NOTE: THIS MEETING IS BEING TAPED FOR THE PURPOSE OF DEVELOPING MINUTES ONLY

LODI TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES
JOINT WORKSHOP
BAORD OF TRUSTEES & PLANNING COMMISSION

Wednesday, October 21, 2026 – 6:00 P.M.

LODI TOWNSHIP HALL

I. **Call to order - Flag Pledge**

II. **Roll Call – Board of Trustees, Planning Commission & Board of Appeals**

III. **Public Comment**

Any member of the Public may address the Township Boards for 2 minutes

IV. **Revision/Approve Agenda**
(Items may be added or deleted from the meeting agenda, and/or the order of items may be changed, at the request of an individual Board member or the Supervisor. The agenda must be approved before proceeding further.)

V. **Work Session with Planning Commission and Board of Trustees**

a. **Natural Features Definition**
b. **Sanitary Sewer Definition**
c. **Golf Course Definition**

VI. **Public Comment**

Any member of the Public may address the Township Boards for 2 minutes

VII. **Next Meeting will be:**
Planning Commission: Tuesday, October 27, 2026, 7pm
Board of Trustees: Tuesday, November 10, 2026, at 6:30pm.

VIII. **Adjournment – Board of Trustees & Planning Commission**

Please note that Lodi Township does not visually record meetings. There is a possibility of a quorum of Planning Commission Members and/or Zoning Board of Appeals at this meeting.

Individuals who require special accommodation should contact the Township Clerk at (734) 665-7583 at least three (3) business days prior to the hearing.

OHM Advancing Communities

September 16, 2026

Planning Commission
Lodi Township
3755 Pleasant Lake Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103

Attention: Cindy Strader, Planning Commission Chair

Subject: Tree Regulation and Replacement Requirements

Dear Ms. Strader,

During the September 2nd Township Board Meeting, the Township Board recommended the Planning Commission review considerations relevant to the regulations of trees and tree mitigation in the Zoning Ordinance. The request was made to resolve regulatory challenges stemming from a recent application by Scott Kovanda of Frontier Club, LLC to develop 13 parcels totaling approximately 334 acres to serve a golf course.

Although we do not recommend consideration of zoning ordinance amendments to address the needs of an individual application, this issue is likely to arise for future development proposals as well. Review of this section will benefit the Township by ensuring that this application, and future applications, are reviewed under standards that do not create hardships and reduce the potential for variance requests or legal challenges. The Planning Commission should evaluate these provisions to determine whether the proposed amendments are appropriate to address future development while maintaining the intent of the ordinance.

This memorandum includes a review of four topics relevant to the Natural Features Protection and Preservation Ordinance in Section 54.08:

1. Tree Survey Requirements
2. Dead, Dying, and Invasive Trees
3. Tree Preservation Requirements
4. Tree Replacement Requirements

Background

Relevant Case Law

Recent litigation in Canton Township, including F.P. Development, LLC v. Charter Township of Canton and Charter Township of Canton v. 44650, Inc. demonstrated the possibility of limitations on local tree-preservation and replacement requirements. In both cases, challenges were made regarding the constitutionality of the ordinance, with the courts ultimately ruling in favor of the developers.

1. **F.P. Development LLC v. Charter Township of Canton.** F.P. Development owned property in Canton Township that it wanted to develop. The property contained a large number of trees. Canton Township had a Tree Ordinance requiring property owners to obtain a permit before removing certain trees and, in many circumstances, to replace removed trees or pay money into the Township's tree fund. F.P. removed trees from its property without obtaining a permit. F.P. said it needed to remove the trees because a clogged drainage ditch was causing flooding on the property. The Township determined that 159 regulated trees had been removed and required F.P. either to replant 187 trees or pay approximately

OHM Advisors
34000 PLYMOUTH ROAD
LIVONIA, MICHIGAN 48150
T 734.522.6711
F 734.522.6427
OHM-Advisors.com

$47,898 into the Township's tree fund. F.P argued that the tree requirements were unconstitutional, making the claim that the Ordinance resulted in a "taking" without just compensation. F.P. argued that forcing them to either replace trees or pay into the tree fund was an unconstitutional "taking" of property under the **Fifth Amendment**, which mandates just compensation for property taken for public use.

The case was heard by the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan and subsequently appealed to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. Ultimately, the appellate Court agreed that Canton was in violation of the Fifth Amendment and that the regulations resulted in a taking.

This ruling means that Townships can regulate tree removals for the purpose of preserving natural resources, but that these types of regulations must be proportionate to the impact of the development. In this case, the courts found that the Township went too far by requiring replacement of the removed trees or paying $48,000 based upon the circumstances that were presented. Regarding replacement trees, the court determined that the mechanism for counting replacement trees did not adequately account for the consequences of removing them, requiring an individualized assessment of the environmental impact of each tree's removal on the property and surrounding area to reasonably relate required mitigation requirements as proportionate that impact.

Notably, this case involved the removal of trees in a drainage ditch, and evidence was presented to the court indicating that clearing the clogged ditch and removing dead trees might have actually resulted in improvements to the property and surrounding area.

2. **Charter Township of Canton v. 44650, Inc.** In this case, 44650, Inc. owned a 16-acre parcel in Canton Township with the intent of using the property for agricultural purposes. Although the applicant was notified of the local tree ordinance, they clear-cut the property without first obtaining the Township's required tree-removal permit. The trees were in poor condition, with many dead ash trees, invasive species, and other brush, and characterized as "blighted and neglected" by 44650, emphasizing that the tree removals did not occur in a healthy forest. Canton Township sued the applicant to enforce the ordinance, but similar to FP, the applicant argued that the Ordinance resulted in a "taking" without just compensation. The applicant argued that forcing them to preserve or replace trees or pay into the tree fund was an unconstitutional "taking" of property under the **Fifth Amendment**, which mandates just compensation for property taken for public use. Their claim argued that Canton could not condition the use of the property on giving the Township something unless there was sufficient connection and proportionality between the requirement and the impact of the proposed activity. Canton's requirement was not sufficiently connected to the environmental impact of what was removed.

   Following an initial hearing in front of the Wayne County Circuit Court which favored the applicant, the case was subsequently appealed to the Michigan Court of Appeals. The Court of Appeals found that although Canton can regulate tree removal, the requirement must be justified; when a government requires a property owner to give up something in exchange for use of the land, there must be (1) a legitimate connection between the government's requirement and the problem caused by the property owner's activity and (2) a reasonable relationship between the amount of mitigation and the impact of the property owner's activity. Canton had a legitimate tree-preservation objective, but its mitigation requirements weren't adequately tied to the particular impact of the property owner's activity.

   Notably, this case highlights that distinctions between dead, diseased, invasive, or hazardous trees should be incorporated into regulations to ensure that the environmental impact of each tree removal is adequately evaluated.

Recent Developments in Lodi Township

In addition to the findings of the Canton Township lawsuits, it should be further noted that two recent large-scale developments required relief from the tree ordinance requirements, granted by way of a variance and a consent judgement. In both cases, relief was granted to account for trees that were dead, dying, or invasive.

This pattern of hardships may be a signal that the current language in the ordinance may not adequately account for the practical challenges of developing land uses that are permitted by the zoning ordinance (or listed as special land uses). Furthermore, in a similar manner as the Canton Township cases, these developments highlight the importance of considering the environmental impact of tree removal when accounting for replacement trees.

Tree Survey Requirements (Section 54.08.D.a.4.e)

The Lodi Township Ordinance requires a tree survey for all developments that involve a preliminary site plan, preliminary plat, or Planned Unit Development, as described in Section 54.08 Natural Features Protection and Preservation. The tree survey applies to individual trees or groupings of trees whose individual bases are located at a ground elevation within one (1) foot of each other.

With that, when portions of a site are undeveloped and trees are to remain in-tact, it may not be necessary to require a survey of each individual tree. This amendment proposes to allow applicants to forgo the tree survey on portions of a site where trees are not impacted by construction. The proposed amendment also removes language requiring the tree survey to include trees within 100-feet beyond the property line.

Ultimately, this relief from the survey requirements helps to ensure that the tree ordinance does not require excessive information and that all required information is tied to the regulations in the ordinance.

Dead, Dying, and Invasive Trees

Section 54.08 Natural Features Protection and Preservation includes standards to ensure that the impact of tree removal is offset by a proportionate level of new plantings. This section of the ordinance has helped to preserve the Township's robust tree canopy, while allowing for new development that is compatible with the Township's character and natural environment.

With that, the ordinance does not consider the condition or species type when determining the mitigation requirement. The language below includes considerations that the Township may wish to consider to ensure that planting requirements are proportionate to the impact of tree removals. This language will also help to align the ordinance with the legal precedents set in the F.P. Development LLC v. Charter Township of Canton and Charter Township of Canton v. 44650, Inc cases.

In addition, the proposed language includes updates to the qualifications of arborists and qualified wetland consultants to ensure the accuracy and objectivity of tree and wetland evaluation in making these determinations.

Tree Preservation Requirements

The ordinance requires preservation of thirty-five percent of the number of protected or landmark trees that have existed on the subject site within the last five years. If the preserved trees do not average 15 trees per acre, then additional mitigation trees must be planted to ensure sufficient canopy. If additional trees are planted, they can count towards an applicant's existing mitigation requirements.

These standards raise some important policy considerations and questions based on the relevant case law described above:

1. Does the five year lookback mean a developer can be penalized for trees that were removed before the developer owned the property? *If the intent of this regulation is to prevent a property owner from intentionally clearing trees shortly before a development application, the ordinance should clearly distinguish between trees removed by the current owner and trees removed by a prior owner. With that, it is important to ensure that no individual clears trees for the purpose of avoiding replacement requirements.*
2. Does the ordinance create an inconsistent incentive by providing replacement credits for new trees planted to meet the minimum preservation requirement, but does not give credit for preserved trees? *Since landmark trees are the most valuable for preservation and provide the greatest ecological impact, we recommend providing replacement credit for preserved landmark trees.*
3. Are the standards of "35%" and 15 trees per acre arbitrary? What is the justification for these preservation requirements? How are these numbers connected and proportional to the impact of the regulation? *We recommend providing credits for landmark trees that are preserved, rather than requiring an arbitrary level of preservation. In some circumstances (such as those included in the Canton Township cases) tree removal may provide a greater ecological benefit than preservation. In addition, the 15-trees-per-acre requirement may require new plantings when a site does not currently have any trees, rather than providing a base level of preservation. Instead of this requirement, we recommend a "general site landscaping" requirement that can be met with existing or new trees.*

The draft language eliminates the required preservation minimums to ensure that they are not considered arbitrary or excessive. Instead, a general site landscaping requirement was added to the landscaping section, which can be met using existing vegetation to encourage preservation. In addition, a preservation credit is offered for preserved landmark trees which incentivizes preservation by reducing the number of replacement trees needed.

