



RICHLAND TOWNSHIP

Kalamazoo County

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

**Richland Township Planning Commission
Minutes of a Meeting Conducted on April 26, 2023**

A regular meeting of the Richland Township Planning Commission was conducted on April 26, 2023 commencing at 7:00 p.m. at the Township Hall.

Present were:

Chairman Tim VanderMeulen
Andy Woolf
John McCann
Dave Wentzel
Ron Vorholt
Morgan Belt

Absent was:

Gary Drouin

Also present were Township Clerk/Zoning Administrator Bear Priest; Township Planning Consultant Brad Kotrba; and Township Attorney Roxanne Seeber. There were 7 additional members of the audience.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Wentzel moved, supported by Woolf, to approve the agenda as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

MINUTES

The minutes of the April 5, 2023 workshop meeting had been provided to the members of the Planning Commission in their packets prior to the meeting. Priest noted the wrong date on the headers after the first page.

Woolf moved, supported by Vorholt, to approve the minutes as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

The minutes of the March 22, 2023 regular Planning Commission meeting had been provided to the members in their packets prior the meeting.

Wendzel moved, supported by Woolf, to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion passed unanimously.

CORRESPONDENCE

None.

Richland Township Planning Commission
Minutes of a Meeting Conducted on April 26, 2023

1 **PUBLIC COMMENT**

2
3 Jerry Luedeking expressed concern about the solar ordinance and minutes, indicating that there had
4 been no discussion about reclamation plans. Priest and Seeber stated that it was in the proposed
5 ordinance, but that the Planning Commission had not gotten to that portion of the ordinance yet.
6 VanderMeulen stated that decommissioning was one of the Planning Commission’s primary concerns.

7
8 **NEW BUSINESS**

- 9
10
 - **Special Use-** *Steve and Melissa Augustine, 8834 E DE Avenue special use application.*

11
12 The first item on the agenda was the application of Steve and Melissa Augustine, 8834 E DE Avenue, for a
13 special exception use permit to allow a new 1,600 square foot accessory building and allow 1,950 square
14 feet of total accessory building space at 8834 E. DE Avenue, Parcel No. 03-22-426-020. The parcel of land
15 is approximately 1.14 acres in size and is located in the “A-1” District Zoning Classification. Wendzel stated
16 that he was an adjoining property owner and recused himself.

17
18 Lee Crossley spoke on behalf of the applicant. He stated that they wished to replace the current garage
19 with a new 40’ x 40’ garage. He pointed out that a ten-foot portion of the proposed new building on the
20 east side was a covered patio. The garage, he said, would actually be 1200 square feet in area with a
21 1600 square foot footprint under roof. Crossley pointed out another small building in the back of the
22 property which is used as a storage building and playhouse. It was there prior to the time the present
23 applicants had purchased the house. He indicated that the plan was just to tear down the old garage
24 and replace it with a bigger one, and to leave everything else “as is”.

25
26 Crossley stated that the neighbor to the south is Gull Meadow Farms. They will not be impacted by the
27 addition. The property’s neighbors to the east and west are comparable in size and use. He stated that
28 the new garage would benefit the applicants and be an asset to the neighborhood. In response to an
29 inquiry from VanderMeulen, Crossley stated that the plan was for a total demolition of the existing garage.
30 In response to an inquiry from McCann, Crossley stated that the building would be large enough to hold
31 everything they needed it to. They also want to enjoy the porch. Priest placed an aerial view of the
32 property on the screen and pointed out the existing building and the new building interposed over it. He
33 stated that the new building met all of the requirements of the zoning ordinance, except they need a 125
34 square foot size waiver due to the size of the footprint of the house. VanderMeulen wished to assure
35 that the new building would be sided the same as the house. The applicants agreed that it would. Belt
36 inquired about the size of the current garage. Crossley stated that it was 12’ x 12’. The Chairman opened
37 a public hearing on the request. No one spoke for or against it. The Chairman closed the public hearing.

