

LILLEY TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES  
PUBLIC HEARING – SHORT TERM RENTAL ORDINANCE  
NOVEMBER 9<sup>TH</sup>, 2023 – UNAPPROVED

The November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2023 Public Hearing of the Lilley Township Planning Commission, held at the Multi-Purpose Building, was called to order by Chairperson Israels at 7:30 P.P.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, Invocation by Doornbos.

The roll was called with the following members present: Moore, Bonnett, Israels, Doornbos, Hoving

Motion to approve the agenda by Moore, Second by Doornbos  
Voice Vote - All in Favor – Aye – Opposed None – Motion Carried

Motion to approve the Minutes of the Oct. 19<sup>th</sup>, 2023 meeting by Bonnett, second by Moore  
Roll Call: Hoving Yes, Doornbos Yes, Israels Yes, Moore Yes, Bonnett Yes – Motion Carried

Public Comment not pertaining to this agenda: None

Introduction of guests and Counsel: Clifford Bloom – Counsel for Lilley Township  
Mark Clark – Counsel for STR Owners and Hosts

\*\*\*\*\*OPEN PUBLIC HEARING\*\*\*\*\*

Re: Proposed amendments to the Lilley Township Zoning Ordinance regarding Short Term Rentals

Chairperson Israels began with information compiled from our Master Plan. Lilley Township is committed to preserving the existing rules and recreational environment for its citizens. Lilley Township is dedicated to maintaining and improving existing roads, maintaining and where appropriate improving safety for its citizens and showing fairness toward all Township citizens in ordinance enforcement. One of the main objectives of our Master Plan is to maintain the rural character of our Township and to allow for regulated higher density of residences around lakes, streams and main roads without crowding and/or jeopardizing the health and safety of Township residents. Lilley Township will maintain the residential, recreational and commercial use for property owners and visitors and ensure that new development and construction is compatible with surrounding land use. We are working on blight which tends to lower the character of the area. Our Zoning Ordinance will not impose conformance upon all existing properties. The Planning Commission agreed that all lawful existing property usage is to be Grandfathered or Grandparented and that Planning and Zoning is not retroactive. We conducted a taxpayer survey for our new Master Plan. The Township shall develop policies and regulations that encourage limited business growth by accommodating home business and low impact cottage industry standards throughout the Township and concentrating commercial development where mixed use, that also allows residential uses, can occur. From our survey, one of the main questions showed that 47% of our respondents agreed that the Township should carefully analyze the amount or location of any development. 71% agreed that businesses should be restricted to certain areas of the Township. 77% said it is especially important to preserve fields, forests, lakes and rivers. The majority of our residents agree that our Township should remain rural and should have a Country feel to it. Several of our lakes have been taken over by Short Term Rentals. 61 cottages exist on Pettibone Lake alone. 17 have become STRs in the last 3 years. That is a takeover. We as a Planning Commission are obligated and take an oath to protect the property owners and residents of this Township and their tax dollars and that is what we have tried to do.

Lilley Township has already incurred a large expense to satisfy STR owners. We have tried to be fair to all but there have been five meetings held pertaining only to Short Term Rentals. Public Hearings are generally paid for in advance to cover Township expenses by those who request them but none have been paid for by STR advocates. We hope you can see that we have tried to be fair to your demands while remaining true to our responsibilities to the Township.

Tonight's Hearing is to only deal with the language that is in the Ordinance Amendment.

**Correspondence: Ben Maffit – Received by email early on the day of this meeting**

**Ethan and Sarah Glidewell – email sent at 4:47 PM the day of this meeting**

**Sara Glemby - letter with attachments – email sent at 4:37 PM the day of this meeting**

**Josh Wisner & The Short-Term Rental Owners Group – 7-page document by email sent at 4:58 PM the day of this meeting.**

Due to their very late arrival the Planning Commission Members did not receive this correspondence in a timely manner. This information will be considered and available for review at the Township Offices.