Tree Replacement Requirements

The ordinance includes a replacement schedule for trees that are removed, requiring any clearing to be aligned with restoration of the canopy. While these regulations play an important role in minimizing the impact of tree removal, it is important to make sure that replacement plantings are proportionate to the impact of tree removal and that they cannot be deemed excessive.

The draft language includes a mechanism for relief, based upon an individualized assessment of the impact of tree removal, to ensure that the requirement does not hinder the development feasibility of a site and that replacement requirements are proportionate to the impact of removal.

Additional Considerations

While the draft language proposes a waiver in circumstances where site constraints prevent an applicant from being able to provide required replacement trees, the Township may also consider a conservation fund to serve as an alternative approach to mitigation in circumstances where tree replacement would be infeasible.

Many communities use a tree fund that supports plantings on public lands at the discretion of the community. However, in Lodi Township, a tree fund may be problematic because the Township does not own any roads or parks where tree planting would typically take place. One potential alternative could be to create a conservation fund, but this would require the implementation of a substantial conservation policy.

The conservation fund would be used to support the purchase of development rights or conservation easements in the Township. A new conservation policy would be required, which would likely include the creation of a new public body responsible for reviewing and selecting sites, creating plans or partnerships for stewardship, establishing funding priorities and criteria, overseeing acquisitions and easements, and developing a mechanism for monitoring and enforcing conservation requirements.

Proposed Text

The text below provides language in accordance with the policy analysis above. The proposed language is intended to serve as a starting point for discussion and subject to change based on the Planning Commission's priorities and intent. Text in black is existing zoning ordinance language; text in blue is new proposed language, and language proposed to be removed is in ~~red strikethrough~~.

Section 2.03 Definitions

Qualified Arborist. A person who, through education, training, and professional experience, has demonstrated expertise in the care, preservation, and management of trees and meets all of the following minimum qualifications:

1. Has a bachelor's or graduate degree from an accredited institution in a field related to arboriculture, including, but not limited to, arboriculture, forestry, horticulture, botany, plant science, landscape architecture, natural resources, or a related field as determined by the Township.
2. Has at least three years of professional experience in arboriculture, horticulture, forestry, landscape architecture or other closely-related field as determined by the Township.
3. Holds a current arboricultural credential or certification from a nationally recognized professional organization, such as the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA).
4. Is able to provide documentation of qualifications, including relevant training, professional experience, and examples of comparable tree assessment, preservation, or management work, upon request by the Township.

Qualified Wetland Professional. A person who, through education, training, and professional experience, possesses demonstrated expertise in wetland identification and delineation and who meets all of the following minimum qualifications:

1. Has a bachelor's or graduate degree from an accredited institution in a field related to wetland science, including, but not limited to, biology, ecology, environmental science, natural resources, soil science, hydrology, botany, or a related field.
2. Has at least three years of professional experience conducting wetland identification, delineation, assessment, or permitting work, including demonstrated experience in Michigan.
3. Has knowledge of Michigan's Part 303, Wetlands Protection, and applicable federal wetland regulations.
4. Is able to provide documentation of qualifications, including relevant training, professional experience, and examples of comparable wetland delineation work, upon request by the Township.

Protected tree. Any deciduous tree species having a DBH of six (6) inches or greater or coniferous tree species with a height of six (6) feet or greater and that is not included in the definition of landmark tree.

Section 54.08 (D) (4) (a) (4) Natural Features Statement of Impact, Protection, and Mitigation

(4) Natural feature location survey, in a form acceptable to the Township, including but not limited to the following:
   a. All natural features located on the parcel shall be inventoried by an actual field survey and shown on a map by type, location and drawn to scale.
   b. Proposed changes to any designated natural resources within the subject site.
   c. A statement setting forth how natural features, not to be relocated or physically impacted, are to be protected during land clearance and/or development construction.

d. A general grading plan prepared by a registered engineer or land surveyor showing the anticipated drainage patterns, including the location of any areas where cut and fill operations are likely to occur and their potential impact on the viability of the natural resources.
e. Existing landmark trees, as regulated by Section 54.08.I.2. (Landmark Tree Identification), all existing individual deciduous trees of six (6) inch diameter at breast height (D.B.H.) or larger, and all existing individual evergreen trees six (6) feet in height or higher located on the property, within adjoining road rights-of-way, ~~, and within 100 feet beyond the property~~ shall be shown on the map and clearly identified by numbered dots, along with an accompanying database table of corresponding species and size listings, and the ground elevation at the base of each tree. Groups of trees whose individual bases are located at a ground elevation within one (1) foot of each other may be shown on the map as a group with the overall crown spread drawn to scale, by predominant species, with estimated number and size of each predominant species, and with an average base elevation of each group.
    i. The above tree survey is only required for portions of the site where development is proposed and where the development area is supported by clearly defined clearing limits. Trees with driplines that extend into the area to be developed shall be included in the tree survey, even if the trunk of the tree is not in an area that will be disturbed.
f. An evaluation of the quality of woodland area and trees proposed for removal, conducted by a Qualified Arborist. The evaluation shall include: ~~including but not limited to:~~
    i. Tree species (including diversity of species).
    ii. Tree size and density.
    iii. Health and vigor of the trees. Tree health and vigor shall be evaluated in accordance with the latest edition of the International Society of Arboriculture's Guide for Plant Appraisal or similar rating system approved by the Township Zoning Administrator.
    iv. Soil conditions and site drainage characteristics.
g. Other factors such as the value of the woodland area as a scenic asset, wind block, noise buffer, or other environmental benefit (i.e., cooling effect).
h. Isolated trees shown on the topographical map shall be tagged in the field with identifying numbers using non corrosive metal tags. Groups of trees shall be tagged sufficiently to identify the group upon field inspection. Such identifying numbers shall be shown on the topographical map.
i. All existing trees proposed to remain, to relocate, or to remove shall be so designated by the identifying number.
j. If existing trees are to be relocated, the proposed locations for such trees, together with a statement setting forth how such trees are to be removed, protected or sorted during land clearance, development, and construction, and how they are to be maintained after construction.
k. A determination of all wetlands regulated in accordance with part 303 of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act and the Administrative Rules thereunder, as amended. The wetland determination must be conducted by a Qualified Wetland Professional, or the applicant may submit an applicable wetland determination or delineation verification issued by the Michigan Department of Environment, Great Lakes, and Energy (EGLE). The Zoning Administrator may reject a wetland delineation if the person preparing the delineation does not demonstrate the qualifications required by this Ordinance or if the submitted information is insufficient to determine the location or extent of wetlands. The Zoning Administrator may require a supplemental delineation or independent review by another Qualified Wetland Professional.

(5) Documentation of compliance with Section 54.07.D. (Floodplain Standards and Requirements).
(6) Such other information and detail as to vegetation or physical details as may be requested by the Township.

(7) Where a professional credential is not specifically required by this Ordinance, ~~All~~ information and details shall be provided by a registered land surveyor, registered engineer, registered landscape architect, certified arborist, or forester who shall verify the contents by seal or signature, whichever applies.

54.08 (I) Woodland and Tree Preservation Standards

1. No Changes Proposed
2. No Changes Proposed
3. Tree removal. Except as otherwise provided in this Section, any development that includes a building, structure, or use that requires site plan review and approval, according to Article 44.0 (Site Plan Review), subdivision plat approval or PUD approval shall not remove, transplant, damage or destroy any landmark tree or other deciduous tree, evergreen tree or similar woody vegetation regulated by this Section and Ordinance currently existing on the subject site ~~or that has existed on the subject site within the last five (5) years~~; and shall not conduct any land clearing or grubbing activities within any woodland area.
4. ~~The following requirements shall apply to all property subject to or proposed for development requiring site plan, plat, or PUD approval:~~
    a. ~~Except as provided elsewhere within this Section, the developer shall be subject to the following requirements:~~
        1. ~~Preserve and leave standing a minimum of thirty-five percent (35%) of the total number of individual deciduous trees of six (6) inch D.B.H. or larger and individual evergreen trees six (6) feet in height or higher within the development that have existed on the subject site within the last five (5) years~~
        2. ~~If existing preserved trees do not average 15 trees per acre in the subject development, additional trees shall be planted to equal a minimum average ratio of 15 trees per acre, at a minimum D.B.H. of 2.5 inches for deciduous trees and a minimum of six (6) feet for evergreen trees within any development subject to the provisions of this Section. Species and spacing of trees shall be subject to the approval of the planning commission. The required mitigation of trees shall be counted towards this ratio.~~

54.08(O) Tree Relocation and Replacement.

Tree Relocation and Replacement. The intent of this Section is to replace removed species with similar species in appropriate habitats. Whenever the removal of individual landmark trees and other deciduous trees and coniferous trees regulated by this Section and Ordinance is deemed necessary, such trees shall be replaced or relocated in accordance with this Section. If removed trees are to be replaced as provided within this Section, replacement trees may be used to satisfy preservation percentage requirements of this Section.

(1) When removed, trees shall be replaced in accordance with the following replacement standards. The replacement standards shall apply to all trees that have existed on the subject site within the last five (5) years preceding submission of the development application. A tree that was removed from the subject site before the applicant acquired or obtained a legal interest in the property shall not be included in the calculation of trees subject to the replacement requirements of this Section, unless the Township determines, based upon substantial evidence, that the tree was removed for the purposes of avoiding the replacement requirements of this section.

(2) Replacement species standards. Replacement trees shall be of the same species as the removed tree, except where otherwise provided ~~for in this Section~~below

(a) Non-native species. Species that are not native to Michigan may be substituted with ~~for non-~~native species ~~or prohibited species~~.

(b) Not available. Replacement trees for species not readily available from qualified nurseries may be substituted with an appropriate species acceptable to the applicable approving body or official.
(c) More appropriate. Different species that are more appropriate for local conditions or that provide greater benefits than the removed trees may be approved by the applicable approving body or official.
(d) Diversity. A maximum of twenty-five (25) percent of replacement trees may be of a single species in order to preserve genetic diversity and resilience, unless otherwise approved by the applicable approving body or official.
(e) Habitat. Replacement tree species shall be suitable for the habitat where they will be located and may be substituted with an appropriate species based upon site-specific environmental conditions with approval by the applicable approving body or official.

