according to ordinances if it is approved.

Chairman Rissi stated that this is a basic preliminary review, and if the applicant wishes to proceed after hearing comments of this review, there will be a public hearing in which Mr. Rohde and other adjacent property owners will be notified of.

Mr. Jeff Dionne (2984 Thornapple River Drive) stated that in relation to Article 9 on the Agenda, he believes the Planning Commission Board should have an active role in controlling and planning the direction and speed of traffic throughout the Township,

specifically through neighborhoods. Mr. Dionne stated that he would like to see all Township rules and ordinances enforced equally.

**ARTICLE 6. Case #21-3629/Bob Morse**

**Property Address: 6390 and 6420 28<sup>th</sup> St**

**Requested Action:** Basic Plan Review for an amendment to the PUD to accommodate a new car wash.

Planner Hilbrands stated that the applicant has submitted three plan options for review. Plan A is very similar to their original plan introduced at the meeting in April; this would combine all parcels and right of way, and place both a carwash building and drive thru coffee shop on the one parcel. Planner Hilbrands noted that the zoning ordinance only allows for one building with a primary use on a parcel, which in this case would be the car wash with the coffee shop being the second building with a primary use; the second building would not be permitted. Planner Hilbrands stated that there are a few examples in the Township of multiple commercial buildings on one parcel, however each of those properties is being used a retail strip center, and although there are multiple tenants in each one, so the use is the same for each building. None of these examples are standalone buildings as the applicant is proposing. The example parcels are also much larger in size than the applicants proposed 2.1-acre parcel that would have two buildings with two separate uses on it. The number of buildings allowed is also based on the minimum lot size requirements of the underlying zoning. The underlying B2 zoning has a minimum size of 3 acres, so in order for the parcel to have two buildings, it would need to be at least 6 acres in size.

Planner Hilbrands stated that the applicants Plan B is similar to Plan A, except each building would be on its own parcel, and the applicant is proposing that the eastern parcel be reduced from .7 acres (153 feet wide) to .48 acres (104 feet wide). Planner Hilbrands stated that the existing parcel is already well under the minimum size requirements of 3 acres and 300-foot width for B2 zoning, so this would be considered a legal, nonconforming parcel. Planner Hilbrands stated that the expectation for a legal, non-conforming parcel is that they are brought closer to compliance when there is a change being made to them, this would bring the parcel further from compliance as the size would be shrinking. Planner Hilbrands stated that if the applicant would like to have two parcels, the property lines should remain the same.

Planner Hilbrands stated that Plan C also proposes to combine the parcels and right of way into one parcel, however it would only include the carwash. This is in line with comments provided after the initial basic plan review and it is the plan that staff would prefer moving forward since its asking for the fewest exceptions, and most closely follows zoning requirements.

Planner Hilbrands stated that after a plan has been decided on, the applicant must submit required documents for a site plan review, all of which are listed in the Staff report. The next phase will be a public hearing for a preliminary development plan review.

Member Korstange asked to see where the original property lines are between the two parcels on Plan A, Planner Hilbrands drew the lines on the plan for Members to view.

Member Moxley asked about the obvious grade difference between the east and west side of the property, and if the applicant has taken any steps to address the slope. Planner Hilbrands stated that he is unsure, but the applicant may be able to answer this.

Member Noordyke asked if the vacuums at the end of the car wash have been removed from the plan. Planner Hilbrands stated that it appears they have been removed from both plan A and B.

Member Noordyke stated that he does not believe it to be unrealistic to have two buildings with separate uses where there are already two buildings with separate uses. Planner Hilbrands stated that the two buildings currently on the property are on two separate parcels, and that the applicant is combining the parcels for the ability to have a larger car wash, therefore losing the ability to have a second building.

Member Rapin asked if there is a plan to correct the vacuum setback to 50 feet on Plan C since there is more space available than the 36-foot setback shown on Plan A. Planner Hilbrands stated that the vacuums are in the same position on all plans and he is unsure if the applicant will be using that space on the east side for stormwater retention, however there may be an opportunity to move the vacuums closer to the 50-foot setback.

Member Meurlin asked how long the two parcels have been vacant. Planner Hilbrands stated that the motel was in use until recently, and the Pizza Hut has been vacant for about a year. Member Meurlin stated that he believes the Township does not need to stick absolutely to the rules if there is an opportunity to enhance an area.

