

**CASCO TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
RENTAL WORKSHOP
DECEMBER 20, 2017
3PM – 6PM**

Members Present: Chairperson Dian Liepe, Daniel Fleming, Greg Knisley, and David Hughes

Absent: Judy Graff

Staff Present: Kathy Stanton, Substitute Recording Secretary

Also Present: Lynee Wells (Williams & Works) Ron Bultje (Township Attorney), Supervisor Overhiser, Trustee Macyauski, Clerk Brenner and 15 interested citizens. (attachment #1)

Diane opened the meeting by asking if anyone wanted to make a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion was not made to adjourn the meeting.

1. Call to order and review of agenda
2. Opening comments by PC members
3. Public Comment
4. Approval of Minutes 11/29/2017 (Workshop Meeting)
5. Update on Public Meeting held 12/11
6. Continue review and discussion where we left off on updated draft
7. PC members decide next steps
8. Public comment
9. Closing Comments from /Commissioners and Adjournment

2 Opening comments by PC members

Dave Communicated that he was concerned that the meeting was moving forward without Judy and that he had expressed that concern to Dian earlier in the week. Related to motion to adjourn the meeting...committee of 7 dropped to

5 now down to 4 that concern the meeting. Didn't want to address the subject without her, but understands the need to move forward.

Diane explained that Judy was invited to attend by phone, but she declined. Dian explained that there have been other workshop meetings where Judy couldn't attend and the meetings were held. Dian also stated that her preference was to have everyone in attendance, but that there is a quorum and that she has to treat everyone as equal and can't hold the committee hostage because one member can't come. Dian explained that Judy stated that a meeting wasn't held when Dian was sick and couldn't be there. Dian explained to Judy that was an entirely different situation where the Vice-Chair had recused himself from the issue being discussed so there wasn't someone to run the meeting

Ron explained that the most that will happen at the meeting today will be to tentatively agree on language that will be sent forward to a public hearing and that Judy will have an opportunity to weigh in both at the public hearing and as a member of the board.

Ron offered to weigh in on the by-laws, regarding emails back and forth. Ron reviewed the bylaws and it states that there will be 2 week notice of a PC meeting. This is a constitutional meeting under the open meeting act because this is a continuation of the other meeting that was scheduled 3 weeks ago. Because of the tentative nature of the meeting he said that he was comfortable moving ahead with the meeting and that the meeting is in full compliance with the law.

3 Public Comment

John Barkley – Stated that he was going to be “consistent if not repetitive... that by any measure of what we have seen so far, short term renting causes some level of disturbance – it seems to be most significant for people who live on the lakeshore and maybe less significant for those who rent on a regular basis or those who live off the lakeshore. But it is still a significant problem for us – the only question is how bad is it? So that's what we've struggled with, with the data.

So, I'd like you again, to please consider a more restrictive policy, for instance, a great example that I like is from Spring Lake Township and it offers a maximum of 14 days, 2 occurrences per year and limits the number of people. It's a win:win to use Allan's words, because it allows people who want to rent to meet some property tax or some financial wants that they have but it also limits people that want to rent full-time, or the hotels, or the party houses that causes most of the disturbances we have. I'd also, since that isn't enough for you today, I'd also ask that you address the tipping point which is also sometimes called the density problem – could choose a nominal limit which I'd like to see you do, some communities choose 10% for example, or use the same standard that is currently applied to B&Bs today – which is a 300 ft. distance – that would avoid discriminating either against short term rentals or B&Bs - it would be a consistent policy you could use. so I think you could address the tipping point either way if you chose to do that. I think it is a significant problem for at least one neighborhood, well-studied it's been discussed.

Chris Barczyk – Thanked Ron for addressing the bylaws, but added a side note that MCL statute does state that the bylaws will dictate and supersede the state minimums. The only reference made to continuance of meetings “references a 36 hour carryover, not a rescheduling like this”.

Going to John's point...I think there are a few different things You all wanted to address saturations – I heard it in the last meeting when we had open dialogue – we asked that there at least be a discussion and that you commence on some form of acknowledgement and per Allan's own tipping point of rentals doubling – Miami is a prime example of rentals doubling. We've hit the tipping point, we had a moratorium, we crossed that line, we hit that tipping point, we've crossed that line. So can we start with just one community, can we at least have a dialogue about what's reasonable. And I'll throw out Vancouver as another option

...wanted to address saturation there is a line in the sand...VanCouver is another option for reviewing rental issues.