(3) Exemptions.
(a) Exempt without Written Notice and Approval. The following trees, when removed, shall be exempt from the replacement standards of this section, however, if the removed tree was part of an approved site plan or required under Section 55.09, the tree must be replaced in accordance with the approved site plan or Section 55.09, as applicable. Removal of any of the following trees shall not require written notice or approval:
i. Any deciduous tree less than six (6) Inches DBH as determined by a Qualified Arborist.
ii. Any evergreen tree less than six (6) feet tall as determined by a Qualified Arborist.
(b) Exempt after Written Notice and Approval. The following trees, when removed, shall be exempt from the replacement standards of this section, however, if the removed tree was part of an approved site plan or required under Section 55.09, the tree must be replaced in accordance with the approved site plan or Section 55.09, as applicable. Removal of any of the following trees requires written notice and approval by the Township Zoning Administrator:
i. *Dead trees or trees in poor condition.* Removal of any dead tree or tree that has been determined by a Qualified Arborist to be in poor or very poor condition using the latest edition of the International Society of Arboriculture's Guide for Plant Appraisal or similar rating system approved by the Township Zoning Administrator;
ii. *Damaged, diseased, and infested trees.* Removal of any damaged, diseased, or infested tree that is likely to die as a result of the damage, disease, or infestation as determined by a Qualified Arborist;
iii. *Hazards.* Removal of any tree that is a hazard or danger to human life or property due to its condition where such removal will prevent injury or damage to persons or property, as determined by a Qualified Arborist and verified by the Township Zoning Administrator, with the removal using accepted standard forestry practices;
iv. *Government agencies.* Removal, transplanting, or trimming of trees by or on behalf of government entities or agencies for public interest purposes when the Township Zoning Administrator determines the activities serve a bona fide public interest;
v. *Public road right-of-way and private road easement.* Removal, transplanting, or trimming of trees in an existing public road right-of-way or an existing private road easement but only to the extent necessary for safe access and proper drainage along such right-of-way or private road easement and to protect the public health, safety, and welfare;
vi. *Washtenaw County drain easement.* Removal, transplanting, or trimming of trees in a Washtenaw County drain easement when such removal, transplanting, or trimming is authorized by Washtenaw County in accordance with Washtenaw County requirements;
vii. *Invasive or prohibited species.* Any tree species identified by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) or other applicable state or federal agency as an invasive species, or identified by a recognized scientific or professional organization as an invasive species that is known to be unsuitable for use as a replacement tree, in addition to any

species listed as one of the "prohibited species" in accordance with *Section 54.08.O.9* below

(4) Replacement Ratio. Replacement trees are required when protected trees and landmark trees are removed unless the removed tree is exempt from replacement in accordance with Section 54.08.O.3 above. The replacement schedule below is based on the impacts of the tree removal and the offsetting mitigation to replace the benefits provided by trees. ~~Removed trees shall be relocated or replaced in accordance with the following schedule.~~ Where more than one replacement ratio may apply to an individual tree, the higher ratio shall apply:

Size of Removed Tree	Replacement Ratio (Number of replacement trees per removed tree)
Coniferous (Height)	
Six (6) to ten (10) feet	1:1
Ten (10) to fourteen (14) feet	1.5:1
More than 14 feet	2:1
Landmark coniferous tree	One (1) tree per four (4) inches of removed tree DBH
Deciduous (DBH)	
Six (6) to ten (10) inches	1:1
Ten (10) to 14 (14) inches	1.5:1
More than 14 inches	2:1
Landmark deciduous tree	One (1) tree per four (4) inches of removed tree DBH

(5) Credit for Preserved Trees. Existing landmark trees that are not exempt in accordance with 54.08.O.3 above shall be provided credit towards the total replacement calculation for a development when the landmark tree is preserved. The overall required replacement calculation shall be reduced by one (1) tree per four (4) inches of preserved landmark tree DBH.

(6) Reduction of replacement trees based on new trees in landscape plan. When new trees are proposed on a landscape plan in accordance with Section 55.09 of this ordinance (e.g., screening trees, parking lot trees), the total number of trees required by (a) and (b) above shall be reduced by one hundred (100) percent of the number of trees proposed on a landscape plan in accordance with Section 55.09. For example purposes only, if a site development proposal requires one hundred (100) replacement trees pursuant to (a) and (b) above and sixty (60) trees are proposed on the landscape plan in accordance with Article 5, then the number of required replacement trees will be reduced to forty (40) (i.e., one hundred (100) replacement trees required minus sixty (60) trees proposed in accordance with Section 55.09, equals forty (40) net replacement trees required).

(7) **(RE-ORDERED).** Location. The location of any replacement tree shall be on the same parcel as the removed tree wherever feasible, as determined by the Township. If the tree replacement on the same parcel is not feasible, the Township may designate another planting location for the replacement tree within the Township.

(8) Minimum Requirements. **(NO CHANGES PROPOSED)**

(9) ~~Species prohibited as replacement trees~~ Prohibited Species. **(NO CHANGES PROPOSED)**

(10) Maintenance. **(NO CHANGES PROPOSED)**

(11) Identification of trees to be removed or transplanted. **(NO CHANGES PROPOSED)**

(12) Relief from tree replacement requirements.

(a) Impact Assessment.

i. An applicant seeking relief from the tree replacement requirements of this section shall submit an assessment prepared by a qualified arborist addressing the proposed tree removal and the anticipated impacts of such removal. The assessment shall include, as

applicable, an evaluation of the number, size, species, condition, location, and canopy of the trees proposed for removal; the environmental, aesthetic, screening, buffering, stormwater, and other functions or benefits provided by the trees; the anticipated impacts of the proposed removal; and the extent to which proposed replacement trees or other mitigation measures address such impacts.

ii. Upon review of the arborist assessment and other information submitted with the application, the Township Board may reduce, modify, or waive the required number of replacement trees when it determines, based upon the specific characteristics and circumstances of the site, that the otherwise required tree replacement is disproportionate to the impacts of proposed tree removal. Any reduction, modification, or waiver granted in accordance with this subsection shall be based upon the specific facts and circumstances of the application.

(b) Site Constraints. The Township Board may reduce, modify, or waive the replacement requirements of this section upon a determination that the physical configuration, existing development, parcel dimensions, or other unusual characteristics of the subject property create exceptional site constraints such that strict compliance would prevent reasonable development of the property and no alternative locations are available.

55.09 Landscaping, Screening, and Land Use Buffers.

A-G: NO CHANGES PROPOSED

H. **(NEW SUBSECTION)** General Site Landscaping.
   (1) In addition to any landscape screening and/or parking lot landscaping required by this section, ten percent of the site area, excluding existing public rights-of-way, shall be landscaped. Such site area landscaping may include a combination of the preservation of existing native vegetation and tree cover, planting of new trees and plant material, landscape plazas and gardens and building foundation planting beds. Landscaping that is used to screen potentially objectionable site features such as, but not limited to, retention/detention ponds, transformer pads, air conditioning units, and loading areas may be counted towards this site area landscaping requirement.
   (2) Wetlands and/or areas used for storm drainage purposes, such as drain courses and retention areas shall not be counted towards this requirement.

I. **(RENUMBER)** Prohibited Plant Materials. The trees listed in Section 54.08.O.4-9. (Prohibited Species) have been determined by the Township to be undesirable for the landscaping, screening, and buffering purposes of this Section and Ordinance, and except under the limited circumstances noted in Section 54.08.O.4-9. shall not be used to satisfy the requirements of this Section. Existing undesirable trees may be left in place.

J. **(RENUMBER)** Installation and Maintenance. **(No Changes proposed)**

K. **(RENUMBER)** Modifications. The Township Board shall have the authority to approve alternative designs or plant materials as part of final site plan approval, after recommendation by the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission shall have the authority to make recommendations to the Township Board regarding how the standards of this Section apply to existing conditions and redevelopment sites. Such actions shall be subject to the following:
   (1) Alternative designs or materials. The Township Board may approve alternative landscape designs or plant materials upon determination that the alternative would meet the purpose and objectives of this Section.
   (2) Existing conditions. The Township Board shall have the authority to determine that requirements of this Section have been satisfied by existing topography, vegetation or other means recommended for acceptance by the Planning Commission.
   (3) Redevelopment sites. Where an existing building is undergoing renovation, expansion, or change in use, required landscaping and screening improvements shall be in reasonable proportion to the size and

configuration of the site and the scale of proposed improvements, as recommended for acceptance by the Planning Commission in accordance with the purpose and objectives of this Section.

(4) General Site Landscaping. The Township Board may modify the general site landscaping requirements of Section 55.09.H where compliance is not reasonably feasible due to the parcel's size or configuration, or the extent of wetlands or areas used for storm drainage purposes located on the parcel.

Sincerely,
OHM Advisors

Julia Upfal
Client Representative

Hannah (Smith) Firlit
Senior Planner

cc: Jacob Schiable, Township Supervisor
Christina Smith, Township Clerk
Marcus McNamara, OHM Advisors
MC Moritz; OHM Advisors

OHM
Advancing Communities

October 13, 2026

Planning Commission
Lodi Township
3755 Pleasant Lake Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103

Attention: Cindy Strader, Planning Commission Chair

Subject: Private Community Wastewater Systems

Dear Chairperson. Strader,

The Zoning Ordinance includes provisions that prohibit Private Community Wastewater Systems. However, the definition and description of Private Community Wastewater Systems in the Lodi Township Zoning Ordinance are different from the statutory definitions included in the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act (PA 451 of 1994) and may be determined to be overly restrictive. The language described in this memorandum seeks to update the local definition to provide greater flexibility for on-site systems that are maintained by a single owner, but service more than one building on the site.

Although this discussion was triggered by a recent application, we do not recommend consideration of zoning ordinance amendments to address the needs of an individual application. However, because this issue is likely to arise for future development proposals, the Planning Commission may wish to review these provisions to determine whether an amendment may be appropriate to address future development while maintaining the intent of the ordinance.

Previous Discussion

September 2, 2026- The Township Board reviewed a request by OHM for the Planning Commission to review an amendment to the regulation of Private Community Wastewater Systems in the Zoning Ordinance. The request was made to mitigate confusion stemming from a recent application by Scott Kovanda of Frontier Club, LLC due to differences between the local and county requirements for private wastewater systems.

September 22, 2026- The Planning Commission reviewed draft language and provided several suggestions. This included adding a definition for an on-site wastewater system, clarifying that the "system" includes the drainfield, exploring the ordinance's regulation of wells, and researching how other communities treat wastewater systems serving more than one building.

Overview

The Zoning Ordinance includes provisions that prohibit Private Community Wastewater Systems. However, the definition and description of Private Community Wastewater Systems in the Lodi Township Zoning Ordinance are different from the statutory definitions included in the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act (PA 451 of 1994) and may be determined to be overly restrictive.