Member Meurlin asks what exceptions to the rules Plan C would require. Planner Hilbrands stated that Plan C has exceptions to setbacks for both the vacuums and the building (from 28<sup>th</sup> St.).

Member Noordyke asked about vacuum setbacks for other car washes in the Township as he says they are not 50 feet from a setback line. Director Peterson stated that the vacuums in question (Mr. Car Wash) have been there for quite a while, and they are in the B1 district which allows for different setbacks. Chairman Rissi asked if the setbacks for the vacuums can be reduced since this is a PUD, Director Peterson stated that is possible. Director Peterson stated that there is a concern of two businesses that both have heavy traffic flow in close proximity causing traffic backups. Member Noordyke stated that he has been to other Tommy's car wash locations, and believes they have found a way to successfully route traffic while sharing lots with other businesses.

Member Moxley stated that erosion control and a detention basin will be important with this plan as there is a lot of paved area, and with the grades, water will run downhill towards the east.

Member Deering asked if exceptions to setbacks will need to be made for each plan. Planner Hilbrands stated yes, as each plan has the same setbacks. Member Deering asked if the only other exception for Plan A is to add the second business, Planner Hilbrands stated yes, from his perspective at this time, however he would have to look at the plan in further detail as it is provided.

Planner Hilbrands stated that as the PUD is currently written, it does not allow for fast food restaurants, and that is what a drive thru coffee shop would have to be considered. The PUD would need to have its language changed.

Chairman Rissi stated that Starbucks in The Village did not need to be classified as a fast-food restaurant as it does not prepare food on site. Director Peterson stated that is correct, and that parking calculations/requirements are much higher for a fast-food restaurant than for a restaurant or drive thru.

Member Deering asked for confirmation that the coffee shop will only be a drive thru. Planner Hilbrands stated that is what the applicant is proposing.

Member Katsma asked for clarification of parcel sizes for Plan B. Planner Hilbrands stated that minimum size and width is based on underlying zoning, which is B2 in this area, and that requires 3 acres and a 300-foot width. Planner Hilbrands stated that the smaller parcel is currently only 153 feet wide, and with the applicant proposing to move the property line, that would leave the parcel only 103 feet wide, and less than an acre in size.

Chairman Rissi asked if Planner Hilbrands is aware of why the lot line is being moved to its proposed location. Planner Hilbrands stated that there is not enough setback for the building, and the current lot line would go right through a needed component for the car wash.

Member Noordhoek asked about the vacuums near the west exit, and how wide the parking spots for those are. Planner Hilbrands stated that they are 90-degree spaces that can be pulled straight into, and the travel lanes are a typical width for parking spaces on each side, which is a 24-foot width between the two sides, and 18-foot parking spaces.

Member Katsma expressed concern regarding what would happen if the coffee shop closes in the future and the owner wants to have another business move in. The concern is because if the coffee shop is approved as part of this plan, there would be restrictions on what kind of business could operate in that space in the future.

Member Meurlin asked if the applicant will own each business, or if they will operate independently. Planner Hilbrands stated that he believes each business will be owned and operate independently.

Chairman Rissi invited the applicant to comment.

Mr. Robert Morse stated that his goal is to focus on Plan A, and that they've made several changes to the plan since the Planning Commission has last seen it. The bank of vacuums that were going to be at the exit of the car wash (38 feet away) has been eliminated and is now proposed to be a landscape buffer, north and south driveways have been removed, and a buffer yard to the east has been added (near the Electric Cheetah). Mr. Morse believes that making these changes will simplify the traffic flow and eliminate conflicts.

Mr. Morse stated that the coffee shop is/will typically be busiest in the morning, and the car wash is/will typically be busiest in the afternoon going into evening hours, so he believes that these two uses go well together.

Mr. Morse stated that the currently approved land coverage for the property in question is 52%, and that he is asking for 51%, so less than what is already approved. Mr. Morse stated that his requested land coverage usage is less than many other commercial use PUDs in the Township.

Mr. Morse stated that there will be a land lease for the coffee shop.

Mr. Morse stated that they have support from the Kent County Road Commission to vacate the right of way on the property.