38
39 **Woof moved to approve the special use and accessory building size waiver according to the application**
40 **as submitted. Belt seconded the motion. McCann stated that there was no impact on the adjoining**
41 **properties. The motion passed unanimously.**

- 42
43
 - **Text Amendments for Animal Protection Shelters**

44
45 The next item on the agenda was the request of Joni Kelley, 10418 North 32nd Street, Richland MI 49083,
46 for a zoning ordinance text amendment to allow for animal protection shelters in the Township. Joni
47 Kelley introduced herself. Belt stated that her company makes donations to the rescue operated by
48 Kelley. No member of the commission saw any conflict of interest.

Richland Township Planning Commission
Minutes of a Meeting Conducted on April 26, 2023

1 Kelley indicated that she is the executive director of a nonprofit cat rescue since 2012. She currently rents
2 the property at 10418 N 32nd Street. She lives next door. She explained that she wished to make a zoning
3 change to let the cat rescue stay in the location permanently. Kelley stated that based on national
4 statistics on homeless cats, every adult in the US would have to adopt 18 cats to cure the problem. She
5 indicated that two unfixed cats in 7 years can produce 4,000 kittens. Her rescue takes in the lost, sick and
6 broken animals, get them healthy and socialized and then adopt them out. They also do educational
7 programs for the community regarding ensuring that cats are spayed and neutered and kept inside. She
8 does a “Reading to Cats” program for school children. This helps the children to avoid feeling judged for
9 their ability to read and helps to socialize the cats. They do kitten therapy for troubled teens. At this
10 time, they want to continue to do their work in a more stable environment. They want to retain their
11 current location and continue to serve the community.
12

13 Kelley voiced her understanding that there are several required steps in order to accomplish this goal.
14 First, they were requesting a text amendment to address their activity. Next, they would need to ask for
15 a zoning change from the current A-1 district zoning classification to a business/office zoning classification.
16 If the text amendment required a special use, they would also need to obtain a special use. Since she
17 lives next door, Kelley stated that she is the overseer/caretaker. VanderMeulen inquired as to whether
18 she lived on a separate parcel. The applicant responded in the affirmative.
19

20 McCann inquired as to what the issue was. Priest placed an aerial view of the property on the screen.
21 He explained that there are three houses on the single zoning lot. The Cat Nap Lodge is located in the
22 larger building. Kelley stated that she has been trying to purchase the parcel, but there had been an issue
23 with three houses on one parcel as well as the use. Priest described the parcel as “nonresidential”
24 containing three houses. The present owner wished to sell and he had a hard time obtaining a home
25 equity loan or refinancing. Priest pointed out the larger building presently containing the cat rescue. He
26 described the overall process indicating that there is not presently anything in the zoning ordinance for a
27 small animal rescue. Some of the nearby parcels are in the B-1 district zoning classification. He would
28 ask the Planning Commission to consider a conditional rezoning to allow the rescue if the text amendment
29 went through. VanderMeulen inquired as to whether a site plan was required. Priest stated that the
30 issue was down the road a bit, but that the Planning Commission should consider what would be needed
31 in a site plan.
32

33 VanderMeulen stated that the first task was the text amendment, which was independent of the property
34 in question. While it would be good to know the characteristics of this particular property, a text
35 amendment would apply to the ordinance itself and not to a particular parcel. Wendzel inquired about
36 the types of animals. He recalled that the Planning Commission had setbacks and the like for doggie
37 daycares and that they had asked Belt, who operates one, a number of questions. He inquired as to
38 whether a master plan change was needed. Priest responded that a master plan amendment was not
39 needed. There was a need in the community for a use that did not exist under the zoning ordinance.
40

41 The Chairman opened a public hearing on the request. A Cat Nap Lodge volunteer named Darcy spoke in
42 favor of the text amendment and the work that was being done by Cat Nap Lodge. She comes from Battle
43 Creek to volunteer at the rescue. She feels that Kelley has a strong vision, with clear and concise visiting
44 parameters that are followed by all. Darcy stated that the Cat Nap Lodge takes in cats that are broken,
45 or have other issues. They work hard to get veterinary care and to socialize the animals. She feels a
46 great deal of joy when watching a family getting a new cat into its forever home. She indicated that the
47 kids and the cats enjoy the reading academy. Kelley stated that her program is funded by donations and
48 grants. Volunteers do the work. Lee Crossley stated that he had shown the property recently. He was

