

Minutes of the Gaines Charter Township Planning Commission

Regular Meeting held March 28th, 2024, at 7 pm

8555 Kalamazoo Ave., SE, Caledonia, MI 49316

MEMBERS PRESENT: Thomas, Waayenberg, Wiersema, Giarmo, Rober, Haagsma

MEMBERS ABSENT: Billips with notice

STAFF PRESENT: Dan Wells, Community Development Director; Dakota Swan, Assistant Planner

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chair Giarmo called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM.

II. CONSIDERATION OF MEETING AGENDA

III. CONSIDERATION OF MEETING MINUTES

Consideration of the February 22nd, regular Planning Commission meeting minutes.

Motion: Motion by Waayenberg, supported by Wiersema to approve the minutes of February 22nd, 2024 with corrections.

DISCUSSION:

AYES: All

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

DECISION: Motion Carried (6-0)

IV. INQUIRY OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

None.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT

VI. NEW BUSINESS

1. Public Hearings

a) 2023 Stoneco Annual Review

Austin Fisher, the Operations Manager for the 100th Street Stoneco Operation spoke on behalf of the project and offered insight into the progress being made. He stated that the reclamation on the 100th Street parcel, also known as the Barnaby parcel, is going very well and that everything is going to plan. He said that 75% of the regrading has been completed at this time.

Chair Giarmo inquired about whether MDOT intends to use part of the reclamation as wetlands, and Planner Wells responded that it is unlikely, seeing as this parcel is quite dry and doesn't hold water well. Chair Giarmo then asked if this land would go back to being used for agricultural purposes; Planner Wells responded that agricultural use is a possibility, but ultimately the landowner will be able to decide what the land is used for after reclamation is complete.

Commissioner Haagsma inquired about if the parcel is planned to get seeded this spring, and Fisher stated that while that is the plan, it is a possibility that some sections might not get completed. Planner Wells added that the timeline seems reasonable, and he had visited the parcel recently and they seem to be making good progress.

Fisher added that it is important to Stoneco to maintain consistent and transparent dialogue with the community and highlight how a responsible operator can function. Commissioner Haagsma inquired about the culvert that goes under the road and the plan for it, and Fisher mentioned that it is planned to be backfilled with clean fill.

Chair Giarmo opened the public hearing and subsequently closed it after no individuals approached the podium with comments or questions.

Planner Wells mentioned a note from staff that this review is on behalf of the Barnaby parcel, and the review for the Jeplawy parcel will happen sometime this summer.

Motion: Motion to approve annual review by Waayenberg, support from Thomas.

DISCUSSION: None.

AYES: ALL

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: None

DECISION: Motion Carried (6-0)

b) 8808 Eastern Avenue – Special Use Permit/ Site Plan Review

Chair Giarmo invited applicant Matthew VanNoord to explain his request for a Special Use Permit.

Matthew VanNoord runs a lawncare business that has been in operation for 20 years out of an accessory building on an adjacent parcel owned by his dad, and as his parents are thinking about selling their property, he is requesting two Special Use Permits to allow for the construction of a 4,040 S.F accessory building on his property, and the ability to operate a lawncare business in the Agricultural/ Rural-Residential Zoning District. VanNoord went on to clarify that the lawncare business is seasonal and operates from April through October, meaning they do not do any snow removal, and they do not operate on weekends. He also stated that no equipment or materials are stored outside. In February, VanNoord gave fellow neighbors on their private drive an overview of the project seeking their approval, and 5 out of 8 neighbors wrote letters in support of his request.

Planner Wells offered the Township's perspective on this request, and clarified that under the current zoning, the applicant would be limited to 2,040 S.F of accessory buildings, hence the need for a special use permit. Wells clarified that the Planning Commission needed to make determinations on the Special Land Use Standards that were found to be undetermined by staff, including 19.8 B, which pertains to maintaining consistency with the intent of the Master Plan, and standard 19.9 K, which ensures that the

accessory building remains subordinate to the primary residential use on the property. Planner Wells expressed that in public comments submitted via email, some neighbors voiced concerns regarding traffic related to deliveries for the business, and that a possibility for mitigating this could be imposing a condition for weight limits on delivery vehicles entering the private drive. Wells also said that the building would likely have a prominent visual impact, and the Planning Commission should consider whether the proposed architecture would be harmonious with the area and the dwelling on the property. Clarification was provided on the nature of the proposed business, and Wells mentioned that no retail or wholesale operations would be happening in this space. Planner Wells stated that all setbacks are met with the proposed project, and that all applicable standards for a landscaping business are met. Wells addressed conditions of approval recommended by staff which are as follows; architectural similarities between the proposed accessory building and the existing home on the site, no outdoor storage besides material bins that were noted on the site plan, and no retail sales on the site.