Mr. Doug Stalsonburg (Engineer for this project) stated that if a two-building concept is approved, stormwater detention will be handled underground; they do have a preliminary design in place for that.

Mr. Stalsonburg stated that in addition to the Road Commission supporting the vacation of the public street, they are ok with the storm sewer outlet connecting to an existing catch basin on 28<sup>th</sup> Street, and they also approve of eliminating one curb cut along 28<sup>th</sup> Street, and moving the other one to align with an existing curb cut that is across the street. Mr. Stalsonburg stated that the KCRC was concerned about the "stacking" of cars (line of cars waiting to get into the wash) and does not want them lined up on 28<sup>th</sup> St., however a plan was provided that was able to satisfy that concern.

Mr. Stalsonburg stated that they have provided a plan showing how the extreme difference in grading across the property can be accomplished so that a cross access connection to The Electric Cheetah can be made if it is still a requirement.

Chairman Rissi asked about a small part of parcel that shows to be in the right of way and asks if it is an error, Planner Hilbrands stated that the applicant is purchasing that part of the parcel from the southern parcel.

Member Moxley asks what the primary difference between Plan A and Plan B is, Planner Hilbrands stated that there is a difference of combining the two parcels to make one, or having the two parcels.

Member Meurlin asked if it can be required that the coffee shop building be torn down if it becomes vacant for a period of time. Director Peterson stated that has never been a

requirement in the past, and the way the PUD ordinance would be written, it would allow only for another coffee shop to go into that space, any other use would need to go in front of the Commission again for an amendment request.

Member Rapin prefers Plan C, but believes that if Plan A moves forward, every exception that can be removed should be removed.

Member Moxley also prefers Plan C, and believes that Plan A is too congested. Member Noordyke asked if Plan A moves forward, can an agreement be made with the applicant to raze the coffee shop if it sits vacant for a predetermined period of time. Director Peterson stated that is possible if the applicant would volunteer to do that.

Member Korstange asked for an explanation as to why the applicant was asked to connect the business via the cross-access point. Planner Hilbrands stated that the driveway currently there allows access to those parcels from 28<sup>th</sup> Street, so eliminating that would make it more difficult to turn into or out of those businesses.

Planner Hilbrands stated that he would like the Planning Commission to give the applicant a direction to head in (Plan A/B/C), and if there is going to be two businesses on one parcel, he would like very specific reasoning as to why it's allowed in this instance so it won't be assumed as possible in the future.

Member Noordyke asked if they could ask the applicant right now if they would be willing to sign an agreement stating that they will raze the coffee shop building after a period of vacancy. Mr. Morse stated that he would be happy to sign that agreement.

Member Noordyke asked if the applicant would be willing to remove the southwest bank of vacuums (to presumably ease congestion), Mr. Morse stated that he would not want to underserve the community and that they typically have 15 vacuums, which is a number they are already under. Mr. Morse stated that this same setup is in other locations, and they have not had problems with congestions.

Conversation was held between Members on how to suggest the applicant move forward. Six Members are comfortable with "Plan A to C" with an agreement to raze the coffee shop building after a period of vacancy, three prefer Plan C.

**ARTICLE 7. Case #21-3636/Roundhill**

**Property Address: 3000 Thornhills**

**Requested Action:** Amend PUD to allow for a retaining wall and pool within the 25-foot setback for unit 4 (6569 Roundhill Ct.)

Director Peterson stated this is a basic plan review to intended to introduce the project to the Planning Commission, and then to give the Planning Commission the opportunity to ask for any additional information they need to move forward.

Director Peterson stated that Roundhill is the ten-unit subdivision that was built a couple of years ago. This project has a long history with compliance issues during the 2019 amendments. One of those amendments is that there was nothing to be placed in

required 25-foot setback; specifically including retaining walls, excluding the large retaining wall approved as part of the project. Director Peterson stated that the applicant has come forward with a proposed amendment to add a pool, and a retaining wall within the 25-foot setback. Director Peterson stated that in normal subdivisions, pools are allowed as close as ten feet to the property line, which is measured to the water. In the current PUD language, this would not be permitted because it's inside the 25-foot rear yard setback.

Director Peterson stated that the original project had a retaining wall along the north side, however the developer removed it during the 2019 amendment. As a result, the stormwater system was designed accordingly, and has been complied with.