Richland Township Planning Commission
Minutes of a Meeting Conducted on April 26, 2023

1 surprised as to how clean the applicants kept the facility. He was impressed by the numerous changes
2 and upgrades that had been done to the inside of the house. Kelley stated that they had remodeled.
3 They added tile because cats cannot be on carpet. Crossley stated that Cat Nap Lodge is doing good work.
4 He was impressed that they can do as much as they do on donations and grants alone. The house was
5 super-clean and well organized. He never knew it was there. He had been in residential houses with only
6 one or two cats that smelled a lot worse than this one did.

7
8 Ron Rynbrandt of 741 Marsh Road, Plainwell spoke in support of the Cat Nap Lodge. He had been
9 rescuing cats from the forest behind his house for at least 20 years. They have as many cats as they can
10 handle. Kelley takes some of the excess. The Cat Nap Lodge, he stated, is effective. It is a grass roots
11 organization. He agreed with the statistics on reproduction that had been provided by Kelley. He asked
12 that the Planning Commission approve the request.

13
14 VanderMeulen stated that he had no idea that the rescue was located there. Kelley stated that they try
15 to stay under the radar. VanderMeulen inquired as to how people found the rescue. Kelley stated that
16 they have a Facebook page and they occasionally do events at local pet stores. They have a partnership
17 of sorts with Kalamazoo Animal Rescue and the Cat Nap Lodge gets a lot of exposure through their
18 website. She is presently trying to create a new website. Kelley cautioned that a lot of individuals want
19 to call themselves a “rescue” but they are not licensed through the state. For many of these people, it is
20 too short of a walk between “rescue” and “hoarder”. Cat Nap Lodge will try to do more advertising and
21 media once they have a permanent location. They would like to increase their capacity into the other
22 two houses on the parcel.

23
24 Kelley stated that she had worked with Priest on the parameters of a potential text amendment. She had
25 indicated that a rescue must be licensed by the state and inspected by MDARD. She had requested that
26 the text amendment specifically require an applicant to be licensed. She is required to be licensed by
27 MDARD and she must report certain things to them on a regular basis. MDARD does regular inspections.
28 Rescues, she said, must adhere to all of the specifications of the state.

29
30 VanderMeulen inquired as to why a text amendment was necessary. Kotrba stated that there is no way
31 for them to do a rescue legally now because there is no provision in the zoning ordinance for it. His
32 understanding was that the operator wished to expand and that she cannot do that legally in Richland
33 Township. VanderMeulen inquired as to whether a text amendment would legalize a purchase. Priest
34 stated that adherence to zoning would go a long-ways in getting financing. Many times, an insurance
35 company will not insure a property if it cannot be rebuilt. VanderMeulen inquired as to whether a text
36 amendment changed the zoning district. Wendzel stated his understanding that the chosen location was
37 in the “B” District Zoning Classification. Priest briefly outlined the through process from text amendment
38 to special use approval. He would be open to considering a “conditional rezoning” request, which was
39 like a “contract to zone”. If the conditions fail, then the property reverts back to the prior zoning district.
40 Wendzel was concerned that there appeared to be a lot of moving parts. He felt that perhaps this
41 application was moving too quickly. Priest explained conditional rezoning. VanderMeulen expressed his
42 understanding that the Planning Commission must divorce itself from consideration of the existing
43 property only.