Chair Giarmo then opened the public hearing and proceeded to close the public hearing when nobody approached the podium, however, the Planning Commission did review and reference several public comments that were submitted via email.

Commissioner Haagsma disclosed that he hired this company for lawncare services, however, he didn't believe it would interfere with his judgement or ability to deliberate this matter.

Commissioners Wiersema and Waayenberg inquired about other features seen on the arial image of the property, including a playhouse that was removed last summer, and a seasonal pond that fills up when it rains.

Commissioner Wiersema referenced a public comment that addressed materials being stored outside in a large liquid tank and inquired about where that would be located; VanNoord clarified that the tank stores weed control materials and while they are unsure exactly where it will be located at this time, it will likely be stored in the back of the facility. Waayenberg inquired about said weed control products and how often they get delivered and how much at a time; VanNoord clarified that it gets delivered in 55-gallon drums and they typically receive 24 of them at a time, which is a years' worth of product.

Waayenberg voiced concern with the proposed 60ft width of the paved driveway and said that it seems to be quite wide and a bit of an eyesore, to which VanNoord said they're open to adjusting the site plan. Wells clarified that the fire department requires 26ft driveways for emergency vehicles and that the width of the driveway could be reduced while still satisfying fire department requirements.

Wiersema sought clarification about the garages on the proposed building and what they would be used to store; VanNoord confirmed that their 4 employees all have trucks and corresponding trailers that would be stored in the garage spaces.

VanNoord confirmed that currently with 4 employees, they are operating out of a space that is 3,000 S.F, and they are accessing the space via the private drive. Chair Giarmo expressed concern with the fact that their business has been operating on this private drive for an extended period and is contributing significantly more wear and tear to the private drive than the other neighbors who are still contributing to maintenance of the road. Giarmo stated that this was also a concern that was brought up by one of the neighbors in an email comment.

Waayenberg added that since the criteria in the Zoning Ordinance dealing with landscape businesses is rather vague, it leaves room for interpretation, and is tricky to determine how commercial is *too* commercial of a business to be considered appropriate for the A-R zoning district. Chair Giarmo expressed concerns from a neighbor about the tree line being altered or removed upon construction of the accessory building.

Planner Wells added that accessory buildings in the front yard are permitted in the A-R zoning district, and if the existing tree line is left untouched, it would satisfy the criteria for the required Type I Buffer.

Commissioner Wiersema voiced concern regarding where the liquid tank would be stored, and VanNoord reassured the Planning Commission that it is able to be stored inside, and the material it houses is non-flammable.

Commissioner Rober inquired about the current building the business operated out of on VanNoord's fathers' adjacent property and if it is planned to be torn down in lieu of the new building; VanNoord confirmed that the old building would remain on the adjacent parcel, but all building operations would simply be moved into the new building.

Commissioner Haagsma stated that his concern isn't with additional traffic or the use of the building, but that his concern is rather the outside storage, and ensuring there is enough space and enough of a buffer between the neighbors and the new accessory building.

Rober and Haagsma both agreed they would rather see a larger accessory building that accommodates the business equipment and allows for it to be stored indoors rather than equipment and vehicles being stored outside. Chair Giarmo expressed a desire to ensure that the tree line would remain intact for the sake of maintaining a low visual impact for adjacent property owners.

VanNoord stated that he met with neighbors on Tuesday, March 26th to walk the property and discuss screening; they concluded that pine trees wouldn't be a great option for a buffer since it isn't likely they'd survive, and that their best option would probably be a fence. VanNoord also said they would be comfortable with installing whatever type of buffer would make the neighbors most comfortable.

Commissioner Wiersema inquired about pallets and other items that are stored in the back of the building currently, and if there is a way to ensure they would be stored internally with the new building. Planner Wells stated that junk stored on any property is subject to code enforcement, and if any of the neighbors brought it to the township's attention, formal code enforcement would be able to commence to resolve any potential issues.