In Lodi's Zoning Ordinance, Private Community Wastewater Systems are defined as "A facility for the transportation, collection, processing or treatment of sanitary sewage which is owned by a non-governmental

OHM Advisors
3767 RANCHERO DRIVE, SUITE 100
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48108
T 734.522.6711
F 734.522.6427
OHM-Advisors.com

entity and which is proposed to service more than one structure…." To avoid the installation of a prohibited Private Community Wastewater System, under the current Zoning Ordinance, a site with multiple structures would be required to install a separate sanitary treatment system for each structure, even when the site is operated and maintained by a single entity.

In contrast, PA 451 of 1994, Sec. 3109 defines an "on-site wastewater treatment system" as "a system of components, other than a sewerage system as defined in section 4101, used to collect and treat sanitary sewage or domestic equivalent wastewater from 1 or more dwellings, buildings, or structures and discharge the resulting effluent to a soil dispersal system on property owned by or under the control of the same individual or entity that owns or controls the dwellings, buildings, or structures."

While community wastewater systems fall under Part 41 of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, requiring approval by EGLE, on-site wastewater systems servicing more than one building under single ownership may be permitted by the Washtenaw County Environmental Health Department when the proposed system has the capacity to handle the combined wastewater flow from all buildings.

Washtenaw County's community sewage regulations also identify systems that are operated by more than one dwelling or establishment under separate ownership as "Privately Owned Community Sewage Systems" (POCCS), recognizing that separate ownership is a component of a community system. In contrast, Lodi's regulations consider anything serving multiple structures (regardless of ownership) to be part of a community system.

Based upon the statutory distinction between on-site and community wastewater treatment systems, the Planning Commission may wish to consider whether the local definition and regulation, which does not consider ownership, may unnecessarily restrict developments in which multiple buildings are served by a common on-site wastewater treatment system under single ownership.

Examples from Surrounding Communities

As part of this proposed amendment, OHM researched surrounding communities' wastewater regulations to understand whether permitted systems were limited to a single structure, or if individual systems serving multiple nonresidential structures on a single lot with single-ownership would also be permitted.

We found that many communities permit community systems that serve more than one building following a special approval process. However, these ordinances are generally more permissive than the proposed regulations by allowing multiple dwellings or lots to be a part of the system, as long as there is an established entity that is responsible for maintenance. The regulations we have drafted below maintain a prohibition on community systems, but exclude multiple nonresidential structures on a single-lots from the definition of community systems.

Municipality	**Multiple buildings on one system permitted?**	Key Provisions
Pittsfield Township	Yes	**§ 36-99Multiple unit system permits.** A private sewage disposal system serving more than one dwelling or business may be permitted with approval by the Township Board of Trustees
Superior Township	Yes	**Ordinance 166- Private Community Wastewater Systems**

		PCWS have the same definition as Lodi Township, but may be permitted when part of a PUD (PC District)
Scio Township	Yes	**Division 34-III-3 Community Wastewater Utility Systems** Only permitted after a conditional use permit and development agreement with the Township. Includes multiple dwellings and condominium developments, as well as multiple structures.

Community Wells

The Zoning Ordinance does not have a specific section regulating water systems that serve more than one property. Although the definition of "Water Supply System" refers to water systems serving more than one principal dwelling, principal use, or principal building, and the term "Community Well" refers to a water supply system that serves more than one dwelling unit and is owned by a non-governmental entity, the terms do not appear in the zoning ordinance, except for in reference to a "Municipal Water Supply System," or a water supply system that is operated by more than one governmental entity.

The intent of the Single-Family Residential (R-1) described in Section 10.205 states that lots shall be of sufficient size to accommodate private water wells, an indication that it is the intent of the ordinance for each lot to have its own private well. Similarly, the Low Density Multiple-Family Residential District (R-3) described in Section 10.206 explains that areas not yet served by a municipal water supply system should be limited to single-family detached dwellings served by private well, thus, all multi-family uses should be a part of a municipal water supply system.

The Ordinance does not provide clear direction as to whether multiple non-residential buildings on a single lot may be served by a private well or if multiple private wells are needed in these circumstances. However, approval of a single private or multiple private wells are subject to the County Health Department regulations. The County health department does not have a rule that each nonresidential structure must have its own private well; however, a Type 2 water supply (or water supply serving more than 25 persons or with 15 or more service connections) is common for churches, restaurants, schools, etc. Depending on flowrates and several other factors, Type 2 water supplies may require state construction permits in addition to county approval.

Proposed Language

The language below seeks to modify current regulations to permit wastewater systems under single ownership when shared between multiple structures.

Text written in blue indicates text that was proposed to be added to the ordinance and text written in ~~red~~ is text that was proposed to be deleted.

Section 2.03 Definitions

Private On-Site Wastewater System. A wastewater system owned or operated by a private property owner that is designed to collect, treat, and dispose of sanitary sewage generated by a single zoning lot and the buildings located thereon. The system may include a septic tank, pump, distribution lines, drainfield, treatment system, and other appurtenances necessary for the collection, treatment, and on-site disposal of sanitary sewage.

Private Community Wastewater System (PCWS). A ~~facility~~ wastewater system owned by a non-governmental entity that provides for the transportation, collection, processing or treatment of sanitary sewage ~~which is owned by a non-governmental entity and which is proposed to service~~ generated by more than one ~~structure~~ zoning lot. The PCWS shall be deemed to include any individual septic tanks, pumps, collection lines, treatment facilities, drainfields and other appurtenances serving ~~each~~ individual buildings or lots, ~~residence, in addition to the community drainfield and treatment system~~ together with shared treatment and disposal facilities.

Section 55.10 Sanitary Sewage Facilities

A. General Standards.
   1. No device for the collection, treatment and/or disposal of sewer wastes shall be installed or used without the approval of the County Environmental Health Division.
   2. Each dwelling, lot or structure required by state or county law, ordinance or regulation to have a sanitary sewage facility to be suitable for occupancy by any use ~~permitted~~ allowed under this Zoning Ordinance shall be subject to the following:
      a. If no municipal sewer is available, each ~~building on the~~ lot shall be served by an ~~independent on-site septic system~~ private on-site wastewater system meeting the requirements of the County Environmental Health Division. No more than one (1) single- or two-family dwelling shall be served by ~~an~~ ~~independent on-site septic system~~ private on-site wastewater system.
      b. The on-site septic system shall not be separated from the dwelling, lot or structure by a public or private road.
   3. (No changes proposed)
   4. (No changes proposed)
   5. (No changes proposed)

We would be happy to answer any questions regarding the proposed language.

Sincerely,
OHM Advisors

Hannah Firlit
Senior Planner

Julia Upfal
Client Representative

M.C. Moritz

MC Moritz, PE
Client Representative

cc: Jacob Schiable, Township Supervisor
Christina Smith, Township Clerk
Marcus McNamara, OHM Advisors

OHM
Advancing Communities

October 15, 2026

Planning Commission
Lodi Township
3755 Pleasant Lake Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103

Attention: Cindy Strader, Planning Commission Chair

Subject: Golf Course Definitions

Dear Ms. Strader,

Lodi Township has received an application for the development of a golf course that includes lodging facilities for guests. Although this type of use is not uncommon, the Ordinance does not currently regulate or define "Golf Course Resorts" making permissibility subject to interpretation. The enclosed amendment takes this into consideration and includes clear language to regulate Golf Course Resorts as a Special Land Use in the same districts where golf courses are currently permitted.

It should be noted that although the Township has received a relevant application, this amendment must be considered based upon its broader regulatory impact, and not its applicability to a specific development.

Previous Discussion

September 2, 2026- The Township Board approved a request by OHM to have the Planning Commission to review and update the definition of golf course to provide clear language that articulates the appropriate zoning treatment for golf courses with lodging facilities in order to reduce potential confusion with existing language in the ordinance.

September 22, 2026- During the September Planning Commission meeting, the Commissioners reviewed the draft language and discussed some additional desired changes, including clarification that the site shall be maintained under common ownership, a limit on the amount of lodging, and considerations for a broader recreational resort type of use.

Proposed Language

The language below includes a definition for Golf Course Resorts. It also ensures that clubhouses and sleeping quarters for guests are regulated as principal buildings when associated with a destination golf course. This ensures that these uses are not regarded as accessory dwellings or accessory structures, which are not permitted to include sleeping quarters.

Since the September meeting, new language has been added to ensure common ownership and limit the amount of lodging based on the size of the clubhouse (for attached lodging) or the number of holes (for detached lodging). In addition, a separate, alternative amendment, was drafted to provide a more permissive "recreational resort" land use for the Planning Commission to consider.

Finally, we updated the parking schedule to include a requirement for golf course resorts. The Planning Commission may determine that the use of the golf course and resort will overlap, eliminating the need for

OHM Advisors'
34000 PLYMOUTH ROAD
LIVONIA, MICHIGAN 48150
T 734.522.6711
F 734.522.6427
OHM-Advisors.com

additional parking spaces. With that in mind, we have proposed language for the purpose of discussion subject to the review and consideration of the Commission.

Section 2.03 Definitions

Golf Course. The premises upon which the game of golf is played, ~~that may include clubhouses, swimming pools, tennis courts, or other facilities or uses customarily incidental to a golf course.~~ including the golf course, clubhouse, and other buildings, structures, facilities, and uses associated with the operation of a golf course. For purposes of this Ordinance, a clubhouse located at a golf course shall be considered integral to the operation of the golf course and part of the principal use and shall be regarded as a principal structure, rather than as an accessory use or accessory structure. A golf course may also include accessory uses such as swimming pools, tennis courts, spa or wellness facilities, maintenance facilities, and other facilities or uses customarily associated with and incidental to a golf course.

~~**Par-3 Golf Course.** A golf course consisting of shortened fairways, typically no longer than 200 yards. Par-3, eighteen-hole golf courses typically occupy 50 to 60 acres.~~

Golf Driving Range. A golf practice facility commonly consisting of a large, open field with a teeing ground at one end where golfers line up side-by-side hitting golf balls into the field. The landing area for the golf balls may be an empty field or include target greens and yardage markers. A golf driving range may be included as part of golf course or as a stand-alone business away from a golf courses.

Disc Golf. A game in which a concave plastic disc is thrown into each of a series of metal baskets situated on an outdoor course, the object being to complete the course using the fewest possible throws.

Golf Course Resort. A golf course that includes short-term lodging accommodations for members or guests of members for transient stays as a component of the golf course. The golf course and lodging accommodations shall be maintained under common ownership and shall be operated as an integrated use. Lodging accommodations may include guest rooms, suites, cottages, villas, or similar accommodations. For purposes of this Ordinance, lodging accommodations and buildings containing such accommodations shall be considered part of the principal use and shall be regarded as principal buildings, rather than accessory uses or accessory buildings.