Darren Massey – If anyone wants to review the FOIA information you will see that there has been a systematic approach to slowing the process down. Start making motions and advance the process.

Laura Toweson – Looking at complaints sent in and there are has been a lot of time spent on issues that are tiny compared to the number people complaints involved.

Chris Barczyk - To Darren's point, in the window during the summer were not held or scheduled during the summer.

Diane – pointed out that there have been 20 meetings held by the Planning Commission in 2017 - at least 8 special meetings.

4 Approval of minutes from November 29th (workshop meeting)

Dan makes motion to approve the minutes. Greg seconded.

Discussion: Dan – 1st page, number 2, 4th line up change exhausting to exhaustion, Page 10 halfway down, supported by Fleming. It actually was not seconded, and died for the lack of a second.

Dave asked if we make corrections based on Grammar and the answer was no...unless it affects the content.

Motion was made to approve the minutes with the corrections. All approved.

5 Update on Public meeting held 12/11

Allan provided the update:

At the last board meeting they asked if there were any more changes and no one offered any. Ron has been involved in the process and has worked carefully to make sure the content is what it should be for a regulatory ordinance. He suggested removing some items because they were zoning related. Where we are today is waiting to see where the PC goes and the board is pretty much finished and waiting.

Dave asked a question about why the section on extension of application for more than 12 occupants was removed and Allan explained why that provision was removed – it was discussed over several meetings and on and off over the past year. Over that number is where things get problematic.

Also, removed daytime guests for funneling reasons...trying to support the residential neighborhood aspect of things.

Why is the board not dealing with saturation limits? Because there aren't good numbers to work with and we need to get a years worth of real data, with host compliance helping with the monitoring.

Ron said that if the Board had started looking at saturation (as part of the regulatory ordinance) he would have told them that the Planning Commission should be looking at saturation as a zoning issue. Ultimately it's a board decision, but it's a zoning issue.

Dave asked what the zoning ordinance should include, what should be in it. Allan responded that zoning should be land use descriptions/definitions. The regulatory ordinance deals with behavioral issues.

Dan asks why the Planning Commission is looking at the regulatory ordinance? And wonders if they regulatory ordinance is applied district by district or if it applies to the whole township.

Ron says it is instructive...and they can take the behavioral things and not include them...don't worry about them and limit yourselves to land use issues...and if the Zoning Ordinance allows Short Term Rentals, then the Regulatory Ordinance applies to the whole township the way it's written.

Dan asks if the Regulatory Ordinance can be written so it only applies to certain districts...the answer is yes. Hearings are not required...The Planning commission plays no formal role.

Dan asked if the PC did not approve Short Term Rentals anywhere in the township, then the regulatory ordinance wouldn't apply anywhere?

Ron answered Yes. The Regulatory ordinance applies to all short term rentals...but the Planning Commission can adopt an ordinance that approves short term rentals only in certain districts or limit it, including not allowing Short Term Rentals anywhere in the township.

Dian: Can they say, "Yes, you can have short term rentals in the AG district?" Can we allow rentals in all areas but say the Regulatory Ordinance doesn't apply to all areas?

Ron: The zoning ordinance cannot restrict the Regulatory Ordinance but the Planning Commission can recommend to the board make changes to the Regulatory Ordinance.

Ron explained that the Planning Commission couldn't use the Zoning Ordinance to make changes to the Regulatory Ordinance.

Ron, explained that the Planning Commission can approve or disapprove Short-Term Rentals in each district. Then the PC can make a motion to recommend to the Board that the Regulatory Ordinance exempt a district (Ag for example).

Lynne says that a similar discussion took place at the previous meeting regarding adopting a 300 foot notification to the board – and that is something that they recommend to the board to consider.

Ron stated that those were clearly outlined in the November 29th minutes so they could be forwarded.

Dan: So, to break it down, we have to 1 – determine definitions & 2- districts where it is permitted.

Dian: Lynee will update as we go...to update we definitions and districts are what the pc is responsible for...You ave reg. thing next to it so you can we what's what.

Dave stated that this discussion has been very helpful.

6. Continue review and discussion where we left off on updated draft

Lynee Wells, Williams & Works leads the group through review of the proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance, picking up on page 3 ...November 21st version, labeled DRAFT FOR REVIEW 12/21/17:

Definition of “**rent or rental**” has not changed from the previous versions. Happy to discuss it but has been discussed before and it hasn't changed.