Motion: Motion by Haagsma, supported by Rober, to approve a Special Use Permit for 4,040 S.F. in accessory buildings with the conditions that the building is architecturally and aesthetically similar to the home on the parcel, the buffer and setback requirements remain satisfied, and that the driveway is no more than 30ft wide within 60 ft of the building.

DISCUSSION:

AYES: Haagsma, Waayenberg, Thomas, Rober, Wiersema

NAYS: Giarmo

ABSTAIN: None

DECISION: Motion Carried (5-1)

Motion: Motion by Haagsma, supported by Rober, to approve a Special Use Permit to allow operation of a landscaping business in the A-R Zoning District with the conditions that there is no outdoor storage, meaning all materials and vehicles are to be stored inside, no retail sales will occur on the premises, and permitted operating season will be March through October.

DISCUSSION: Haagsma reiterated that the business already exists on the private drive and significant traffic will not be added to the area, the business is simply relocating to an adjacent parcel.

AYES: Giarmo, Thomas, Rober, Haagsma

NAYS: Waayenberg, Wiersema

ABSTAIN: None

DECISION: Motion Carried (4-2)

c) 9889 East Paris Avenue – Special Use Permit

The applicant, Steven Redmond, took to the podium to introduce and explain his request for a Special Use Permit.

Redmond stated that there used to be a barn on his property that was approximately 120 years old, and he tore it down before it became too dilapidated and fell on its own. He plans on using the proposed building for residential storage for items such as trailers, lawnmowers, and toys, rather than storing items as such in the yard.

Planner Wells offered the Township's perspective on this request and confirmed that all applicable standards for special land uses have been evaluated and met. Wells stated that this type of accessory building is in character for the area, and that traffic and public services would not be impacted by the proposed accessory building. Wells also noted that approving this request wouldn't set precedence for any similar requests in the future since the original barn had already been there for over 100 years. Wells voiced that staff recommends a condition upon approval that the accessory building is similar in appearance to the home on the property and confirmed that the proposed building meets all setback requirements.

Chair Giarmo opened the public hearing and subsequently closed the public hearing as no residents approached the podium with comments or questions.

Motion: Motion by Haagsma, supported by Waayenberg, to approve the request for 2,304 S.F of accessory buildings with the condition that the accessory building is similar in appearance to the existing building, and isn't used for commercial purposes.

DISCUSSION: NONE

AYES: Thomas, Waayenberg, Wiersema, Rober, Giarmo, Haagsma

NAYS: NONE

ABSTAIN: NONE

DECISION: Motion Carried (6-0)

2. Site Plan Review

a) 6141 East Paris Avenue – Stone Pro Warehouse/ Office

Matt Kohle, the engineer for this project, spoke on behalf of StonePro's application for a Site Plan Review. He explained that on this site currently there is a primary residence and two outbuildings, and that they intend to build a 6000 S.F warehouse with some office space and a showroom as well. The applicant intends to use the two existing outbuildings as storage and repurpose the residence into either storage or office space. Kohle also mentioned that there are 13 parking spaces proposed with this project based on their calculations and township parking requirements.

Planner Wells offered the townships perspective on this request and began by clarifying that StonePro is a company that does exterior architectural stone applications. Planner Wells said that the two pole barns on the property are 1,600 and 2,300 S.F, respectively, and the house on the property is approximately 2,00 S.F. The 1,600 S.F pole barn is nonconforming but is not planned to be altered with this request, so the situation will not be made any worse. Wells stated that staff reviewed this request against Site Plan Review standards, and that all setbacks and height restrictions were found to be met; additionally, this site plan was reviewed by the Township Engineer and the Fire Chief, and no issues were found to be present. In terms of parking, Wells said that currently there are no designated parking spaces on the property, and that the 13 proposed spaces are an improvement to the site. Furthermore, it was clarified that signage for the building will be reviewed administratively by staff.