Section 20.04 Table of Uses by District

	Rural			Residential			Business		Other			Use Standards
Uses	RC	AG	NR	R-1	R-3	MHP	O	C-1	LCD	PSP	I-1	
Disc Golf	S	S										Section 41.24
Golf Course Resort	S	S										Section 41.24

Section 41.24 Recreational Facilities, Golf Courses, Golf Driving Ranges, and Campgrounds and Recreational Vehicle Parks.

Recreational facilities, golf courses, golf driving ranges, campgrounds, and recreational vehicle parks shall be subject to the following:

A. General Standards
   1. No building shall be located within 100 feet of any property line.
   2. Facilities such as licensed restaurants and bars may be permitted as an accessory use when occupying an integral part of the main structure, provided there is no exterior display or advertising of said facilities.
   3. Golf fairways, swimming pools, tennis courts, and similar uses shall comply with the greater of the required yard and setback requirements of the zoning district in which located or a minimum setback of 50 feet from any property line. Screening shall be provided per the requirements of Section 55.09.D (Methods of Screening).
   4. Construction, expansion, and alteration of recreational facilities shall be subject to site plan approval per Article 44.0 (Site Plan Review).

B. Golf Courses, Golf Course Resorts, and Driving Ranges.
   The following requirements shall apply to all golf courses, golf course resorts, and driving ranges, in addition to the general standards above:
   1. A maintenance plan shall be submitted with the application for site plan approval, which shall include the following minimum information:
      a) The entity responsible for long-term maintenance of the facility, and methods and anticipated funding sources for such maintenance.
      b) Details of the proposed landscape and lawn care maintenance program, which shall include the best available practices for protection of abutting properties and the environment of the Township.
   2. Accessory uses, such as restaurants and bars, swimming pools, tennis courts, spa and wellness facilities, or other ancillary uses shall be limited to members or guests of members of the golf course or clubhouse.
   3. Structures associated with such uses shall be set back a minimum of 100 feet from lot boundaries that abut Residential Districts or existing Residential Uses.
   4. The facility shall be designed and maintained to contain golf balls and other course activities within the site.
      a) The use of netting or similar materials to contain errant golf balls within the site shall be prohibited, except where the Planning Commission determines that it would be compatible with surrounding uses.
      b) The site plan shall include illustration of expected ball trajectories and dispersion patterns for fairways and driving ranges located within 500 feet of a building, parking lot, lot boundary or road right-of-way.
   5. Golf Course Resorts.
      a) Golf course resorts may only provide short-term lodging accommodations during months when golf is open and available for regular play.
      b) Lodging accommodations shall be limited to members or guests of members using the golf course and shall not be operated as a hotel, motel, short term rental, or other lodging facility for general public use.
      c) Lodging accommodations shall not be permanently occupied. No rental period shall exceed 30 consecutive days.
      d) Lodging accommodations shall be limited to the following:
         1. When located within the clubhouse building, lodging accommodations shall be limited to 25% of the total floor area of the building or less.

2. When located within detached structures, lodging accommodations shall be limited to three (3) guest bedrooms for each hole of the golf course.

Section 51.05.B Schedule of Off-Street Parking Requirements

Recreation Facilities, Outdoor, with the exception of Campgrounds or Recreational Vehicle Parks	For golf courses: Four (4) per hole, plus one (1) per employee.
	For golf driving ranges: One (1) per practice station, plus one (1) per employee.
	For golf course resorts: Four (4) per hole, plus (1) per employee, plus one (1) for every four guest bedrooms
	For facilities with a known maximum occupancy: One (1) per four (4) persons allowed within the maximum authorized occupancy.
	For all other uses: One (1) per 7,500 square feet of land area.

Alternative Language

The proposed language does not address other types of recreational resorts, such as cabins associated with campgrounds or other recreational facilities. If desired by the Planning Commission, the following alternative language would allow for broader permissiveness to accommodate this kind of use.

Section 2.03 Definitions

Golf Course. The premises upon which the game of golf is played, ~~that may include clubhouses, swimming pools, tennis courts, or other facilities or uses customarily incidental to a golf course.~~ including the golf course, clubhouse, and other buildings, structures, facilities, and uses associated with the operation of a golf course. For purposes of this Ordinance, a clubhouse located at a golf course shall be considered integral to the operation of the golf course and part of the principal use and shall be regarded as a principal structure, rather than as an accessory use or accessory structure. A golf course may also include accessory uses such as swimming pools, tennis courts, spa or wellness facilities, maintenance facilities, and other facilities or uses customarily associated with and incidental to a golf course.

~~**Par-3 Golf Course.** A golf course consisting of shortened fairways, typically no longer than 200 yards. Par-3, eighteen-hole golf courses typically occupy 50 to 60 acres.~~

Golf Driving Range. A golf practice facility commonly consisting of a large, open field with a teeing ground at one end where golfers line up side-by-side hitting golf balls into the field. The landing area for the golf balls may be an empty field or include target greens and yardage markers. A golf driving range may be included as part of golf course or as a stand-alone business away from a golf courses.

Disc Golf. A game in which a concave plastic disc is thrown into each of a series of metal baskets situated on an outdoor course, the object being to complete the course using the fewest possible throws.

Recreational Resort. A recreational use that includes short-term lodging accommodations for transient stays as a component of the recreational use. The recreational use and lodging accommodations shall be maintained under common ownership and shall be operated as an integrated use. Lodging accommodations may include guest rooms, suites, cottages, villas, or similar accommodations. For purposes of this Ordinance, lodging accommodations and buildings containing such accommodations shall be considered part of the principal use and shall be regarded as principal buildings, rather than accessory uses or accessory buildings.

Section 20.04 Table of Uses by District

Uses	Rural			Residential			Business		Other			Use Standards
	RC	AG	NR	R-1	R-3	MH P	O	C-1	LCD	PSP	I-1	
Disc Golf	S	S										Section 41.24
Recreational Resort	S	S										Section 41.24

Section 41.24 Recreational Facilities, Golf Courses, Golf Driving Ranges, and Campgrounds and Recreational Vehicle Parks.

Recreational facilities, golf courses, golf driving ranges, campgrounds, and recreational vehicle parks shall be subject to the following:

C. General Standards
   1. No building shall be located within 100 feet of any property line.
   2. Facilities such as licensed restaurants and bars may be permitted as an accessory use when occupying an integral part of the main structure, provided there is no exterior display or advertising of said facilities.
   3. Golf fairways, swimming pools, tennis courts, and similar uses shall comply with the greater of the required yard and setback requirements of the zoning district in which located or a minimum setback of 50 feet from any property line. Screening shall be provided per the requirements of Section 55.09.D (Methods of Screening).
   4. Construction, expansion, and alteration of recreational facilities shall be subject to site plan approval per Article 44.0 (Site Plan Review).
   5. Recreational Resorts.
      a) Recreational resorts may only provide short-term lodging accommodations during months when the recreational use is actively being used.
      b) Lodging accommodations shall be limited to individuals using the recreational use and shall not be operated as a hotel, motel, short term rental, or other lodging facility for general public use.
      c) Lodging accommodations shall not be permanently occupied. No rental period shall exceed 30 consecutive days.
      d) Lodging accommodations shall be limited to the following:
         i. When located within a clubhouse building, lodging accommodations shall be limited to 25% of the total floor area of the building or less.

Commented [JU1]: Hard to enforce without membership

ii. When located within detached structures, lodging accommodations shall be limited to:
    a. Five (5) detached buildings used for lodging purposes, plus one (1) additional building for each ten acres of land in excess of the first fifty (50) acres.
    b. Within the detached buildings used for lodging purposes, there shall be no more than ten (10) guest bedrooms in aggregate, plus two (2) additional guest bedrooms for each ten (10) acres of land in excess of the first fifty (50) acres.

D. Golf Courses, Golf Course Resorts, and Driving Ranges.
The following requirements shall apply to all golf courses, golf course resorts, and driving ranges, in addition to the general standards above:
1. A maintenance plan shall be submitted with the application for site plan approval, which shall include the following minimum information:
    a) The entity responsible for long-term maintenance of the facility, and methods and anticipated funding sources for such maintenance.
    b) Details of the proposed landscape and lawn care maintenance program, which shall include the best available practices for protection of abutting properties and the environment of the Township.
2. Accessory uses, such as restaurants and bars, swimming pools, tennis courts, spa and wellness facilities, or other ancillary uses shall be limited to members or guests of members of the golf course or clubhouse.
3. Structures associated with such uses shall be set back a minimum of 100 feet from lot boundaries that abut Residential Districts or existing Residential Uses.
4. The facility shall be designed and maintained to contain golf balls and other course activities within the site.
    a) The use of netting or similar materials to contain errant golf balls within the site shall be prohibited, except where the Planning Commission determines that it would be compatible with surrounding uses.
    b) The site plan shall include illustration of expected ball trajectories and dispersion patterns for fairways and driving ranges located within 500 feet of a building, parking lot, lot boundary or road right-of-way

Section 51.05.B Schedule of Off-Street Parking Requirements

Recreation Facilities, Outdoor, with the exception of Campgrounds or Recreational Vehicle Parks	For golf courses: Four (4) per hole, plus one (1) per employee.
	For golf driving ranges: One (1) per practice station, plus one (1) per employee.
	For facilities with a known maximum occupancy: One (1) per four (4) persons allowed within the maximum authorized occupancy.
	For recreational resorts: One (1) additional parking space shall be provided for every four (4) guest

	bedrooms, in addition to the parking spaces required for the principal recreational use.
	For all other uses: One (1) per 7,500 square feet of land area.

We would be happy to answer any questions regarding the proposed language.

Sincerely,
OHM Advisors

Hannah Firlit
Senior Planner

Julia Upfal
Client Representative

cc: Jacob Schlable, Township Supervisor
Christina Smith, Township Clerk
Marcus McNamara, OHM Advisors
MC Moritz; OHM Advisors

Christina Smith

From: Leslie Blackburn
Sent: Wednesday, October 7, 2026 10:36 AM
To: Jacob Schaible; Christina Smith; Cindy Strader
Cc: Andrea Paine; DLossing@hrwc.org
Subject: Oct 21st Special meeting
Attachments: Proposed Improvements for Zoning Ordinances and Processes.pdf

Hi Jacob, Cindy and Christina,

I am writing regarding the Oct 21st special meeting of the Board of Trustees and Planning Commission. Thank you for setting this important collaborative meeting up. While I am disappointed that I cannot be there in person, I wanted to be sure the information I have shared before is posted publicly and ask that we include some important attendees.