Member Noordyke asked if any citations have been issued to Roundhill since the 2019 amendments. Director Peterson stated that no citations have been issued. Member Noordyke asked if every timeline agreed to has been met by the builder. Director Peterson stated they have hit every timeline, however there have been instances of one thing needing to be completed before something else can be started.

Member Moxley stated that he is concerned about the way the retaining wall is designed, and believes it should be raised to divert water away from washing over the top of the wall.

Member Meurlin asks if this request is from one owner because of something he wants to do, or if this is the builder making the request after agreeing to the 25-foot setback rule. Director Peterson stated that should be asked of the applicant.

Chairman Rissi asked Director Peterson how far the house is from the back lot line at the nearest corner. Director Peterson stated approximately 30 feet. Chairman Rissi asked if there is a rule stating how far a pool needs to be from a building/structure, Director Peterson stated there is no rule. Chairman Rissi asked what the side yard setback is for a pool, Director Peterson stated it is ten feet to property lines, and it cannot be in the front yard.

Chairman Rissi invited the applicant to come forward.

Mr. Tom Giusti came forward as the builder/developer for this project. Mr. Giusti stated that he is proposing the retaining wall within the setback as it is on the south side of the project. Mr. Giusti stated that although it was approved originally on the north side, the wall wasn't necessary at that point. Mr. Giusti stated that units 3 and 4 are the units with the highest slope from the Township property, and there are catch basins along that area.

Mr. Giusti states that the drawing shows where the retaining wall would be, where the pool would be, and where the drainage heading to the furthest east catch basin is (which is outside of the retaining wall). Mr. Giusti states there is no issue with unit 3 or 5, and units 1 and 2 do not have the elevation changes that would require a retaining wall.

Mr. Meurlin asked if the owner of unit 3 has a problem with the wall and its design that seems likely to push water into his yard. Mr. Giusti stated no, not that he is aware of. Mr. Giusti stated that there is a catch basin behind every unit.

Member Moxley asked if there is a way to create a swale to divert the water to either side so it does not wash over the top edge and into the pool. Mr. Giusti stated that is possible.

Member Noordhoek stated that he has a concern with a retaining wall going in behind lot 4 as there seemed to be problems with the rules last time. Mr. Giusti stated that the last wall was approved by the Township to be where it was, and he was also trying to be compliant with the neighbor. Member Noordhoek stated that he would like to have an owner's rep to make sure that conditions are met with a new wall.

Member Meurlin asked where water between units 4 and 5 goes as he does not see a storm sewer or drain. Director Peterson reminded Members that this is a basic plan review, and what Member Meurlin is looking for (detailed engineering plans) is part of what he is asking the developer to provide in order to do an evaluation.

Member Noorddyke asked Mr. Giusti if he intended to install guardrails in certain areas at the property. Mr. Giusti stated that has not been decided yet, however something may be installed in the future depending on the homeowner.

Member Meurlin asked if installing a pool is Mr. Giusti's decision, or the buyers. Mr. Giusti stated this is something the buyer wants to do.

Chairman Rissi asked if the catch basin could move and the pool be located there, and if so, would a retaining wall or PUD amendment be needed. Director Peterson stated if the pool and/or wall was outside of the 25-foot setback no amendment would be needed. Director Peterson stated a pool could go in the side yard as far as the front corner of the house.

Chairman Rissi stated that he would like to explore all options in order to avoid amending the PUD.

Mr. Giusti asked for clarification of if the PUD is amended, will that only apply to unit 4, or for the entire project. Chairman Rissi stated it would be amended to show this change only for unit 4, the change will not follow each lot.

Member Katsma asked if there are any other projects where the retaining wall is in the setback. Chairman Rissi stated that is a concern the neighbor has (that the wall is in the setback), but that anywhere else, retaining walls can be in the setback. Director Peterson stated that setbacks are not taken for retaining walls, but in 2019 it was established in the (current) PUD ordinance that nothing be in that 25-foot setback.

Member Noorddyke asked if it is fair to say that Staff will recommend to not approve this because of the 2019 PUD amendment. Director Peterson stated he would like to see the

detailed plans of the whole project/stormwater system before any recommendation at this point.