44
45 Kotrba had provided a draft text amendment to the Planning Commission based on the request as he
46 knew it and the state “Animal Shelters Act”. Woof inquired about parking. Kotrba started going through
47 the proposed text amendment orally. He explained that many of the definitions and requirements were
48 recycled from the statute. He stated that the goal was to address “animal protection shelters” as

Richland Township Planning Commission
Minutes of a Meeting Conducted on April 26, 2023

1 opposed to dog pounds and/or county animal control. Kelley stated that they must obtain a license from
2 the state. The license could only be applied for if the township signed off on the zoning. Kelley explained
3 some of the requirements for licensing.
4

5 Woolf inquired about the text amendment inclusion of dogs, cats, ferrets and birds. Woolf next
6 considered the proposed location. He was trying to visualize the places in which the application would
7 fall. Seeber pointed out that the current zoning was A-1, which took up all of the white space on the
8 zoning map. Woolf stated that the A-1 district zoning classification for this parcel did not make sense.
9 Woolf wondered aloud whether the use should be limited to smaller business-type districts. Priest stated
10 that the text amendment could also fit into the B-2 or C zoning classifications. Wendzel commented that
11 the Planning Commission had put in a great deal of work on this matter. He considered whether an
12 animal protection shelter should be screened from neighboring residential properties. VanderMeulen
13 inquired as to how Kelley dealt with some of the rules. Kelley stated that "pet health" is now a division of
14 MDARD.
15

16 In response to an inquiry from VanderMeulen, the applicant stated that they have off-street parking in
17 locations on the property. The group discussed the number of parking spaces that would be needed for
18 an animal protection shelter. Wendzel and Woolf recognized that there is a big difference between
19 traditional dog pounds and what is operating here. Kelley stated that she works a fulltime job. She is
20 only seeing visitors by appointment.
21

22 McCann felt that it was reasonable to have a number of required parking spaces. He inquired as to how
23 many volunteers would be present at any given time. Kelley stated that the number of volunteers peaks
24 at 2. McCann suggested perhaps three additional parking spaces. Kotrba stated that the Planning
25 Commission can always add conditions to a special use approval. Kelley stated that she is the only person
26 that does adoptions. In response to an inquiry from Vorholt, Kelley explained that there are vague
27 references to volunteers verses number of pets in the state literature. Wendzel cautioned that the
28 Planning Commission appeared to be deviating from the problem at hand. Seeber inquired as to whether
29 the Planning Commission would be inclined to consider whether the state's approval was enough? Woolf
30 responded in the negative. He wished to continue discussing parameters for the text amendment. He
31 wondered aloud as to whether the Planning Commission would require a particular type of construction.
32 For example, he asked, do we retrofit a house, do we allow a pole-type structure? Further, he inquired
33 about what the Township would do if the applicants failed. Kelley explained that the state's standards
34 are very strict on environment building materials, paints, and the required floor drains. Kelley stated that
35 MDARD requires the applicant to empty the building prior to initial inspection. The code is very strict.
36 Belt redirected the group, indicating that it was time to give the planning consultant some direction.
37

38 Kotrba stated that MDARD requires zoning approval prior to the issuance of a license. VanderMeulen
39 wished to be assured that such a facility would not be allowed in the A-1 district zoning classification.
40 Priest did not recommend allowing such a facility in A-1. Kotrba agreed with Priest that the appropriate
41 districts in which the special use would be required would be in B-2 or C and then Industrial by reference.
42 Belt had no issues with the 6-foot fence requirements. Kelley described an outdoor enclosure for cats,
43 indicating that they had enclosed tops as well.
44

45 In response to an inquiry from Wentzel, Belt stated that a dog rescue is a lot different from a doggie day
46 care. Whereas a day care typically has dogs running outside and playing with each other, a rescue usually
47 only has a small fenced enclosure with a cement floor that is more easily washed off. She did not think it
48 was very likely that a dog rescue would be keeping dogs outdoors to play or run around. Belt stated that

Richland Township Planning Commission
Minutes of a Meeting Conducted on April 26, 2023

1 for dog rescues, each dog must have its own enclosure. She understood the need for setbacks and the
2 like for kennels, but indicated that the situation would not be the same for a dog rescue. McCann stated
3 that there are smaller parcels in the Commercial and Industrial Districts. The use would likely be more of
4 an indoor use. Wendzel suggested taking all of the provisions for kennels into the text amendment being
5 proposed. Woolf inquired as to whether kennels were allowed in residential.