First, please include this email and its attachments in the packets for the meeting, and post in the meeting materials on the website.

Second, I am also including Andrea Paine and Dave Lossing from the Huron River Watershed Council to invite them to join. As I had mentioned in my prior email, they have some important input into this process and some key planning resources that can help Lodi Township, at no cost to us. I would love to see them invited to sit at the head tables for this conversation. If not, I hope they are still willing to come as members of the public since it is a meeting subject to the Open Meetings Act.

In addition to what I shared before (see below email and attached PDF), it is important that we get our Green Infrastructure plan that was developed a few years ago, included in our Master Plan and/or Zoning Ordinances so that we can best leverage this important tool. As mentioned at the Green Infrastructure planning tool at the HRWC website "The Green Infrastructure maps show interconnected natural areas and cultural features, and HRWC provides communities with policy and ordinance recommendations to help conserve those lands, maintaining natural ecosystems and water quality as development occurs." That website also has examples of how other municipalities have incorporated their Green Infrastructure plan into their Master Plans and ZO's, and there are also worksheets for the Master plan and Zoning ordinances in their *Land Use for a Healthy Watershed Guidebook* linked there and also here.

Third, I would like to reiterate what I shared in the Sep 2026 BOT about concerns that we are putting a priority on ZO changes in three letters from the planner focused on recommendations being sparked by a single applicant. (I share those details below my closing *)

The current three letters are linked below. I assume revised letters may be underway, and that if so, the new ones will be a part of the packet for this meeting as well. Can those please be sent to HRWC also? Or at a minimum notify them when the website is updated?:

Links to Letters from the Lodi Twp planner:

1. Tree & Landscaping
2. Golf Course
3. Sanitary Sewer

In summary, we should not be considering changes to our zoning ordinance as a result of only one applicant. Our planner has also noted this in their letters. Instead, we should look at them in full context with the input of the lists developed over many years by several of our board and commission members, and input from residents.

Two critical examples of many concerns I have with the three letters submitted by the planner:

Number one: They are recommending adding a Golf Course Resort definition to effectively allow the applicant to have eleven cabins along the property that will be places for their members to stay short term. However, elsewhere our ordinances currently ban residents from doing Short Term rentals, Tiny Homes and other small accessory dwellings (for example: building a structure to have one's mother stay on the property and help with the grandkids). Residents have been repeatedly told "no" to doing these things, however this definition addition would essentially allow eleven cabins for this applicant without allowing it for the rest of the residents.

I believe any changes made for this applicant need to be considered in whole for how we are going to allow all residents the same access. Or if it is decided to continue to not allow these small dwelling units, then that applies to not only residents as a whole but this applicant also.

I personally believe there could be a creative way to say yes to this applicant while also making the necessary changes that support all residents. But we can't do one without the other. Do not rush ourselves into this hazard.

Number two: The letter for the *Tree Regulation and Replacement Requirements* uses arguments about court cases to justify weakening our ordinances. These two cases may be misrepresenting our situation, and they are both about one township. I strongly support that we do NOT further weaken our ordinances but instead strengthen them. I ask that HRWC and any other partners that can offer help: can you review these cases and give us a second opinion? What other court cases are there that show support for strengthened natural features protection?

Importantly - we have to widen the discussion of the Oct 21st meeting to include these other considerations, lists and resident input. It is not just a matter of three letters sparked by one application.

At a minimum, for example, the list I shared back on 9/9 includes items that are in the ZO's directly addressed in the planner letter on *Tree Regulation and Replacement Requirements*. **Please consider** items 7, 8 (and lower priority item 9) from my list while we are opening the door with ZO 54.08.

Thank you, I do hope the Lodi Township Board of Trustees, Planning Commission and the HRWC can have this important shared conversation at the meeting and that we can work together to best serve the residents and land of our beloved township.

Respectfully,

Leslie

Leslie Blackburn
Lodi Township Trustee

pronouns: they/them
(why this is important: pronouns)

email: leslie@loditownshipmi.org
loditownshipmi.org

PS *More details: To give some additional background, here were my concerns I spoke at the Sep 2026 BOT meeting:

1. I am noticing the recent application does not meet many aspects of our Zoning Ordinance (ZO).
2. I am noticing that the planner is recommending changes to the ZO to accommodate this and others.
3. I and others have been asking for changes, for many months, to the ZO for many reasons due to past experiences.
4. I also see a pattern of residents wanting to do creative things in the township and being told no, while applicants with access to more money and land are getting responses that include recommended changes to our ZOs.
5. I do not think it is in the best interest of our township and its residents to make changes to support a single applicant.
6. I do not support Planning Commission (PC) resources to work on a select few ZO changes to support a single applicant.
7. I do support asking our PC and BOT to collaborate on a committee to review the FULL list (I have a list, currently about 30 things to take a look at - I know others have lists also, (let's gather them all) and make appropriate recommendations based on the full context.
8. (Examples from the past: an applicant was told they must have separate septic fields for separate buildings, another has asked about tiny homes, another about small homestead needs - these were all shut down or ignored in the past, yet this application sparked a letter from the planner recommending changes.)

From: Leslie Blackburn <leslie@loditownshipmi.org>
Sent: Wednesday, September 9, 2026 9:33 PM
To: Christina Smith <Christina@loditownshipmi.org>; Jacob Schaible <supervisor@loditownshipmi.org>; Cindy Strader <Strader@loditownshipmi.org>
Cc: Andrea Paine <apaine@hrwc.org>
Subject: Re: Zoning ordinance list

Hi Jacob, Cindy and Christina,

As promised at the recent Board meeting, I am sharing my list of Proposed Improvements to Zoning Ordinances (ZO) & processes.

As we discussed at the meeting, I believe it's important to include suggestions from all of our members and partners as we are considering the list from the planner created as a result of a recent application. I

believe it's in the best interest of the township and our residents to not only look at a narrow list sparked by a recent application, but to consider the ongoing list that has been created over time from multiple applications and resident feedback and the broader context. I hope we can collaborate and involve input from the board of trustees, planning commission, residents, public, and our intergovernmental partners.

Thank you for sending this on to the planner for review. And I encourage any other board or planning commission member to share their lists also.

Here is a link to the document:
https://docs.google.com/document/d/1LBnTk7dfVXS2ZN31Nl3L4mx79egCx0UheiF7Hoir9JY/edit?usp=sharing

And I am also attaching a PDF version.

You'll see in Appendix A that, as promised, I also included a starter list from Andrea Paine of Huron River Watershed Council (HRWC) from a few years ago. She spoke of opportunities to strengthen our ordinances and offered HRWC support to do so, which I highly encourage us to pursue. I'm cc'ing her to see if she could share more recent thoughts and ideas for how to work together on this.

Thanks again for your support to consider zoning ordinance changes in the wider context to best serve our residents and land in the township.

Warmly,

Leslie

Leslie Blackburn
Lodi Township Trustee
pronouns: they/them
(why this is important: pronouns)

email: leslie@loditownshipmi.org
loditownshipmi.org

From: Christina Smith <Christina@loditownshipmi.org>
Sent: Wednesday, September 2, 2026 12:53 PM
To: Leslie Blackburn <leslie@loditownshipmi.org>; Jacob Schaible <supervisor@loditownshipmi.org>
Subject: Zoning ordinance list

Please email me your list zoning ordinance changes as well as the watershed list that you referred to last night in the meeting.

The planner is asking for them so she can review them.

Christina

Get Outlook for iOS

Proposed Improvements to Zoning Ordinances (ZO) & processes:

First - specific Ordinance sections

1. Open space requirements (42.301.G) should be more clear that setbacks/buffer areas don't count as open space (just like Rights of Way or Easements)
    a. Section 42.301.G.2, last sentence: Add the word "setbacks" to the list as follows: "Such open space shall not include land area devoted to a dwelling, an accessory use, yard areas adjacent to buildings, vehicle access or parking, road right-of-way, utility easement, **setbacks** or similar uses or improvements."
    b. Section 42.301.G.2.c: Add the word "setbacks" to the list as follows: "Developable acreage shall not include bodies of water, designated wetlands or floodplain, **setbacks**, rights-of-way, or easements, except where the Planning Commission determines that a parallel design plan submitted per Section 42.301.C. (Dwelling Unit Density Regulations) demonstrates that such areas are developable under this Article and Ordinance."
2. Developable acreage definition needs clarifying for Open Space calculations. Only pre-existing easements and rights of way should be excluded from the denominator when calculating Open Space. Easements and rights of way that are part of the proposal should be excluded from *only* the numerator, not the denominator.
    a. Section 42.301.G.2.c: add words in bold: "Developable acreage shall not include bodies of water, designated wetlands or floodplain, **setbacks, pre-existing** rights-of-way, or **pre-existing** easements, except where the Planning Commission determines that a parallel design plan submitted per Section 42.301.C. (Dwelling Unit Density Regulations) demonstrates that such areas are developable under this Article and Ordinance."
    b. **Example: Any new roads proposed by a developer should reduce open space calculation, currently this is not the case.**
3. 40.06 & 42.301.G.3 clarify that conservation easement documentation should be in conjunction with a managing partner. Note the recent case where conservation easement assigns management to entities not equipped or inclined to actually oversee whether the development is in compliance with the agreement, so it will be 100% self-monitored by the residents and HOA. Developers should be paying for a competent company like PlantWise to actually monitor compliance and report to whoever has the easement (eg, the township). Then the property owners should be obligated to comply with recommendations (or dispute them).

a. 40.06.3 - see **bold** for proposed added language in number 3: "Appropriate documentation and regulatory documentation regarding continued protection, preservation, and/or maintenance of the conserved land is required. **Documentation shall include naming and contracting with a managing partner skilled in conservation to monitor and maintain.**"
b. Ordinance 42.301.G.3 - currently states: "The open space shall be preserved perpetually by a recorded legal document approved by the Township Board." Propose add - **that includes a managing partner with conservation expertise, approved by the Township Board and paid for by the developer, to monitor compliance.**

4. 54.08.E wetland setbacks should be more clear that you can't put a yard (or anything inside the clear-cut area/ silt fence boundary for that matter), in the setback. It seems already clear in the ZO wording (section 54.08.E.6. a. and b., see excerpts below, and in 54.08P - Protection of Natural Features During Construction") but why was this not held with the prior applicant, does something else need to change?
    a. 54.08.E.6.a: "Prior to the commencement of construction of any structure, building, or any land alteration in any zoning district on a site that contains a wetland or where the site abuts, adjoins, or is adjacent to a wetland, a permanent setback shall be established...."
    b. 54.08.E.6.b: "The setback shall remain permanently undisturbed and in its natural condition with natural vegetation for the following purposes:..."
    c. 54.08P - Protection of Natural Features During Construction - does anything need to be clarified here?
5. 55.10.C. 200' setback from WWTPs should apply to any WWTP, not just "municipal" ones.
    a. The township prohibits private community wastewater systems (PCWS).
    b. The township made an exception and allowed two of them in the Arbor Preserve development, but did not apply any setback or screening requirements.
    c. Proposal: change 55.10.C - Sewage Treatment Facility Screening Standards, proposed strikethrough and add in bold:
        i. "In addition to any state or county requirements, all ~~**municipal**~~ sewage treatment and disposal facilities and operations shall be completely enclosed by a fence not less than six (6) feet high. Such facilities and operations shall be surrounded on all sides by a buffer strip at least 200 feet wide within which dense evergreen screening shall be placed in accordance with Section 55.09.D. (Methods of Screening) to screen the facility from view." **This applies to any**

wastewater treatment facility (whether municipal or PCWS or other) approved to be installed in the township.

   d. And: for the rare exceptions where WWTPs are allowed, we need to add WWTP regulations that aren't covered by other governing agencies. Get input from local resident expert John Vine. What do our planners and consultants and local intergovernmental partners recommend here to protect Township interests?