**Public Comment: (Will be summarized due to time constraints)**

- 1. Kim Holcomb – Township Resident and STR Owner - She states that we, the Planning Commission members, have made statements that there is NO economic benefit to our area businesses from STRs. Questions our truthfulness regarding road conditions and who uses them the most and all the ways the roads are used. They themselves contribute to maintaining private roads used by them. She doesn't understand why, since the Township does not pay to maintain private roads, that the ordinance would deny STRs on private roads and claims that this restriction is unprecedented in the State of Michigan by any other townships.**
- 2. Mark Clark – Counsel for STR Hosts – Thanked the Commission members for their efforts. Has received the Draft Ordinance. He has questions and hopes for full discussion and comments. He has noted that there were two drafts, an initial draft in July and another dated October first with notable changes. Initial draft had a total STR cap of 50. The most recent draft had a cap of 25. He questions how that change was arrived at. Requests the basis for the change in numbers. He also questions how the numbers capped around the lakes were arrived at. Most communities discuss STR limits or caps based on percentage of total dwelling units usually to avoid a housing shortage in the community. In rural area it is usually 6%. He says our current numbers appear to be 3% so he wants information that this figure is not an arbitrary number but based on some analysis. He questions the numbers around the lakes being drastically reduced in the second draft. He questions our numbers and requests information on how these figures were arrived and what criteria was used. Questions our motives on the Township Board and Planning Commission because some of us live on our properties in neighborhoods on or near lakes. Asked what criteria was used surrounding the one-mile radius around the lakes. Questioned the use or meaning of the term "Single Families" in our zoning ordinances. Clark questions that penalties can be used against those who rented to unrelated groups. Claims all uses by his clients were done in good faith and should not be penalized. Claimed that this action would be legally questionable and of an unjustified punitive nature and whether prior STR use is an existing non-conforming use under the existing ordinance and we will differ in our opinions on that. Believes that there is a good faith argument that exists. Claims his clients have never preferred a legal challenge. They want to understand that we have a rational basis for doing what we are doing and that a legitimate criterion was used in coming to our final decisions whatever those may be.**

Public Comments (continued)

Clark continues by asking for due consideration of the issues he has raised. He continues by suggesting that the private roads are not impacted by Short Term Rental users. It is suggested that there be no STRs on private roads without Township Zoning approval but the ordinance does not say what the criteria would be to obtain such Zoning approval. He says no one here understands how, in the current version, they would gain that approval. There doesn't seem to be a public purpose achieved when the Township has a comprehensive private road ordinance as standard for private roads. Questions the public purpose for this. There is an exclusion in the Ordinance regarding Tiny Houses without defining what that is. His clients need an explanation regarding Tiny Houses. Clark questions why this ordinance has no information on the process regarding issuance of a permit or license. Makes suggestions on licensing procedure. Doesn't approve of the procedure we are using. Claims that his clients do not object to regulations but again mentions court proceedings because of the way we are proceeding which does not satisfy the needs of his clients. Suggests again that we adopt a licensing scheme. He again mentions licensing procedures and suggests possible legal implications. He also suggests licensing procedures and Grandfathering the existing ones. In conclusion, he thanks us again for our time.

3. Josh Wisner – STR Owner – Josh read from a letter and packet that was emailed **just prior** to this meeting which most never saw and no one has had time to study. It was seven pages. He mentions previous meetings where his group offered many suggestions and much input on the way he wants our Township to respond to the wishes of the Short-Term Rental business owners he represents. He is very critical of the way we are handling this process and accuses us of not following a process that he approves of. He has an STR on a private road and claims to have asked this “Board” to help with repairs and got no help. **Note:** The Township cannot use taxpayer funds to repair private roads. The information he has supplied in the past has been duly noted. At this point his time to speak was up to which he objected. He had read a large portion of the email that arrived late in the day but insisted on more time. He was told that his time would not be extended and Mr. Bloom our legal counsel had to caution him that his time was up.
4. Robert Sergi – Resident of Lilley Township – His concern is the one-mile radius around lakes. His interest is the hunting grounds and cabins and how this radius might affect or limit the Short-Term Rentals of hunting cabins. He hopes we will reconsider this issue as it pertains to other areas in the Township.
5. Sara Glemby – STR Owner – Sara's email was received shortly prior to this meeting and is referenced above under correspondence. She agrees with Mr. Clark and would add that she supports Grandfathering the existing STRs. She states that the existing owners have long supported licensing, capping and other necessary regulations. She has also made clear that she wants to work closely with the Township Board. She hopes for our thoughtful consideration on these matters. Questions whether any of the exclusionary characteristics that were developed to determine who was lawfully in existence, were based on information received from the voluntarily registry as submitted. If so why was this not discussed. She asked why it appears that the criteria would eliminate STRs that already exist. Thinks that this would open up entirely new STR owners in the Township. How will licenses be awarded? What will be the selection process?