6
7 Wendzel stated his preference to put the proposed rescue in with the special uses for kennels. Kotrba
8 stated that some kennels are actually run from people's homes. Priest indicated that in general, a rescue
9 is not owner-occupied. VanderMeulen inquired as to whether the fire department would need to be
10 consulted. The group turned once again to the parking issue. McCann inquired as to how parking
11 requirements were calculated in the B-1 and C districts. Priest stated that it was usually on square
12 footage. McCann next inquired about parking for a home business. Priest stated that there was one for
13 the business operator and then two customer spaces calculated based on the number of workers on the
14 premises. If the rescue had a limitation on the number of volunteers, then using the same method,
15 parking could be calculated as a home business by providing one parking space for each volunteer and
16 perhaps two additional spaces per volunteer on site. Priest stated that a home occupation is intended to
17 retain its residential character.

18
19 Kotrba summarized the discussion for changes to be made to the draft:

- 20 • consider how parking will be calculated; and
- 21 • remove some of the penal provisions that had been copied from state statute; and
- 22 • make adjustments to some of the language.

23
24 Wentzel inquired about the kennel provisions for dogs. He felt that there was such a big deal about
25 outdoor dogs in kennels and day cares that the text amendment should coincide with what had already
26 been decided. Kotrba stated that he could perhaps adjust the language to provide for only limited outdoor
27 space, such as that which Belt was discussing earlier. The group agreed that the May 10 meeting was to
28 be set aside for solar only. Thus, the next time the text amendment would be considered was at the
29 regular May 24 Planning Commission meeting.

- 30
31 • **Special Exception Use Amendment - Richland Assisted Living, LLC 8774 N. 32nd Street**

32
33 The next item on the agenda was the application of Ade Adeoye, 844 Red Arrow Highway, Stevensville,
34 for an amendment to a special exception use permit to allow up to 40 adults to reside in the full residential
35 care facility and site plan approval at 8744 N. 32nd Street (Parcel No. 03-14-101-049). The parcel of land
36 is approximately 3.72 acres in area and is located in the D District Zoning Classification.

37
38 Tim Dockery of Richland Assisted Living spoke to the application. He stated that the existing special use
39 permit allowed them to add the units that they wanted. He indicated that the present limitation on the
40 overall number of residents per room did not allow for a couple. Thus, he asked to go up to 40 people
41 overall. Dockery stated that they have an Alzheimer's or Memory Care facility. There are 24 units
42 presently on site, he said. The idea was to re-use three units, take one away and add one. Dockery also
43 stated that the required parking was far in excess of what is needed.

44
45 Fire Chief Luedeking stated that if this is a memory care facility, the State of Michigan and the Bureau of
46 Fire Services would have to get involved. He stated that locked doors keeping people in, locking
47 mechanisms with Knox boxes and water flow to overhead sprinklers should have been provided to the
48 Bureau of Fire Services, which would have jurisdiction over the plan. Adeoye stated that he was working

Richland Township Planning Commission
Minutes of a Meeting Conducted on April 26, 2023

1 with the State Fire Marshal already. The two discussed water calculations, with Luedecking indicating
2 that the City of Kalamazoo should do the water calculations because there was already a pressure problem
3 in that area. Luedecking was confident that if the State Fire Marshal was involved, they will make sure
4 that the rules and regulations are followed. Luedecking recalled that there had been a water flow concern
5 when the facility was originally built. At that time, he recalled, there was not enough pressure for a future
6 expansion. Luedecking stated that they would need a Knox box for fire department entry, as well as
7 Knox Boxes for each fire door/access point cut off. Luedecking inquired as to whether the expansion was
8 at the pink flags outside of the building. Dockery stated that it was. Luedecking brought some photos,
9 indicating that the fire truck would not be able to get through on the east side. He thought that the
10 expansion was for the west side when it was originally planned. He indicated that there is security fencing
11 so close to the building that the fire truck cannot get into the area. Dockery inquired as to how the
12 concerns could be resolved. Luedecking stated that he needed construction plans, not site plans. He also
13 needed to know where the snow was going. Adeoye stated that they had submitted construction
14 drawings to the state and they have already been approved. He felt that they had to build what the state
15 had approved.

