

**WATERVLIET CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
OCTOBER 12, 2021**

Present: Joseph Stepich, Colleen Curtis, Deanna Heminger, Louis Nordell,  
Scott McKee.

Also Present: Jessica Fette, Mark Smith, Mike Grey

Acting Chairman J. Stepich called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Roll Call was taken.

The minutes of the September 7, 2021 regular meeting and the special Planning Commission meetings of September 8<sup>th</sup> and September 11<sup>th</sup> were read. C. Curtis made a motion to approve the minutes from September 7, 2021, September 8, 2021 and September 11, 2021. D. Heminger seconded and the motion carried.

**Recreational Marihuana**

J. Stepich opened the continuing discussion of the potential of allowing recreational marihuana uses in the township by asking the Commissioners present if they were confident with proceeding with the adoption of an ordinance. He also asked what approach should be taken; either take the current medical marihuana ordinance as a starting point and work to combine the two into one ordinance or draft a new stand alone ordinance just for recreational marihuana. On top of that, determine what uses, from what the state permits, would be permitted.

J. Fette cautioned the Commissioners that there will be significant changes with a recreational ordinance mainly for the fact that, with the township's medical marihuana ordinance they could issue permits on a first come, first serve basis and that the only required review was to simply determine that the application was complete. She explained that with the recreational legislation, if the township's volition is to limit the number of each use selected, a competitive review process of each application is required and added that the review of each application would have to be done at an open public meeting. She added further that if the township wishes not to restrict uses and their number that process would not be necessary.

D. Heminger noted that, in her opinion, it would not be prudent to allow an unrestricted number of recreational facilities in the township. Heminger further questioned what would be the best approach; to either combine the recreational ordinance with the current medical marihuana ordinance or to adopt a stand alone recreational ordinance. Fette said adopting a separate ordinance would be a cleaner approach and easier of the applicant. J. Stepich poled the Commission of what their preference was; a composite marihuana

ordinance or two separate ordinances. After brief discussion the Commissioners agreed that two separate ordinances would be the best approach. J. Fette stated that she would begin the process of drafting a separate, stand alone recreational marihuana ordinance and present it at the November meeting for review by the Planning Commission.

At this point, J. Stepich requested that the Commission decide what facilities were desired and in what numbers. It was discussed that the number of recreational facilities could mimic the number of facilities permitted in the medical marihuana ordinance. D. Heminger, addressing her question to recreational marihuana business owners in the attendance, asked if both medical and recreational marihuana could be grown in the same facility. M. Smith, who is set to open a medical marihuana facility in the township, replied that, yes, both types of plants are allowed, by state law, to exist in the same facility. Smith explained that to be in compliance with the state a facility owner needs to post both licenses in the facility and that each plant is tagged for its specific use, either medical or recreational.

Through further discussion among the Commissioners, it was decided that a draft recreational marihuana ordinance would use the same number of facilities allowed as the medical ordinance, being: 6 - grow facilities, 3 - processing facilities, 4 - provisioning facilities and an unlimited number of safety compliance and secure transport facilities. Since the recreational marihuana statute permit a type of facility called a marihuana micro business, the Commission discussed if these were a desirable facility to consider. M. Smith, addressing the Commissioners, stated that he doubted anyone would be seeking a permit for one since those uses have been found to be untenable due to the state mandated restrictions place on them.

It was brought to the attention of the Commission that also available, with a state license, are Consumption Establishments. After clarification and discussion of what these types of businesses were, L. Nordell stated he would prefer to leave this type of business out of the proposed ordinance. D. Heminger supported that suggestion.

Through further discussion it was agreed by the Commissioners that they would retain the same facility distancing requirements used in the Medical Marihuana Ordinance.

With there being no further business before the Planning Commission, C. Curtis made a motion to adjourn. D. Heminger seconded and the motion carried.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,



Robert Lohr  
Zoning Administrator