Wells highlighted the fact that there are a lot of utility easements that run through the front of this property and said that the Township Engineer advised altering the proposed landscape plan to accommodate said easements, which staff would review administratively if the Planning Commission were comfortable deferring that to staff. Wells added that this request is consistent with the intent of the Master Plan and the Future Land Use Plan; this is generally an industrial area within the Township and industrial development is anticipated to continue in the area over time. In terms of preservation of natural features, there are some plans for tree removal, however, most plants that are currently there will be left in place. Planner Wells highlighted a staff concern pertaining to sidewalks and noted that there isn't much continuity with the proposed sidewalks and encouraged the Planning Commission to address this issue. In general, staff found that all requirements were met, but Wells also encouraged the Planning Commission to discuss landscaping conditions.

Commissioner Wiersema inquired about the easement in question, and Kohle stated that the Township Engineer had recommended that no landscaping can be proposed unless the Township puts in writing that it's acceptable, given the location of the easement.

Due to the challenges posed by the easement, Chair Giarmo suggested moving the building back to the west and implementing landscaping between the building and the sidewalk. Planner Wells chimed in and added that the Townships point system for landscaping will be challenging to satisfy in this area; Kohle responded and said that the Township Engineer warned of wetlands in the proposed detention basin.

Commissioner Waayenberg stated that if the Planning Commission has the discretion to waive the landscaping requirements, this building will be an improvement visually to the site as it currently is. He added that the improvements to the site are well worth the loss of a few trees.

Commissioner Haagsma inquired about whose discretion it is to determine what can be planted on an easement; Planner Wells responded that it would be a combination of the Township Engineer, the Kent

County Road Commission, and the Byron-Gaines Utility Authority. Kohle commented that in the event of easement maintenance being necessary, it would be marginally easier to remove shrubs than it would be to remove asphalt on top of an easement.

Planner Wells suggested lowering the landscaping point requirements and requiring shrubs and grasses in this area; Chair Giarmo added that it could be taken further by working administratively with the applicant to iron out the details.

Commissioner Wiersema expressed concern about the presented landscape plan and inconsistencies between what is being proposed and the alterations that were being discussed during the meeting. Kohle explained that the applicant is waiting to hear comments from the Planning Commission to make any changes to the site plan, and that they were hesitant to alter any plans until they received direction and guidance from the Planning Commission.

Chair Giarmo inquired about the three existing buildings on the property and if they are planned to remain the same architecturally, Kohle stated that at this point that is not on the applicant's radar, however, it could be an idea that is entertained in the future.

Commissioner Haagsma suggested tabling this agenda item to allow time for alterations to the site plan to be made, rather than approving the request and leaving it up to the Township Engineer and Planner to revise the site plan after approval.

Motion: Motion by Haagsma, supported by Wiersema, to table this request and have the applicant come back with a site plan that clearly depicts the proposed detention basin and any other subsequent changes that might come along with that feature of the site plan.

DISCUSSION: Haagsma said that the new site plan must show where the detention basin will be and the impact it will have to determine where the building goes. Wells added that it is desirable to create landscaping in the front if possible, and the Township Engineer will need to review this proposal again as well.

AYES: Thomas, Waayenberg, Wiersema, Giarmo, Rober, Haagsma

NAYS: NONE

ABSTAIN: NONE

DECISION: Motion Carried (6-0)

b) 3316 68th Street – Dutton Center PUD, Preliminary Review

This agenda item was one the Planning Commission had seen before; however, the proposed Preliminary PUD underwent significant revisions after receiving Planning Commission feedback during the February meeting, so the applicant is back to address these changes and seek preliminary approval.

Representatives for this project include Rick Pulaski from Nederveld, who is the engineer for this project, alongside Dan Larabel and Mike West of Allen Edwin Homes.

Pulaski introduced the project and stated that the applicant seeks to satisfy the vision outlined in the Master Plan and subsequently, the vision for a Village Center in Dutton. Pulaski stated that the applicants referenced plans for Dutton dating back to 2007 and the Master Plan to help inform the changes they made to their original submittal; principles they highlighted in the redesign include front porches, an emphasis on the public realm/ common spaces, and rear-loaded garages. They reconsidered the commercial/ mixed-use areas on 68th Street and determined that bringing the buildings closer to the

road and having parking lots behind them would be ideal for maintaining a low visual impact and not contributing to excessive driveways on 68th Street. In terms of Hanna Lake, Pulaski stated that the entrance point accessed off Hanna Lake is seen as the gateway into the project and the primary entrance, and that the mixed-use buildings in that area are imagined having commercial uses on the first floor and residential uses on the second floor. The boulevard entrance proposed for Hanna Lake would feature sidewalks and street parking to make the project more inviting, protect pedestrians, and calm traffic, which was a goal listed in the Master Plan.