6. Density is based on net acres, not gross. See 30.204 which states this. Revise to be even more clear: Section 30.204 Density Regulations.
   a. "For a residential development project subject to site plan approval, condominium site plan approval, subdivision plat approval, or Planned Unit Development (PUD) Area Plan approval in accordance with this Ordinance or other Township ordinances, net dwelling unit density shall be calculated as the number of dwelling units per acre of land, except that the following shall be excluded from the total acreage used in making this calculation:
      i. 1. Existing rights-of-way and easements;
      ii. 2. Rights-of-way and easements of proposed public and private roads; and
      iii. 3. Floodplains, wetlands, bodies of water, watercourses, and county drains."
   b. Proposed add after 30.204 number 3: **Define net acreage as the number of acres of a property with the above three items excluded.**
   c. Fix Table in 30.101 to show it also and avoid the confusion/ misinterpretation that happened with Arbor Preserve:
      i. The bottom row, currently says, add **bold**:
         1. Maximum Net Dwelling Unit Density (units per **net** acre)
   d. Find and fix this wording in many other places throughout the ZO, see example 42.301.G.1: add the **bold words:** "The land is zoned at a density equivalent to two (2) or fewer dwelling units per **net** acre, or, if the land is served by a municipal sewer system, three (3) or fewer dwelling units per **net** acre."

7. 54.08.I.2 The table of Landmark trees needs revision. Very slow growing trees need to be adjusted for their size/Landmark consideration.
   a. Bur Oak should be considered a Landmark tree at a much smaller size. A native, very slow growing oak species, and the industry commonly uses a growth factor of 6.5. For example, this means the Bur Oak that is 13" DBH in AP plans is estimated to be over 84 years old, yet it was not considered Landmark in the application. I believe this should also apply to swamp white oaks.

b. Chinquapin Oak similar, 12" estimate to be 60 years old, and they are native and locally becoming rare, yet not considered Landmark.
c. Ironwood, historically a slow growing, dominant understory tree in our area, are already listed in the ZO as Landmark when they are 8". This was missed in the Arbor Preserve application and should be noted in the future.
d. Are there more that need to be added here?

8. Fix tree inventory requirements: We saw many cases of lumping landmark trees into one line item, this is currently allowed by ordinance 54.08 D 4.a.(4).e. However, it is unacceptable to have 2-5 additional landmark trees lumped into a count of 1 when considered for tree mitigation (which in the case of Arbor Preserve, caused the number of Landmark trees proposed to be destroyed to be underestimated by as many as 132 EXTRA Landmark trees!). Recommend we change the ordinance that allows this to demand that Landmark trees always have their own line in the table.
    a. Proposal: add a sentence at the end of 54.08 D 4.a.(4).e. Paragraph that says: "**Grouping can not be applied if any member of the group is a Landmark tree. All Landmark trees must be named as individual lines in the accompanying database table.**"
9. 54.08 Natural features statement approval: discrepancy between two sections needs clarified. **Propose that we follow this as is, both must be followed:** Planning Commission must approve, and they can make a recommendation to the BOT, who must also approve. Both approvals would be required for an applicant to proceed.:
    a. 54.08.D.5.a that states that the PC makes a recommendation to the BOT on the Natural Features Statement of Impact, Protection and Mitigation.
    b. 54.08.C.1 Requires that the Planning Commission approve the Natural Features Statement of Impact, Protection and Mitigation.
10. 53.04.E Gates and entry details. Note there is a section in the ZO that governs gates, yet the applicant claimed there was not during the Arbor Preserve process. Please be sure this is included in the review. Do we want to consider changing the ordinance and reconsider whether gates should be permitted?
11. 54.20 Contents of a Development agreement. It states that the cost should be borne by the developer, I agree. However the Township should pick or at least approve who writes it. For example, a developer's lawyer should not be the one drafting it. The draft should be created with the township interests centered. One possibility: the township lawyer team could draft it and they should be paid by the developer. Open to other ideas.
12. 44.06.B Make sure the wording around not starting construction includes NO tree removal of ANY kind before all permits/conditions are met - is clarified in the

zoning ordinance. It appears clear in the ordinance, yet O'Jack stated a different interpretation: claiming the words "site work or construction" did not include the cutting of these trees. Proposed wording added below. Are there any other areas of the ZO that need attention on this topic?

a. 44.06.B Effect of Final Site Plan Approval. Proposed added language in bold: "At the discretion of the Township Board, approval of a final site plan may authorize the execution of a Development Agreement between the Township and the property owner(s)/developer(s) per Section 54.20 (Development Agreement). If no Development Agreement is requested by the Township Board, approval of the final site plan shall authorize issuance of a Zoning Compliance Permit **after all conditions of approval are met**. If a Development Agreement is requested by the Township Board the execution and recording of the Development Agreement shall authorize issuance of a Zoning Compliance Permit **after all conditions of approval are met**. No site work or construction, **including no disturbance or removal of trees or vegetation,** shall begin prior to the issuance of the Zoning Compliance Permit and any required building permits **and all other conditions of approval, including but not limited to all other governmental permits.**"
    i. In the case of uses without structures, approval of a final site plan authorizes issuance of a Zoning Compliance Permit and a Certificate of Occupancy, **after all conditions of approval are met and** provided all other requirements for such Certificate of Occupancy have been met.

13. Improve Minor Site Plan requirements regarding lighting. It appears (based on conversation at July 2026 BOT meeting regarding applicant C&S Lawncare), a Minor Site Plan is not required to meet lighting requirements? We need to have a clear expectation and way for applicants to submit and meet lighting requirements **whenever a new building is built that intends to have exterior lighting as a part of it** - regardless of whether this is Minor, Major or other. What needs to change to ensure this happens?
14. Improve ordinance regarding landscaping requirements - ensure there is encouragement and a pathway to plant native trees, not just ornamental. Trustee Marsh has input on this.

Second - application/process improvements that may include ZO and other tools

15. Update the application process to match current day scenario:

a. Require electronic plans from applicants when available (for readability), and to be posted to the website.
    i. Proposed wording: 44.04.A.: "Application shall be made by filing the completed application form, site plans, and other application materials **both electronically and in hard copy as described below. The filing is to be made** with the Township Clerk…(continue as written)"
    ii. Proposed wording: 44.04.A.3: add to the end of this paragraph: "**The Clerk shall also post the site plan and application materials to the website, in a format that is readable, and make hardcopies available to any Board of Trustees members that request them.**"
b. Update application with latest ZO section information. For example: There are currently errors in the information on the application being given to applicants, see PDF pg 9 of this: https://loditownshipmi.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/08/Frontier-Club-Application-1.pdf:
    i. "You are hereby advised to refer to the Lodi Township Zoning Ordinance for a description of your property's zoning classification, as well as Article 50 (Special Uses) and Article 54 (Site Plan Review); and any other sections of the Ordinance which may be applicable." form dated 2022
    ii. Yet according to the latest 2019 Zoning Ordinance: Special Use is article 43 and Site Plan Review is Article 44.
    iii. There may be other cases, this is only one example.

16. Update application process or otherwise empower office personnel to provide copies of plans to any Board of Trustee members that request them at any point once the application becomes available. Is there a need to include this in the requirements of applicants (44.04 A) so they are providing additional copies or paying for them?
17. Area plan, Prelim/Final Site plan requirements are askew - too much required at the first step of the process, if step one is a draft, allow it to be the draft it's intended to be. See Trustee Marsh for his input.
18. 44.04.D - top flow chart is missing a box: Need "Planning Commission Review of the Prelim/Final Site plan" box to be inserted between "Completeness and Tech Review" and "PC Approval" (just like in the Minor Site Plan approval flow chart below it).
    a. Need to also show that "Recommended Denial" is a possible path
19. Improve process regarding submittals:

a. Clarify what needs to be on the large plans and what can be handled on the smaller 8.5x11 submittals. Supports smaller applicants with less access to the fees and engineering time required to update CAD drawings for text based submissions.
b. If conditional approvals are made, require final plans be updated with agreements and filed with the township. Too many cases of loose ends not be clarified and documented on plans.
c. Improve ability for BOT, PC and public to find these documents. One idea: propose there be a single spot on the website that houses all documents from submittals for each project. For example a folder for each project: examples: Arbor Preserve, Frontier Club, Copperleaf Crossing. Then put the plans, submittals and all supporting documents that are submitted over time in timestamped locations.

20. Lodi Township needs to improve our document storage, retention and access mechanisms so files can be found and accessed by BOT, public, etc. This is important now, and will be required as we near the 2028 deadline for ADA compliant websites for Michigan townships.

Third - Resident and other input and how best to serve the range of our residents/applicants - not just the ones with access to large money and land.

21. I have heard from many residents that are seeking to do creative things with their land and in the past have been told no without clear reasoning, or sent down a long path without clear steps, or asked to pay large fees, then sometimes after they pay, find it wasn't the path that was needed and they get sent down another path. Many get frustrated and some eventually give up.
22. Several residents have asked for help, have gotten help, and have good suggestions for making the Zoning Ordinance and the process more understandable.
23. I'd like to see us create a working group and include these residents, others in the public, our local watershed councils and other intergovernmental partners who have input and resources to help this process.
24. Include how to handle early conversations with residents seeking to do creative projects.
25. Zoning Ordinance layout - include ways to make navigating within the document easier. For example:

a. name the Section in the header or footer so we know by looking at each page which Section we're in (sometimes Sections are many pages long and tracking back is difficult and time consuming).
b. Make the Table of Contents hyperlinks to the named sections.