**Public Comments (continued)**

- 6. Ben Maffit – Property Owner & Taxpayer – What are the Township’s requirements regarding a small retreat property that has less than the required Michigan State’s registration of a campground which specifically states 5 or more total sites. If a property has less than State required 5 and has 4 sites consisting of tents, campers or mini cabins could it be established as a lawful STR lot or be considered for a special land use permit? As an STR host he has good reviews. He informs his guests of local options. Feels visitors are good for the Community.**

**Public Comment Closed.**

**Chairperson Israels then turned the meeting over to Mr. Clifford Bloom, Lilley Township legal Counsel. He may be able to address some of your questions or we can address them when we deliberate.**

**Mr. Bloom requested that Chairperson Israels elaborate on the Registry. She stated that we had 37 declarations of existing operational STRs. The information contained stated single family or just family or groups. None were separated into separate groups based on who they do or do not rent to. Everything went into one before she gave it over to Zoning, now in the process of taking those declarations and putting them into a registry. That is not complete yet and probably will not be for a while based on further investigation. Jeff Wroblewski, our Zoning Officer, will be the one to speak to that because we are done. Member Hoving had a question asking if everyone who has an STR first contacted our Zoning Officer to make sure that what they were planning to invest in is allowed in our township. Is that true? Israels continued asking if everyone made a phone call to make sure that everything you were planning was lawful and that your property met all fire requirements and complied with our existing Zoning. One person responded affirmatively. One person asked the wrong official those questions. Israels continued that the registry is going to take a long time to complete and it will be based on a licensing procedure and it will also be based on how many we are going to allow. The criteria will be discussed when we deliberate and beyond that she had nothing to add.**

**Bloom began with the statement that based on the Registry there are 35 people who have declared that they are operating (37 as corrected by members). Israels spoke out that the STR group are saying that there is a whole housing inventory in this very dense township. There may be 380 plus 562 housing units in total but occupied housing in this township is 380. We have 37 people declaring an STR. That is 10%. To say that we are not being fair in limiting or putting a cap on them is incorrect. The other housing, the 562, belong to owners who don’t live in the state, or don’t visit often but allow family to use it rent free. Some is hunting or vacation property that is not lived in year-round. Mixing vacation properties into our total inventory is incorrect and skews the numbers. Bloom commented that if there are 37 known there are probably more which several members with knowledge agreed with. Israels stated that it is now time to get our registry and ordinances in place.**

**Bloom began by stating that the first public hearing was held in May. There have been at least four drafts similar to this one going back to June. We will decide at this or a future meeting to make a recommendation to adopt the Ordinance to the Township Board and that body will make final determination on its adoption. Public comment will be allowed. If the process goes through and the Zoning Ordinance as amended regarding STRs is approved by the Board, a separate regulatory Licensing Ordinance will be developed. This has been the intent since day one. It would require Township Board approval as well.**

Bloom continued that he had made notes of the good questions and comments raised and would attempt to answer all. One person who spoke stated that there was no recognition by the Planning Commission of the economic benefit for the township. He has a different interpretation based on comments at 3 of the 5 meetings held. If there are no STRs, those dwellings aren't empty. The owners are there so they would also visit local businesses. He does not believe that any of the Planning Commission believes there is no economic benefit to the community or as so stated that the cap assumes they are vacant anyway. Regarding the lake caps, a lot of the population is centered around the lakes and looking at the size of the lakes, over time and additional research, numbers have changed. Another problem is that based on the registry declarations an imbalance has occurred around Pettibone Lake. There are at least 17 STRs there which is far more than any other lake in the Township. That is around 25% of the population around the lake. The Planning Commission is attempting a fair balance in this regard for all the permanent residents living there. The 6% figure that their Counsel mentioned some townships do is interesting in that 6% of 61 housing units on Pettibone Lake would be 3.6%. We are recommending 4 in this Zoning Ordinance.

Regarding the one-mile figure based on the section size, the idea was that you allocate a certain number and it should not be just at the lakes but should include other surrounding areas. This can be looked at.

Regarding the Single-Family issue. It is necessary to remember that we are dealing with two different types of community STRs. A lot of the Ordinances being quoted are more in resort communities in cities, villages and townships with more population. STRs have long been a staple in communities like Grand Haven, Spring Lake, St. Joseph etc. Their ordinances are different although several of those communities are revisiting it because of problems and some of them are tightening down. Then you have a township like Lilley, and he is not saying that they have never had STRs, they have had, but they were much fewer consisting of families renting out for a few weeks or a month per year. A family would also live in their cottage and rent out the one they own next door. The idea of a cottage, house or cabin that is purely STR is relatively new to rural areas. It is important to keep these two different types of communities separate when decisions are made. The urban areas have a police force, a full time Zoning Administrator, full time Building Inspectors and other full time staffing unlike the more rural areas.