Wells interjected to inquire about road widths and if the proposed measurements are deemed suitable by the Fire Department, to which Pulaski responded that although the applicant hasn't spoken with the Township's fire department, 16ft wide roads have seemed to work well in the past.

Pulaski then gave an overview of the east side of the project off Dutton Avenue. Although a secondary road is proposed for that area, it isn't forgotten about, and dwellings in that area are still proposed to be equipped with front porches and rear loaded garages that emphasize walkability and the public realm. Engaging green spaces are present throughout the development, and multifamily units towards the west side of the development feature front porches and attempt to emulate a sort of "courtyard" feel.

Pulaski explained that the goal was to craft a development that didn't have a dull moment or bad location throughout the whole area. They aimed to make sure that the street is active, lively, and engaging to promote connectivity and keep with the spirit of the Master Plan and the Future Land Use Plan.

Planner Wells then explained the Townships perspective on this revamped proposal for a PUD, and started by saying that this development is meant to become a mixed-use hub that will integrate seamlessly with the historic fabric of Dutton. This is a new model of development for Allen Edwin Homes, and Wells said that the applicant did a good job of using previous Planning Commission feedback to inform their revisions and advised that the Planning Commission debate whether this request satisfies the 16 goals for Dutton that the Master Plan is aiming to achieve.

Planner Wells took some time to address reinvestment in the Dutton area and how if done right, this project could positively impact engagement in this area. Appropriate architecture, such as the use of pitched roofs instead of flat roofs, is an example of how this development could emulate a sort of "main street" atmosphere. Wells also mentioned that this arrangement reinforces retail uses on 68th Street and tucks residential structures towards the middle of the development, and that an influx of residential use in this area may encourage the Kent County Road Commission to address traffic concerns in the area. Additionally, there is a significant amount of underused property to the north of this parcel, which is future zoned as Neighborhood Commercial or Commercial, and as people move into the area, Wells is hopeful that we will also see a demand for the redevelopment of commercial properties; this project could very well likely set that plan in motion.

Wells confirmed that this project is compatible with adjacent land uses and that the scale of the buildings is reasonable, and it sets a good pattern for future development along 68th Street. Last time this project was heard by the Planning Commission, it was determined that the intent of the Master Plan wasn't met, but Wells said that the planning Commission would be able to better discuss that with the revisions that have been made. Wells also clarified that the need for a PUD comes from the desire to implement mixed-use structures and different setback requirements throughout the development that

wouldn't otherwise be attainable. He added that the proposed open space associated with the project could be revised and improved upon.

Chair Giarmo began the discussion by stating that while this proposal is a big improvement to what the applicant provided last time, there is still work to do. Thomas and Haagsma echoed Giarmo's concerns and explained that they would like to see the green space throughout the development be purposeful and conducive for activity, like a park or a sports field, however the proposed courtyard in the multifamily units is an example of intentional greenspace that they would like to see throughout the entire area.

Commissioner Waayenberg highlighted that Dutton Avenue is tiny and lacks shoulders, which would make widening the road to accommodate this PUD quite tricky.

Chair Giarmo said that these lots are planned to be 5,500 S.F. and despite the park that is planned to be installed in the southern platted part of the development, she feels as though this development needs to offer something more adequate for residents in terms of purposeful greenspace.

Commissioner Wiersema echoed earlier sentiments and agreed that this plan is a huge improvement to what had been brought to the Planning Commission last time around; he stated that he likes the idea of the new detention pond being a wet pond, and aside from traffic concerns, he is on board with the general flow of things overall. He did, however, state that there needs to be more community areas, for example, a walking path around the proposed detention pond and perhaps some benches. Wiersema proceeded to address parking within the development, and inquired about where residents are intended to park for the mixed-use and apartment buildings, and where retail patrons are intended to park.

Pulaski confirmed that parking requirements have been met, and Wiersema suggested that perhaps removing an apartment building or a townhouse would be more conducive to providing adequate parking. Planner Wells added that the townhouses feature integrated parking on the ground floor, and Dan Larabel of Allen Edwin Homes confirmed that the townhouse units will have 2-stall garages with 25 ft long driveways, which would be enough parking for 4 cars. Wells added that shared parking is encouraged in areas with apartments and mixed-use retail buildings.