Mr. Giusti asked why this (the retaining wall) was allowed on the south side of the project, but is now not allowed on the north side. Chairman Rissi stated that had it not been removed from the 2019 plan it would already be there.

Member Meurlin stated that he would be opposed because of precedent setting as he can see the other parcels having this same issue.

Member Katsma stated that he likes the alternative of moving the catch basin to install a pool in a different location.

Member Rapin asked Director Peterson if the engineering he is asking for would be necessary if the pool is moved to a spot that did not fall in that 25-foot setback. Director Peterson stated that if the pool could be put in a spot that didn't need the retaining wall or the pool in that setback, it would not need a PUD amendment. Director Peterson stated that moving the catch basin would need the approval of the Township engineer and would be a minor administrative change that would need to be applied for, but would not require the Planning Commissions approval.

Member Noordyke stated that he is not in favor of approving this because of the time it took to get to the current 25-foot setback amendment, and in fairness to the applicant thinks he should know before spending any additional time or money on this process. Member Noordyke stated that if there is a way to have the pool moved to fit within the parameters, that is something completely different and could be supported.

Members Moxley, Deering, and Meurlin also state their agreeance with Member Noordykes comments.

**ARTICLE 8. Case #21-3640/Cascade Township**  
Discussion of Temporary Outdoor Uses

Director Peterson stated that as a result of Covid, Township Staff has come up with a way to administratively approve businesses to utilize their outdoor space to safely accommodate patrons. As a result of the last extension by the Township Board, Director Peterson stated that the Board has asked the Planning Commission to look at approving requests this way permanently. There are two uses allowed right now; a short-term event, which would be 72 hours or less, or a long-term use, which would be a permanent outside use that requires a Type 2 Special Use Permit, which requires a Planning Commission public hearing, and a Township Board approval. Director Peterson stated that this process takes about six weeks.

Director Peterson stated that tonight he is introducing this idea to the Planning Commission, and would like to have this on the agenda for public hearing at the July 12 meeting.

Member Katsma asked if there will be a design or standard that will need to be followed, Director Peterson stated that there are none at this time, but it will be up to the Planning Commission if they would like to require any.

Member Katsma asked if there is a plan to reach out to businesses for their input. Director Peterson stated that Sandra Korhorn (Economic Development) has reached out to many businesses already, but will continue to reach out during a public notice phase.

Member Katsma stated that seasonal requirements (example: an “igloo” works well in the winter, but may not in the summer) should be something to think about if any requirements will be set in place.

Member Korstange asked if there is a time frame that a permit is good for at this time. Director Peterson stated that permits are good until the current provision expires, but time frames can be discussed if desired as part of this amendment.

Member Meurlin stated that he would like to see standards set so that aesthetics from the outside are acceptable.

Chairman Rissi and Members agreed to set the public hearing for July.

#### **ARTICLE 9. Review Kent County Road Commission Five Year Road Improvement Plans**

Director Peterson stated that this is an annual report that the Planning Commission receives, and is a summary of the work that is, or will be, going on in Cascade Township.

Chairman Rissi asked how much say the Township has with the Road Commission regarding what happens in the Township. Director Peterson stated that the Township does not have much say at all.

Member Moxley asked what the status of the non-motorized trail and bridge over I96 is. Director Peterson stated that “behind the scene” work is underway right now, and because it’s a bridge over a highway it will need to be reviewed by the federal highway department, and then move on to the state approval process. Director Peterson stated that it’s hopeful to start on site work this fall, and reminds the Commission that it is a separate pedestrian bridge.

Member Meurlin asked what the projected cost is now versus what it was in the beginning. Director Peterson stated that he does not have those numbers at this time, but knows that there has been added cost as it relates to soil underneath the area. Director Peterson stated that he will get the cost projection numbers for the next meeting. Member Meurlin asks how much the grant was, Director Peterson stated that he believes it is 1.3 million dollars.

Member Meurlin asks if anything is or will be done about the bridge over the Thornapple River in Cascade. Director Peterson stated there has been talks about that area, however it has not been made a priority by the Township Board yet at this point.