3.39 Rental of Dwellings

This will be in the Provisional section of Zoning Ordinance– introduces regulations applicable to the different types of rental activity – short-term, long term, or limited short term rental:

The provision having to do with **garbage and refuse** is stricken because it is addressed in the regulatory ordinance. See page 6, 01-05. of the regulatory ordinance, item J. There are a couple things that the ZO includes that the regulatory ordinance does not– closed containers and regular pick-up, but discussion concluded that they'd allow the board/regulatory ordinance to handle the garbage and refuse issue.

Lighting: The Lighting item did not change; it's handled in the existing Zoning Ordinance.

Parking: Staying the same - refer to chapter 18 section 3.24, regulation for parking for single family dwellings

Postings: struck because it is in the regulatory ordinance

Item 5 – Struck because it is in the regulatory ordinance - section 1-05. Section c. Regulatory ordinance is more complete

Signage: Keeping in one sentence from Zoning Ordinance: “signage, if permitted, shall comply with the standards of Section 19.07. The regulatory Ordinance also includes street address marker information.

Fire pit: SHAES – called SHAES and adjusted accordingly: A fire pit shall not be less than 25 feet from any structure or combustible materials. A portable outdoor fireplace shall not be less than 15 feet from any structure or combustible materials. The maximum size shall be three (3) feet wide by two (2) feet high, per the regulations set forth by SHAES *as of 11.1.17, or as amended*.

After some discussion it was decided to leave this section as is except to add per current SHAES requirements – “as amended” so that SHAES standards take precedent and as SHAES requirement change, they apply.

Tents: Beach tents or camping tents shall not be permitted between sunset and sunrise. Keeping this section as is. This would be on the property of the short term rentals.

Accessory uses: Keeping this reference as is – deferring to public nuisance regulations - Section 21.04

Greg: What is accessory use? Ron explains...an accessory use is subordinate to the principal use of the property. Greg pointed out that 21.04 is about nuisance use, not accessory use. Lynee explained that it becomes a nuisance use if it is violating the rule and 21.04 applies.

Item B: This is where we had issues only applicable to short term rentals and only in certain district. They are being stricken from this part of the Zoning Ordinance and I can talk about why. The first was length of stay and that a 6 night stay is required. In the regulatory ordinance, they only allow a single stay per week, so it results in a similar length of stay, but not require a 6 night stay. So you might have a week with four days empty, rather than this regulation where you would have to have 6 nights full.

Greg: It seems a little tough to describe. Who is going to keep track of how this works. Suggests that perhaps there has to be a 4 day gap between.

Dave says that when they discussed a 6-day minimum, they were concerned about people moving in and out more frequently and with the three days minimum with only one a week does the same thing.

Dian asks exactly how that reads in the Regulatory Ordinance:

Ron read from page 2 of Regulatory Ordinance (dated 11/22/2017):
“Short-Term Rental – The renting or subletting of a Single-Family Dwelling for compensation for a term of at least 3 but not more than 27 nights (rental for less than 3 nights are not allowed as Short-Term Rentals). Only one Rental term may begin for a Single-Family Dwelling during any calendar week of Sunday through Saturday.”

Dan suggests that since the board is taking care of this I'd make a suggestion to the that we leave it to the board. Dian and Ron pointed out that if there is an issue, the Regulatory Ordinance can be changed much more quickly than an adjustment can be made to the Zoning Ordinance. Dian confirmed that all members were good with leaving length of stay to the Board and the Regulatory Ordinance.

Maximum occupancy: The Planning Commission had talked about 3 per bedroom, not to exceed 10 per dwelling. The Planning Commission also had stated that no tents or campers were permitted for overnight lodging.

The Regulatory Ordinance is looking at the lesser of (1)12, or (2)two per bedroom plus two per finished story, which meets the applicable egress requirements for occupancy in the Michigan Construction Code.”

The Regulatory Ordinance also stated that basements and attics cannot be used as bedrooms. Dan, Dave, Greg, and Dian all agree that the board can deal with it since they removed the option for more than 12.

Guests: max number of guests being ½ the stays. Dian stated that she felt it was something the board should handle. Others agreed that it be stricken from the Zoning Ordinance and that it be handled in the Regulatory Ordinance by the Board ; allowed guests being half the number of overnight occupants.

Section C: This section relates to occupants and guests and were regulating those standards in differently in different districts. The Planning Commission had decided that these standards didn't apply in these other districts.