Chair Giarmo explained that traffic in the area is a big concern, and the Planning Commission is interested in having the Public Hearing for this project after the traffic study is available. Larabel confirmed that the traffic study should be complete within the next two weeks.

Planner Wells inquired about the timeline regarding utility and engineering plans, and Larabel responded that compiling that information would likely take months, to which Wells stated that the Public Hearing then wouldn't be able to happen for months.

Commissioner Haagsma echoed Wiersema's previous comments and said that he would love to see a walking path around the pond. Chair Giarmo stated that her biggest concern is open space, and that giving up a few lots would be worthwhile if it means gaining additional open space. She encouraged the applicants to consider their audience and what they like to do outside when implementing purposeful open space; for example, a tot-lot for small children in the area, and perhaps a basketball court for teenagers.

Larabel asked if centralized open space achieved by expanding the park in the platted portion would satisfy the Planning Commissions desire for more intentional greenspace, and Haagsma confirmed that the Planning Commission would like to see the park in the southern portion expanded in addition to implementing more in the northern PUD portion of the development.

Commissioner Haagsma agreed with previous comments and stated that this plan is getting a lot closer to what is envisioned in the Master Plan, however, he would like to see retail spaces succeed and be integrated a little more. Waayenberg added that there are several businesses that could thrive in this area, and Planner Wells took that idea further by reiterating that the number of people moving to this area is going to drive development all over 68th Street, and there is a lot of potential for redevelopment throughout the greater Dutton area.

Chair Giarmo suggested that the applicant schedules a Public Hearing after the traffic study is complete, and after an improved version of the overall plan with more open space is submitted; she voiced that hearing from the public regarding this project is of utmost importance. Haagsma said that he is hopeful the next plan will have adequate changes that will appease the public.

Motion:	Motion by Haagsma, supported by Thomas, to forward this application to the Public Hearing phase and let staff schedule the Public Hearing upon receiving the necessary supporting information, such as the traffic study and engineering plans.
DISCUSSION:	NONE
AYES:	ALL
NAYS:	NONE
ABSTAIN:	None
DECISION:	Motion Carried (6-0)

3. Items not requiring a Public Hearing

a) 8269 Kalamazoo Avenue – Ratio Wavier Request

Eric Kusters is the applicant for this request and is a homebuilder for/ owner of Kusters Homes Inc. The property owners contacted Kusters to build a home for them, and the lot is proving to be difficult to work with, hence the request for a 4:1 Ratio Waiver.

Planner Wells provided the Townships point of view on this request and said that the applicants are looking to divide their parcel into two lots, but there isn't enough frontage, therefore there is no chance the 4:1 ratio can be met. The applicant is requesting to build a home on the parcel without having to meet the 4:1 frontage ratio. Wells expressed that the Future Land Use Plan designates this parcel as village residential, and at some point in the future someone may be interested in building this parcel out in a high density way, so it is advised that enough room is left on the south side of the parcel for an access easement. Wells also warned that once this is approved, it's ultimately up to the landowner to decide how they want to divide up the parcel, therefore applying conditions to this request is obsolete. Planner Wells then noted that the back portion of the lot specifically is currently leased farmland and has good development potential in the future.

Motion:	Motion by Waayenberg, supported by Haagsma, to approve the resolution and waive the 4:1 ratio for this parcel.
----------------	--

DISCUSSION: NONE
AYES: ALL
NAYS: NONE
ABSTAIN: None
DECISION: Motion Carried (6-0)

VII. GENERAL DISCUSSION

Planner Wells said that next month Alexander Trails is planning on coming in with a Preliminary PUD request to set parameters in place for subsequent site condos and plats. He also mentioned that there are a few Special Use Permits next month, including a production facility for a local small-scale brewery.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:48 PM.

CERTIFICATION:

I hereby certify that the above is a true copy of the minutes from the March 28th, 2024, Planning Commission Meeting of the Gaines Charter Township Planning Commission held at the time and place mentioned above pursuant to the required statutory procedures.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lani Thomas". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Lani Thomas,

Secretary

Gaines Charter Township Planning Commission

Date: March 28th, 2024