**ARTICLE 10. Election of Vice Chairperson**

**Member Moxley nominated Member Chris Noordyke as Vice Chairman. Supported by Member Meurlin. Motion carried 9 to 0.**

**ARTICLE 11. Any Other Business**

Chairman Rissi stated that he believes the agenda should be changed to state “public comment – anything *not* slated for public hearing”. Director Peterson stated that it has been the discretion of the Planning Commission Chair to allow public comment at a certain time, however this change can be made if desired.

Director Peterson stated that he will work on the language of the agenda, and send it to Chairman Rissi for review.

Member Deering asked if there is a way to receive the information packet for meetings earlier in the week to review. Director Peterson stated that it is possible to try to provide this earlier, however sometimes Staff is waiting for items from an applicant or other government agencies.

Director Peterson stated that this will be worked on with Staff, and will be reported back to The Planning Commission.

Member Korstange asked if there can be an “Old Business” item line added to the agenda to be able to discuss recent cases or activity. Director Peterson stated that can be done.

Discussion was held about rules of conduct for Members, Member Meurlin stated that he would like to have the Township General Counsel review the rules of conduct and provide his view of them. Member Meurlin stated that he would also like Counsel to draft new rules of conduct for the Planning Commission.

Chairman Rissi stated that he would like Committee Members to come up with questions they would like to ask Legal Counsel, and then invite Counsel to a meeting where those questions are presented to both Staff and Counsel.

Member Meurlin stated that he would like to hear what Counsel finds to be typical rules of conduct for a Planning Commission.

Member Noordyke stated that he believes Members should have Township email addresses for FOIA protection as he does not want his personal email used in a discovery request. Member Noordyke states that this would also help Members communicate with each other outside of the meeting.

Chairman Rissi stated that the Township Attorney had indicated to him that he does not know of any other Township that does not provide email addresses for Commission and Board Members.

(Zoom audio was lost at this time for a brief moment)

Member Meurlin stated that he believes the Planning Commission should have a significant input to the Townships Four Year Strategic Plan.

Member Meurlin stated the he believes Chairman Rissi should receive the agenda before it is made viewable to other Members or the public in order to be able to comment or add items to it.

Chairman Rissi asked if Director Peterson has been a part of any discussion about including the Planning Commission in the creation of the strategic plan. Director Peterson states that he has not seen anything in regards to the strategic plan. Chairman Rissi asks Assistant Manager Fast (who is in attendance) if she has been made aware of the Planning Commission being part of the strategic plan, she stated that is being handled by Manager Swayze, and she has not seen anything in regards to it. Chairman Rissi suggested that Township Board Representative Noordhoek relays to the Township Board that the Planning Commission would like to be part of this process.

Chairman Rissi asked if Staff is aware of what will be on the upcoming agenda a week before the scheduled meeting, and stated that he would like to receive the agenda at that time if possible. Director Peterson stated that is possible.

Member Korstange stated that she believes it would be nice for all Members to receive the agenda early if possible. Chairman Rissi stated that he can forward the agenda to Members once he receives and approves it.

Conversation was held about the timing of creation and distribution of the agenda and meeting information packet.

Member Merlin asked Director Peterson if the Planning Commission does an annual report. Director Peterson states that he does and gives it to the Township Manager. Member Meurlin stated that the annual report he read was for the Community Development Department, not just for the Planning Commission. Member Meurlin stated that there is statute that states the Planning Commission has an obligation to write an annual report, and that Staff should draft the report, it should be reviewed and modified by the Planning Commission, and then given to the Board of Trustees, not the Manager. Chairman Rissi stated that this conversation should be picked up closer to the end of the year.

Chairman Rissi asks Director Peterson if a resolution can be made to have the Planning Commission included in the creation of the strategic plan. Member Noordhoek (Township Board Rep) stated that Board Members, Department Heads, and citizens will be interviewed to gather information for the plan.

Member Meurlin stated that under the State statute, the Master Plan should be approved by the Planning Commission before it goes to the Township Board for their approval. If they disapprove part of it, they should note comments, and then send it

back to the Planning Commission for review and adjustment. Director Peterson stated that during the last Master Plan, the Board asserted their right to approve the Plan.

**ARTICLE 12. Adjournment**

**Motion was made by Member Meurlin to adjourn. Supported by Member Deering. Motion carried 9 to 0. The meeting was adjourned at 10:08 p.m.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Brett Katsma, Secretary