Bu now the Regulatory Ordinance applies to all districts at this time. Greg clarified that the areas are being struck that controlled that. Lynee suggest a discussion about recommendations they may or may not want to make to the board regarding regulations only applying to certain districts.

Dan wanted to request that the board explain their reasons for applying the regulations district by district. Dan just wants to understand why or why not.

Dan: makes a motion to ask the board for reasons why *each* district is included in the regulations. Why or why not...Dave seconded the motion. Some discussions followed clarifying what is being requested.

Dave says the Zoning Ordinance may allow Short-Term Rentals in all districts, but the Board can say the Regulatory Ordinance does not apply in the Ag district, for instance. Dian clarified that everyone understands the motion.

Vote on motion. All ayes. Motion passed.

Section D: Applied to all Short-Term Rentals

First one requires an owners agent. The Reg Ord includes (*registration includes providing*) in "Section 01-04. (b) (1) (A) : Name, address, phone number of the owner of the single-Family Dwelling to be used as Short-Term Rental (if the Owner does not reside within 45 miles of the Single-Family Dwelling, the Owner shall name local agent; the Owner, local agent, or the designee of either shall be

on site within one hour of being contacted by the Township or law enforcement concerning an issue regarding the Short-Term Rental;”

Lynee and Dian commented that this is pretty much what the Planning Commission had said and that it belongs in the Regulatory Ordinance.

The next section says that **All Short-Term Rentals be registered** and as we just heard, the Regulatory Ordinance includes that on page 2 in “Section 01-04. Registration Required (a) Registration required. All Short-Term Rentals **must** Be registered with the township.”

Lynee: Notification of Neighbors was discussed at the last meeting and what the PC decided at the last meeting was recommending that the Board consider adding that. Dian confirmed that there was a motion to make that recommendation.

Inspections: The PC had wanted inspections. In Section 105 (f) it says: “ The owner must consent to inspections of the Single-Family Dwelling used as a Short-Term Rental by South Haven Area Emergency Services upon request. In any area in which public water and public sanitary sewer are not available, the Owner must also consent to and pay for a septic inspection by the Allegan County Health Department and must obtain a certificate indicating the Single-Family Dwelling used as a Short-Term Rental has adequate septic pumping, which shall be renewed every three years.”

This section is stricken here but in the Regulatory version it is “by request” and the PC version it was “required”. The group confirmed that they believe that the Regulatory Ordinance is the right place to handle this and that the Regulatory version dives deeper by delving into the issue of Septic inspection and certification.

Dan: Wants to return to the discussion of overnight guests – I’m going to be hard on ron’s comment, but to me, what that does is that people who are honest and believe they have to follow the law, and that if there is no reporting unless there is an issue, it devalues the ordinance. It’s life. Dave commented that people who continually violate the rules, can be revoked.

So the next section deals with all the **Zoning Districts** and where short-term rentals, long-term rentals, and limited short-term rentals are permitted.

Dian: With the Regulatory Ordinance, do we even have a reason for a Limited Short-Term Rental?

There was discussion related to Limited Short-Term Rentals and it's purpose if the Regulatory Ordinance overrules the existence of Limited Short-Term Rentals which was designated to offer a category of limited rentals – 14 days or less that is exempt from the regulations. Ron asked if they want greater restrictions on the limited short term rentals. Dian wonders if someone can have cousins rent for two years, if regulations still have to be involved in that? Dave asked about having 2 weeks + 1 day and it being over the line. Dian asks how this can be done for people who only have had the same people come for 2 weeks – are they being treated the same. Ron says that the PC definition of Short-Term Rentals being permitted by definition eliminates the need for limited short-term rentals. Dave talks about the potential for them flying under the letter of the law and doing two weeks ten times. Ron asks whether there have been any problems with these types of rentals – and Greg and Dave asked about keeping track of these 2 week or less folks – there is no oversight then.

Dan asks if they can ask the board? Ron says that there isn't really anywhere for the PC to go with Limited Short-Term Rentals, but they could ask the Board to consider exempting the Limited Short-Term Rentals from the Regulations. Dave commented on there not having any oversight then and it allows people to fly under the radar and rent two weeks ten times. Ron asks what problem they are fixing – is there a need for regulations. Greg asked when someone says but I'm not a rental, I'm a Limited Short-Term Rental. Ron asks why they would be regulated if there hasn't been a problem? In that pie slice of the society?

Dian says they probably have to decide if they want to recommend to the board that they exempt the limited short-term rentals from the regulatory ordinance.