Bloom respectfully disagreed with opposing counsel stating that his people don't want lawsuits. Lawsuits have been threatened since day one, over and over and over and over again. We potentially face lawsuits from STR people and potentially face lawsuits from neighbors who do not want STRs. We are attempting to come up with an Ordinance that is fair and equitable to all.

On the private road issue, there is a misunderstanding here in that the regulations in the zoning ordinance are regarding new private roads in new developments. Per the Zoning Officer, there have been no new developments in the Township. The Zoning Ordinance Grandparented lawful non-conforming roads and we can't regulate them. So, all of the private road provisions in the proposed ordinance can apply. It is agreed that the provision regarding private roads is not found in known ordinances around the state. There is no central registry of local ordinances. However, addressing issues regarding private roads is innovative based on local conditions within the Township. There is a rational reason for addressing STRs on private roads. Also, safety issues are important and ambulances and fire trucks must have unimpeded access to the structures located on them. Many private roads are in bad shape.

Tiny houses – this comes up a lot. This is probably Bloom's 70<sup>th</sup> meeting around STRs. There are 3 general ways this issue is handled. Park Township and others have banned them. Some areas have very liberal policies regarding them. Some areas do not want to ban but to regulate them such as Lilley Township. It is not a ban but a square footage issue. Tiny houses based on his knowledge are not legal anywhere in the State of Michigan. Even if they are allowed they have to meet the building code and the square footage requirement of 750 square feet. He is not aware of any place in the State that allows a tent or trailer as an STR. They do not meet the building codes. If you are to argue that it meets the single-family residential use it must be in a unit that complies with the single-family dwelling building codes. Any usage other than this would require a special land use application to get a permit for this activity if allowed.

There will be a process outlined for securing a permit if this Ordinance passes. You will go to Jeff Wroblewski, the Zoning Officer to secure a permit. Jeff will make a determination on whether you are first in line or not. Whoever disagrees with Jeff's determinations can go to the ZBA to appeal. The numbers are staggering. We were told by the group that there were 14 STRs here in the Township. He feels that they provided this information in good faith however there are now 37 admitted and probably more who did not respond. There may be at least 40 or 50 out there. Going back to the Group suggested ordinances, they are appreciated but again there is no Central Registry of Ordinances. There can be no way to reach a consensus. The Group is suggesting Grandfathering all of the existing STRs. That would be maybe 40 of possibly 50. If there are 380 year-round homes here, 6% of that would be roughly 23. If you did a total of just under 1000 that would be around 60.

Bloom issued an opinion letter that was published around a month ago to follow up on the letter written in 2009. That letter was asking an opinion on a specific STR. Even though it seems to allow this the Zoning Administrator is the final word and even though it seemed to violate our zoning, a decision was made not to go after the family involved. In the 15 years since a lot of case law has come down from the Michigan Court of Appeals and the Supreme Court. The overwhelming majority of those decided that STRs are Commercial and are not allowed in Single Family Zoned Districts. He repeats, it is a real close call as to whether they are lawful in this township or not. He believes slightly that they are not lawful. Also, there has been a Moratorium in effect so none of them should have been operating STRs unless they can prove that they are lawfully non-conforming.

Concerning property values, even if an STR is not allowed the property still has value. That may be somewhat less based on loss of STR income but value of the property is still there.

At this time Bloom has concluded his comments and says he is available to answer any questions that may arise during deliberations.

**Israels** began deliberation by stating that there was a question regarding the numbers proposed regarding STRs allowed on lakes. Bloom was not a part of this research. We knew based on the complaints we were getting that 50 would be too many for our small township. We were told that there were only 14 in the township causing so much commotion and the conclusions were that 50 is too many. Further research showed that banning them completely would hurt those within the Township, especially around the lakes, who had been quietly renting out their places for a few weeks a year to family and friends to cover taxes. It was a deliberated and negotiated number that we came up with as a fitting compromise. We started on April 20th, 2023 with our first deliberations and went over the 5 questions. It was agreed that we had to come up with some kind of formula. The final agreement was for 1 STR for every 10 acres of lake area. Whatever the Newaygo County GIS shows would be used. Number of cottages & traffic were considered.