16
17 Priest placed the aerial view of the property on the overhead screen. Luedecking pointed out the area on
18 the west side of the building where he thought that the original expansion was going. Between the
19 existing memory care building and the Bawa self-storage, there was no ability to access the east side of
20 the building. Dockery suggested that the fire department could access the center portion and new
21 addition by using the existing driveway and cutting across the open area, if necessary. Luedecking stated
22 that he understood the theory; however, trucks cannot get through 3 feet of snow. Luedecking stated
23 that the building is fully sprinkled and that he was more worried about evacuation than fire. Fire fighters
24 accessing the building to assist people will find that the residents have no instinct for self-preservation.
25 Luedecking stated that he would contact the Bureau of Fire Services with his concerns.

26
27 The Chairman opened a public hearing on the request. Jack Houtkooper owns the adjoining property.
28 He voiced concern about the facility adding 3000 square feet to the building, as well as potentially having
29 up to 40 residents. He inquired as to how many people were allowed per room. The applicant stated
30 that he had spoken with Priest and that the next logical cut-off was 40 people. They just wanted to make
31 sure that they are not excluding couples. Houtkooper stated that the building is already large and that 4
32 people to a bedroom was too many. Dockery stated that the expansion planned was only for
33 one-bedroom apartments. At most, there would be two to a room in the expansion area. The rest are
34 one-bedroom rooms, used for memory care patients. He showed a room diagram and pointed out the
35 types of rooms. Houtkooper inquired as to the location of the retention pond. Dockery pointed out the
36 area. Adeoye stated that the retention basin never has water in it. Houtkooper inquired about the
37 number of bathrooms in the addition. Dockery stated that each room would have a bathroom and there
38 would a central reception area.

39
40 Woolf inquired as to whether there was a way to squeeze a 10-foot-wide fire truck driveway onto the
41 area adjoining the new addition. Luedecking stated that 12 feet would be better. There is already a
42 fence on the adjoining properties. Several trees would need to be removed. VanderMeulen outlined
43 what he thought the expansion area would be. Woolf inquired as to how deep the sanitary sewer lines
44 were. Houtkooper was worried about adding a lot of people to the site. He asked how long the building
45 was. He asked what additional parking would be needed. Kotrba stated that the parking had already
46 been placed and striped. The parking requirements were met. The Chairman closed the public hearing.

47

Richland Township Planning Commission
Minutes of a Meeting Conducted on April 26, 2023

1 Luedecking indicated that he would get with the Bureau of Fire Services. If the BFS approved the
2 expansion, the concerns would have been accommodated. Woolf felt that the expansion should not be
3 approved until the question was answered. Wentzel inquired about the driveway on the other side. He
4 wondered whether BFS would approve driving across a field. Luedecking displayed his photographs.
5 McCann inquired about the location for the building expansion. There is already a 4-foot sidewalk and
6 several trees that would need to come out. Luedecking stated that there was not a lot of room on that
7 side. In response to an inquiry from VanderMeulen, Kotrba stated that zoning did not have issues with
8 the proposed site plan so long as the fire department's concerns were met. The group began talking
9 about the initial configuration for the proposed expansion area. Adeoye stated that they had opened in
10 November 2020. They are presently full all of the time. VanderMuelen inquired about parking in a
11 parking spot and dragging a fire hose into the building. Luedecking stated that he needed a way to access
12 the new portion of the structure from the east side. The building floor plan was placed on the projector.
13 Adeoye identified the location of the fire door and Knox boxes. He stated that the building would not
14 look that much bigger, as they are only adding along the existing line. Dockery stated that Alzheimer's
15 patients can only use studio apartments. The group discussed how the applicant was originally able to
16 meet the setback on the east side. Vorholt stated that they had gotten a variance to build closer to the
17 north property line. They had to remove a portico. VanderMeulen stated that it looked like the most
18 over-used ten feet in the Township.