Dan makes a motion that the recommend that the Board consider their Limited Short-Term Rental Category definition in their regulation and making that category exempt from the regulations. Dian Seconds the motion.

All votes were Ayes and no Nays. Motion passed.

The next section involved reviewing the Zoning Districts and whether Long Term and Short Term Rentals are permitted in each of the districts. Lynee led the group through each district and the group restated their agreement on the following:

Section 5.02 PERMITTED USES AND SPECIAL USES

USES	AG
Long term rental	P
Short term rental	P

Section 6.02 PERMITTED USES AND SPECIAL USES

USES	RR
Long term rental	P
Short term rental	P

Section7A.02 PERMITTED USES AND SPECIAL USES

USES	LR-A
Long term rental	P
Short term rental	P

Section 7B.02 PERMITTED USES AND SPECIAL USES

USES	LR-B
Long term rental	P
Short term rental	P

Section 8.02 PERMITTED USES AND SPECIAL USES

USES	LDR
Long term rental	P
Short term rental	P

Section 9.02 PERMITTED USES AND SPECIAL USES

USES	MDR
Long term rental	P
Short term rental	P

Section 11.02 PERMITTED USES AND SPECIAL USES

USES	C-1
Long term rental	P
Short term rental	P

Section 12.02 PERMITTED USES AND SPECIAL USES

USES	C-2
Long term rental	P
Short term rental	P

Section 13.02 PERMITTED USES AND SPECIAL USES

USES	I
Long term rental	P
Short term rental	P

Dan asked that they go through each and explained why they are permitting Short-Term Rentals in each of these districts:

Dan: “The reason I’m in favor of permitting it in all these locations because it’s always been the intent to allow short-term rentals in this township and Judge Cronen’s decision pointed out a technicality in our ordinance (because our ordinance is positive law) and this move corrects the oversight to reflect the original intent of our zoning.”

Dave: “Consistency – and I’m still not sure that was the intent but if we don’t allow it according to the zoning ordinance, it’s not allowed. I also don’t think the intent was to not allow it. Just didn’t do anything. Agree that the intent was to allow it but no one complained until now.”

Greg: “Now that we are permitting it in all areas of the township, we are putting our faith in the Board to establish a regulation to keep it fair and honorable for all the residents.”

Dian: “I believe there has been a tradition of short-term renting as well as long-term renting and that is how residents have made it here and the reason to permit it is because it’s always gone on – both short term and long-term renting and it’s a good thing for our township I believe.”

Dan and Greg confirmed that the building height issue was removed from Short-Term Rental issue and will be addressed with the whole Planning Commission.

Greg – Does anyone have new thoughts about saturation?

Dian – It seems we have some info but not enough to make a determination of limits in certain areas. How do you make a determination in a certain area and say to people who have been renting that you can and you can’t. “ I don’t think we could do it”.

Ron – When B&B regulations were put into place – we do have some distance requirements with B&Bs - Casco wasn't ahead of the curve but were with the curve - B&Bs were a new thing, a developing thing. Rentals have been happening for decades, so we'd be essentially saying some people can't do something they've been doing for decades. How do we judges who, who has been doing this for decades? If we establish separation requirements, how do we make the call who gets to continue renting and who doesn't.

Ron says he isn't prepared to advise you on this right now – need an indepth study of the long-standing operations that have been in place and how close are they? To make recommendations, this requires a pretty in-depth study!

Dan – one suggestion – that they did up north in the cherry area. They bought development rights from the farmers. So, what if neighbors could buy the rental rights from their neighbors? A very free market approach would be to have neighbors able to buy the rental rights from their neighbors. Then we can buy this rather than stealing them.

Ron explained that development rights have typically been purchased by public entities.

Dan – it it possible to do it privately?

Sure, it's possible to do it privately. I'm going to put a deed restriction on your property that removes your right to rent. but what if the buyer changes their mind and says I'd like to do Short-Term Rentals now?

Dan says it's interesting that you are describing these rights as valuable and we are talking bout taking them away from this guy and this guy.

Ron – Well, Im not sure we are – we are trying to regulate as opposed to take them away.. At least that's where I'm thinking you are headed

Dian has thought but doesn't want to think it...give something to the people who were honest enough to come forward. But we can't do that because we didn't tell everyone that we'd approve those who came forward first. Dian thought there might be a way to reward those that came forward and admitted that they were renting, but she's not sure that is fair either.

Greg: so if we have renters who come forward and do everything right, and 12 months from now we discover we have an overwhelming number of renters in this area or district, do we have any recourse?