We had to revisit the factors affecting each lake. We examined factors on our Zoning map, showing Wilderness recreation, rural residential, MDR, LDR and Commercial. Many factors were considered. Some are private lakes, some have deed restrictions and other factors. Nichols is only partially located in Lilley. We have tried to be fair to everyone including area residents and our Township people and their tax dollars. In regards to private roads, one of the ladies who lives on private Wilvan Drive on Mawby Lake sat and watched some ORVs tear up the roads. Her statement to Israels was that there was no way that she would pay to fix up her private road again. They had just had it fixed. She claimed that the ORVs came from an STR. Everything included in this proposed Ordinance was included to resolve complaints that were made to individual members especially after the 4<sup>th</sup> of July weekend which was especially busy and crowded.

Beginning member input, **Moore** suggesting seeing how often STRs can rent and how long they can rent. Can they rent all year around or be limited to 6 months only? **Bloom** initially advised against this as he was unaware of this limitation being included in other Ordinances. Our previous deliberations determined flexibility regarding rental lengths was the best solution. **Bloom** commented again saying he is actually surprised that this language is not included by more townships. Renting for only 2 days at a time makes it more like a motel. **Hoving** reminded us that STRs are a for profit business. Their primary reason for being here is to make money for their own various reasons. Our job is representing the people who already live here by being fair and also protecting the Township's residents and taxpayers. We have spent, already, thousands of taxpayer dollars for legal fees and many meetings. Planning Commission normally meets 4 times a year. We have already met 9 times to accommodate STR people. We are trying to protect our citizens and their dollars because there are better places to spend our taxpayer dollars in this township than defending ourselves against those who are pretty much here just to make money. That is how it feels to us. This is not fair to those who live here or live elsewhere who own vacation property in Lilley and use it within our zoning restrictions. In spite of STR owners who say they care about us and our Township, basically the bottom line is the bottom line. **Moore** states that even reducing the numbers to 25, we do not have township personnel to do all this. **Bloom** stated that the first step is amending Zoning and then setting up a Licensing Procedure Ordinance, making fees high enough to cover licensing, inspections and other requirements. Licensing will not be a money maker but hopefully we could recover some of the expense to the township for administration and enforcement of these ordinances. **Moore** mentions that our Zoning officer is part time. He has a full-time job and he is already overextended. **Bloom** said that some rural townships contract with outside agencies to perform some of the functions. Comment – More taxpayer money. **Moore** states that we have to charge enough to cover taxpayer funds. **Israels** states that she is aware of a local taxpayer that will be all over us for spending his tax dollars to accommodate or defend against these businesses. **Bloom** reminded us that Zoning always causes enforcement expense. **Israels** does not see how licensing can possibly cover all of the expense of enforcement. **Doornbos** suggested contacting a business, giving them our numbers and get an estimate of what it would cost. He continued that we would then go back, divide the costs by the number of STRs and base the licensing costs on those figures. **Hoving** is concerned that if we begin to allow for-profit businesses in residential areas, what else does that open up our residential areas to? **Doornbos** suggests that this could open up a big can of worms. **Israels** stated that even in the case of around the lakes there is no more room than what is already allocated on the list, not if we go by the formula already adopted. **Doornbos** suggested that Hoving might be concerned that down the road some other business would like to set up in MDR and take us to court because we have already allowed other businesses to come in. **Bloom** responded that that is a danger but once the ordinance is well drafted, that should not be a problem. They are very limited to ones that traditionally have been there etc. He says that since we have stated that STRs are allowed and home-based businesses are allowed, that pretty much precludes other businesses from being allowed. STRs are a very different animal than everything else because the home still looks the same and as long as they are only renting to **ONE** family.

Bloom continued that some kind of machine shop with large equipment would not be allowed.

**Hoving** continued by asking what if there is some kind of reunion and there are nineteen cars parked on both side of the two-track road? **Bloom** replied that he had not addressed that and should have. Most ordinances he has seen do not allow those. **Israels** went on to add comments to the group saying that you had the worst group member representing your interests. He is gone, finally. He followed no rules, very antagonistic, hostile, in your face, I am going to do what I want to do, and now all of you are reaping the benefits of all of this. **Hoving** said he made accusations of corruption. **Israels** added that he wrote blogs that were nasty. He turned many of us in the township against STRs specifically. The group denied that he was their spokesman. **Israels** replied that at the same time it taught us a lesson about what we have to look forward to in the future. We have to make sure that our ordinance will address those things. He showed us what your group is capable of. **Hoving** mentioned that we can look up the reviews given to the STRs. We can tell that groups of people were there in a single family MDR zone. Violations are easy to find in your platform reviews. We have done due diligence in documenting activities and listening to the opinions and complaints of those in our community. We have listened to those who came to our meetings making complaints and expressing opinions as documented in previous minutes. The charge against Commission members regarding negative comments made, were actually made by citizens against STRs who attended our meetings and submitted correspondence and not by our members. **Moore** adds that now we need to work on this.