19
20 VanderMeulen expressed the goal for the evening, which was to approve the application, comment on it
21 and then decide what to do with it. He voiced concern about proceeding further with the fire department
22 issue hanging out there.

23
24 **Woolf moved to table the application until such time as the Planning Commission receives plan approval**
25 **from the State Fire Marshal.**

26
27 Adeoye stated that the plan review from the state is already in place. VanderMeulen recalled that there
28 were a lot of issues when the building was originally constructed. Luedecking recalled problems with the
29 water pressure as related by the City of Kalamazoo. He did not think that there had been any gain in water
30 pressure since the time of approval.

31
32 **McCann seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.**

33
34 **PLANNING COMMISSION ANNUAL REPORT**

35
36 The draft Planning Commission annual report had been provided to the Planning Commission members
37 in their packets. McCann stated that there was nothing objectionable in it.

38
39 **McCann moved, supported by Belt, to approve the annual report. The motion passed unanimously.**

40
41 **SIDEWALKS**

42
43 Wendzel introduced a sidewalk question. Woolf stated that it was feasible to use the west side of the
44 road instead of the east side of the road because it was flatter and it would cost less for installation. The
45 group discussed adding sidewalks along M-89 at the light. In response to an inquiry from Woolf, Priest
46 stated that the state had M-89 on its project list for the summer. He stated that prior to installation of
47 any sidewalk, the DOT would need to be consulted first. The group also considered the need for
48 easements, municipal approvals and cost. Priest placed the area aerial view on the overhead screen.

**Richland Township Planning Commission
Minutes of a Meeting Conducted on April 26, 2023**

1 McCann recalled a grant to place sidewalks at the park. McCann felt that there may be some funding
2 opportunities. Wendzel stated that the Township Board would not be inclined to hear or approve any
3 new projects until the pickleball courts were built. Woolf inquired about using asphalt instead of
4 concrete. Priest made an estimate of 4600 lineal feet of sidewalk. He stated that the MDOT would not
5 approve asphalt, only concrete. When pressed, McCann provided a very rough estimate of \$500,000 to
6 \$1,000,000 in materials and labor for the proposal. Looking at the aerial, the estimate was reduced to
7 about 1900 feet of sidewalk. That would then be, in McCann's estimation, \$300,000 to \$500,000 without
8 engineering costs. McCann stated that they should talk to the MDOT to see if the project would be eligible
9 for grants. Woolf stated the sidewalk was on the master plan. Priest suggested that the Planning
10 Commission could make a recommendation to the board, which would at least get it on their plates.
11 Wendzel suggested sending the request to the parks committee, reiterating that until pickleball was
12 handled, there would not be other projects considered. Kotrba agreed with McCann that there may be
13 an MDOT grant available. There is a lot of rights-of-way on either side of the road.

14
15 **VanderMeulen moved to request that the board consider adding sidewalks along M-43. McCann**
16 **seconded the motion.** Woolf wished to consider adding further discussion to the May 24 agenda. Priest
17 stated that there were already four applications and the continuing text amendment on the agenda.

18
19 Priest gave an update on the Telfer property and ordinance enforcement. Seeber stated that the gravel
20 mining legislation may be coming up again.

21
22 **There being no further business to come before the Planning Commission, upon motion of Wendzel,**
23 **supported by McCann, and unanimous voice vote, the meeting was adjourned at 9:30.**

24
25
26
27 **Synopsis of Actions**
28 **Richland Township Planning Commission**

29
30 The Richland Township Planning Commission undertook the following actions at its meeting of April 26,
31 2023:

- 32
33
 - Approved new accessory building for property located at 8834 E. DE Avenue;
 - Undertook discussion on application for animal rescue text amendment;
 - Discussed possibility of sidewalks along M-43 near the Gull Road/32nd street intersection.

34
35
36
37
38 Respectfully Submitted,
39 *Roxanne C Seeber*
40 Roxanne C. Seeber, Recording
41 Secretary

42
43
44 Date minutes available: May 5, 2023

45
46 Date minutes approved: May 24, 2023 as presented