Dave: Can we put it forward as a question for the Township board to look at this issue – because it's obviously a deep subject – it's logarithmic and find places this is being done – or where it's too late, is there a point where it's too late and we can't do much

Ron: One analysis would say, if we take Cronin's decision as it is now, and other decisions that say renting is commercial uses, they weren't listed as allowed, so it can never be grandfathered, so no one has the right, not right now, to say I'm grandfathered and you can't regulate me out, I can continue to exist; no one has that right. That's a theory.

If we amend the zoning ordinance to permit rentals by right, we have legitimized those uses and there are now grandfather rights if we try to change that later.

The practical limitation on that is though even if the short term rentals weren't allowed, explicitly in the zoning ordinance the fact is our tradition, our practice has been that we don't regulate the occupants, we don't regulate who is there as long as it is a single family dwelling whether it's occupied by the owners or the renters we don't as a township treat them differently. In the decision Cronin made, the Zoning Administrator gave a deposition saying that renting is the township practice. So even if those short-term renters can't technically say they are grandfathered, they can create a very good argument that the township, after two decades or three decades, or whatever should be estopped from enforcing the zoning ordinance after the fact, after this many decades of relying on the

ability to rent. And that would be a legitimate argument too. So, we are creating some grandfather rights if we amend the zoning ordinance.

Dave: So, someone could take us to court and say they can do it without having to follow the regulations?

Ron: No, the new Regulatory Ordinance allows us to regulate – even if people have been operating for 50 years without a regulatory ordinance the township has the right to regulate.

If we disallowing renting , they could take us to court and would be able to say that the township's inactivity allows them to sue, arguing that they have relied on the rentals for their income and retirement.

Dian asked if looking at the Regulatory Ordinance down the road allows the board to amend the Regulatory Ordinance more easily than the Zoning Ordinance.

Dan: asked if the occupancy limits only apply to renters or to residents as well?

Ron: Said that courts have a long history of saying it is fair to regulate renters differently than owners. That owners have more concern for property, etc.. and that doesn't mean you have to make it the same for residences.

Dan: how do you decide character of neighborhoods? What if the residents are big party houses?

Ron: If the character of the neighborhood is partying it makes it more difficult to manage, however if the character of the neighborhood is just partying on the weekend and the party house is 7 days a week, you could make an argument that it is changing the character of the neighborhood.

Discussion ended here.

7. PC members decide next steps

A motion was made by Fleming, supported by Hughes, to schedule a public hearing before the Planning Commission, on January 24, 2018, at 6:00 pm, to consider amendments to the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to the rental of single family dwellings, specifically as such amendments were described in a November 21, 2017 memorandum from Lynee Wells of Williams & Works, and as those described amendments were tentatively revised by the Planning Commission in the course of its meetings on November 29, 2017 and December 20, 2017. The motion passed unanimously.

Public Comment:

John Barkley: Would recommend that you not discount data because it was updated by Ellie and reaching out to neighborhoods.

Use of Spring Lake Township – Relating R1 & R2 peer the earlier comment - he wouldn't recommend comparing all of Casco to all of Spring Lake but he would recommend looking at Spring Lake because they are "best in class" at this time.

If we keep the Limited Short-Term Rental he suggests using the phrase "a total of 14 days"

One more here

Darren Massey – No one has really gone on record saying they discount what they've heard in the information from the police reports.

Historically small plot platted developments – he wants to clarify that they have considered the context of that phrase within the current ordinance changes. It appears in the Master Plan but the phrase doesn't appear in the Zoning Ordinance.

Darren said he was trying to get to whether they are covered by what was just read and listed and Lynee explained and Dian supported that they are included

Greg Haas: Asked if we think that 12 people in each of the homes every 60 feet is adequate. He believes that this is now heavier usage that it has been for years. The health department regulates that and Ron explained that the Health department is inspecting and making sure that there is adequate support.

Chris Barczyk: Illegible on the tape

Allan – Ron talked about the right that has been assumed and many townships have not dealt with it at all...partially from the court decision and partially because of the residents. We aren't different than other townships.

Phil Kays - What will happen at the public hearing?

Ron answered that at the public hearing the Planning commission will take comments from the public. They have only decided to make a presentation at the public hearing, after the hearing they can reject, rewrite, or recommend it as drafted, or recommend once modified

Dian asked if there was any more public comment or comments from the Commissioners.

Dan put forth a motion to adjourn which was seconded by Dave.