**Bloom** states that the Licensing Ordinance is going to be tough. He will give a few examples that he will recommend. If these are legalized, there will be some really strict rules. As anyone who has driven around Pettibone Lake, as he has his whole life, knows there is no place to park multiple vehicles. To say that we do not enforce that around noncommercial properties does not apply. **Israels** asks that once the Ordinance is adopted and Licensing is in place, what happens to those who continue to rent without a license? **Bloom** replied that tickets would be issued and possible fines. **Doornbos** asked if the ticket would be attached to their land. If we ban them all some will still continue to operate and argue their case in court. The courts are more likely to uphold our case if some are allowed under defined circumstances.

**Hoving** asked to speak regarding one more issue involving shared driveways or the shared access issue. I do know that there were actual serious threats made caused by a misunderstanding when there was a shared access. A caretaker threatened a serious assault against a neighbor's contractor around a no parking sign being installed. You can get to both places because of the little half-circle access allowing access to both places. STR guests too can be confused. Private roads around lakes are another issue. The Bitely family has spoken, regarding the private road at their family compound on Lamoreaux Lake, at several township meetings. One family on the lake wants to build a campground and STR accessed by the private road created, built and maintained by Sue Bitely's husband. This is what we are trying to protect against.

Moving on, **Moore** asked if everybody read the proposed ordinance? All agreed that they had.

**Israels** questioned **Moore** regarding the renting terms and does she have suggestions as to how often and how long. **Moore** would like to see them rent only six months of the year but if we have to change anything never mind. **Hoving** mentioned nine months however there is also snowmobiling and nine months would cut out one season so probably limiting it would not be good. **Doornbos** agreed no limit yearly due to four seasons of activities and **Bonnett** agreed.

Note: For those that have accused us of not deliberating and violating the OMA, I have highlighted names.



Israels asked the Commission members if any had any additions or deletions. Our counsel, Cliff Bloom replied that we should make sure that we have in front of us, the October 31 draft. On page 7, C. (3) regarding tiny houses, he would propose revising the wording to read “Any “tiny house” or any dwelling that does not meet the minimum size requirements of this Ordinance.

In addition, on page 8 of the Oct. 31<sup>st</sup> draft, C. (8) to read “Any dwelling or structure that does not comply with all applicable Zoning Ordinance requirements, building codes, fire safety codes and the maintenance code.”

All members agreed to these additions.

In response to a question by **Doornbos**, Bloom has found that STRs do not have to comply with commercial building codes if there is single family occupancy. If they rent to more than one family at a time or a group, they would probably have to comply with multi-family building codes.

There being no more business to complete, Chairperson Israels called for a motion to recommend the Ordinance as amended.

Motion by Moore, second by Hoving to recommend to the Township Board approval of The October 31<sup>st</sup>, 2023 Zoning Ordinance Amendment regarding Short Term Rentals as revised.

Roll Call: Doornbos No, Bonnett Yes, Moore Yes, Israels Yes, Hoving Yes – Motion Carried

This approval information will be presented at the next Lilley Township Board Meeting on November 13<sup>th</sup>, 2023 in the Planning Commission portion of their Agenda.

Israels spoke of the 3 multi page emails received just prior to this meeting. They contain information already seen and/or discussed at previous meetings and will be archived. She suggested going to the website [lilleytownship.org](http://lilleytownship.org) and reading or printing all of the minutes regarding Short Term Rentals.

Bloom spoke regarding current legislation on solar farms being considered in the Michigan Legislature. There are several pending bills that would take away local control including gravel mining. An audience member asked about the licensing bill as discussed. The Licensing Ordinance is not ready yet. The Board will consider the Zoning Ordinance approved today and the Licensing Ordinance will follow.

Our next regular meeting of the Planning Commission will be January 18<sup>th</sup>, 2024 at 7:00 PM. We are going to consider moving all of the future meetings starting time to the earlier time of 7:00 P.M.

Motion to adjourn by Doornbos, second by Moore – All in Favor - Meeting adjourned at 9:05 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Judith C. Hoving*

Recording Secretary