26. Ensure Zoning ordinance has version tracking, revision log that includes what changed and the date, and is clear both in downloaded/printed form and in electronic form which is the latest. (Background: The 2019 document and the one updated in 2024 look identical on their cover pages yet are significantly different and both versions were available on the website at one point which adds to confusion and gives false information.)
27. One example: these ideas are from Lodi Township resident Kat Watson (see full email in Appendix B). Kat is asking that: "Lodi Township consider creating a middle category for small-scale homesteading or household agricultural use. This would be more flexible than the current non-farm animal rule, but still clearly regulated to protect neighbors, water quality, public health, animal welfare, and rural character. Consider an amendment allowing limited small-scale agricultural and homesteading practices as an accessory residential or agricultural use, especially on agriculturally zoned parcels. This could include:
    a. vegetable gardens, fruit trees, berry bushes, herb gardens, edible landscaping, and residential greenhouses;
    b. composting, soil-building, pollinator plantings, rain gardens, and water-conscious growing practices;
    c. poultry, rabbits, and bees for household food production;
    d. separate treatment of small food-producing animals from large livestock or commercial-scale operations;
    e. no roosters on smaller parcels;
    f. secure enclosures and fencing;
    g. rodent-proof feed storage;
    h. regular manure and bedding management;
    i. no contaminated runoff leaving the property;
    j. practical setbacks from neighboring dwellings, wells, septic systems, drains, wetlands, and waterways;
    k. complaint-based enforcement for odor, noise, pests, animal escape, or unsanitary conditions."

APPENDIX A

HRWC input

More input: Here's a starter list from Andrea Paine of Huron River Watershed Council (HRWC) from a few years ago. She spoke of opportunities to strengthen our ordinances and offered

HRWC support to do so, which I highly encourage us to pursue. I'm cc'ing her to see if she could share more recent thoughts and ideas for how to work together on this.

Gathered from Andrea Paine, Huron River Watershed Council:

(early on in the Arbor Preserve final site plan process): "It is extremely disappointing that the developer has yet to address ordinances related to a natural features assessment (Section 44.08), tree removal mitigation (Section 54.08 O.), and wetland buffer protection (Section 54.08 E.). The proposal seems thoroughly inadequate in these regards, but I think also points to opportunities for us to work with the Planning Commission down the road to strengthen these components of the zoning ordinance.

It is my hope that the challenges with the Arbor Preserve development will inspire the PC to take action to strengthen the Township's zoning ordinances related to land and water. We see a few opportunities for zoning ordinance improvements that we could support the Planning Commission with, including:

1. Amend Ordinance definition of "open space" to comprehensively include natural features/undeveloped land instead of the current minimal definition "A specifically designated area, that can be public or private, that is to remain in a protected state."
2. Amend PUD "public benefit" option to make it more specific. The current definition seems extremely broad and could function as a "free pass" for developers to bypass effective natural feature preservation. Additionally, incorporate low impact development design and green infrastructure into exemplary project design bonuses.
3. Extend wetland buffer and setback requirements to non-contiguous wetlands <5 acres in size.
4. Amend woodland protection ordinance to require more canopy to be preserved than the existing 35%, and omit the alternative to substitute native tree plantings for non-native or prohibited species."

APPENDIX B

Gathered from email from Kat Watson (see email 8/4/20206):

Original email to Leslie Blackburn from Kat Watson 6/22/26

"With the rising cost of food, utilities, housing, and everyday living expenses, many families are looking for practical ways to become more self-sufficient. For residents in a township with substantial agricultural zoning, that should include the ability to responsibly grow food, keep limited food-producing animals, compost, support pollinators, and manage land in ways that are consistent with rural living.

Lodi Township's current ordinance is very restrictive for residents who are not commercial farmers but who want to produce food for their own households. Section 40.14 regulates "Keeping of Farm Animals and Livestock, Non-Farm," while excluding active farming operations that conform with the Michigan Right to Farm Act and applicable GAAMPs. This creates a gap for residents who live in agricultural areas but are not operating a commercial farm.

Lodi's own ordinance already recognizes agriculture broadly. It defines agriculture as the use of land for the production of plants and animals useful to human beings, including poultry and poultry products, livestock, herbs, flowers, seeds, nursery stock, fruits, vegetables, and similar uses. It also recognizes farming operations, farm products, composting, greenhouses, farm markets, and other rural or agricultural activities throughout the ordinance.

I am asking that Lodi Township consider creating a middle category for **small-scale homesteading or household agricultural use**. This would be more flexible than the current non-farm animal rule, but still clearly regulated to protect neighbors, water quality, public health, animal welfare, and rural character.

Nearby communities have shown that limited household food production can be allowed responsibly. Ann Arbor allows residents to keep chickens or ducks through a 6-bird permit system. Saline allows residents to keep up to 12 chickens. Bridgewater Township allows non-farm keeping of a limited number of poultry, rabbits, bees, and similar farm animals, with requirements for proper control of animal waste, odor, and noise. Manchester has also adopted backyard female chicken and quail regulations through a permit process.

These examples show that local governments can protect neighbors without prohibiting responsible small-scale food production. Rather than relying almost entirely on acreage thresholds, Lodi could regulate actual impacts: odor, noise, sanitation, runoff, animal escape, manure handling, feed storage, water protection, and neighbor disturbance.

This is especially important for residents in agriculturally zoned areas. If Lodi wants to preserve agricultural land and rural character, residents should be able to use that land in modest, responsible ways to support their households. A family keeping a few hens, ducks, rabbits, quail, or bees for personal food production is not the same as a commercial livestock operation or intensive animal facility. The ordinance should distinguish between those uses.

Michigan's GAAMPs already provide a responsible-management framework that Lodi could draw from. The Care of Farm Animals GAAMPs recommend clean facilities, prevention of soil, water, and air pollution, minimizing odors and dust, minimizing vermin and parasites, and compliance with applicable laws. The Manure Management GAAMPs emphasize

preventing runoff from livestock areas and protecting surface water and groundwater. These are the kinds of practical standards that could be incorporated into a balanced local ordinance.

I would respectfully ask that Lodi consider an amendment allowing limited small-scale agricultural and homesteading practices as an accessory residential or agricultural use, especially on agriculturally zoned parcels. This could include:

1. vegetable gardens, fruit trees, berry bushes, herb gardens, edible landscaping, and residential greenhouses;
2. composting, soil-building, pollinator plantings, rain gardens, and water-conscious growing practices;
3. poultry, rabbits, and bees for household food production;
4. separate treatment of small food-producing animals from large livestock or commercial-scale operations;
5. no roosters on smaller parcels;
6. secure enclosures and fencing;
7. rodent-proof feed storage;
8. regular manure and bedding management;
9. no contaminated runoff leaving the property;
10. practical setbacks from neighboring dwellings, wells, septic systems, drains, wetlands, and waterways;
11. complaint-based enforcement for odor, noise, pests, animal escape, or unsanitary conditions.

I would welcome the opportunity to work with the Township, the Planning Commission, and other residents to help develop reasonable standards that protect neighbors while allowing responsible household food production. I understand that clear rules are necessary, and I am not asking for an unregulated system. I am asking for a balanced approach that allows residents to practice small-scale agriculture while giving the Township enforceable standards for sanitation, animal care, setbacks, runoff, odor, noise, and nuisance concerns.

This type of amendment would support food security, household resilience, environmental stewardship, responsible land use, and Lodi's agricultural identity. Residents who live in agricultural areas and want to grow food, keep a few small food-producing animals, compost responsibly, support pollinators, and reduce their dependence on expensive food systems should be encouraged under clear and enforceable standards.

Preserving rural character should not only mean preventing large subdivisions. It should also mean allowing residents to use their land in responsible, traditional, small-scale agricultural ways.

At a time when many families are struggling with rising costs, Lodi should not make it unnecessarily difficult for residents in agricultural areas to produce eggs, vegetables, fruit, honey, herbs, and other basic food items for their own households.

I would appreciate your consideration and would be grateful if you would support referring this issue to the Planning Commission for review and discussion of a possible zoning text amendment. I would also be happy to participate in that discussion, provide examples from surrounding municipalities, and work collaboratively toward standards that are practical, fair, and protective of neighboring properties."

"Respectfully,
Kat Watson
Lodi Township Resident"

Christina Smith

From: Dr. Gerigk's <brushall32@hotmail.com>
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2026 10:53 AM
To: Christina Smith
Subject: Possible changes to current ordinance
Attachments: GerigkLodi.jpg

Hello Christina,

Please include this letter regarding possible ordinance changes in the packet for the members of the Board of Trustees as well as the Planning Commission for the Oct. 21, 2026 meeting.

Please include this letter again in the packet for the meeting on Oct 27, 2026.

If you are unable to unable this letter in the Oct. 21, 2026 packet due to time constraints, do let me know.

Would you be able to read this letter to the members on Oct, 21st otherwise?

I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Dr. C. Gerigk

Electronic mail is not secure, may not be read daily and should not be used for urgent or sensitive issues.

October 19, 2026

Dear Members of the Planning Commission, dear Members of the Board of Trustees,

At present, you are working with OHM, which has stressed that the township should not amend its ordinance simply to accommadate one applicant, but that the Frontier Club review should reveal broader questions that could affect future projects. This being said, how likely are there to be more future exclusive world class golf club projects in Lodi township? How does the change in ordinance open up for development of future prjects?

Michigan has approximately 860 golf courses. Golf season in Michigan last approximately 6 months. Destination clubs with out-of-state and potentially out-of-country member, only have a short window in time to utilize the cottages/lodgings and other amenities. There should be serious consideration to limiting the expansion of useage of the lodgings and club house ammentities, clear limits on number of dwelling/buildings and clear language that prohibits any off season events.

Please think carefully how your decisions to create new ordinance language adressing the allowance of a single septic system for multiple buildings and dwellings will affect community water systems, waste water treatment, the environment and the health and well being of the community. These decisions need to be made with patience and diliberation, not on impluse or for any one party's interest.

As you are already working with OHM, I remind you of their lead statement by OHM's president John Kramer, " buildings and roads don't define a community, people do. So we strive to design solutions that truly serve the people who work and live there every day."

So dear members of the Board and Planning Commission, how does changing the language of the ordinance truly serve the people who work and live here every day?

Sincerely,

Dr. C Gerigk

Dr. C. Gerigk
Lodi Resident