

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CHESTERFIELD
PLANNING COMMISSION**

February 14, 2017

A regular meeting of the Charter Township of Chesterfield Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, February 14, 2017 at 7:00 P.M. at the Township Hall located at 47275 Sugarbush, Chesterfield, MI 48047.

1. CALL TO ORDER:

Mr. Miller called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Paul Miller
Rick LaBelle
Joe Stabile
Carl Leonard
Jerry Alexie
Frank Eckenrode
David Joseph
James Moran

Absent: Ray Saelens, *excused*

Others: Patrick Meagher, Community Planning & Management
Jonathon Palin, Planning & Zoning Administrator

3. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Motion by Mr. Miller to approve the agenda as submitted

Supported by Mr. LaBelle

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

4. SUB COMMITTEE REPORT (Committee will report on items under Review)

5 **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

A. PUD #2016-20: Michael Simko Development, 2200 Genoa Business Pk., Ste. #100, Brighton, MI 48114. Proposed Story Point Senior Living Community located on the east side of Gratiot, north of 23 Mile Road. (Application Phase)

Michael Simko Development, 2200 Genoa Business Pk., Ste. #100, Brighton, MI 48114 addressed the board.

Applicant mentioned they he was in front of the board last September for the pre-applicant phase for Story Point Senior Living Community. The project is a 187 thousand square foot facility that will be three stories with 120 independent living units and 42 enhanced living units. He stated that the facility includes a lot of common area and many different dining options including a bistro, and formal dining rooms plus billiard rooms, and many activities rooms. He explained that their hope is to be under construction early this summer and construction will be done over a 20 month time schedule. He stated that Story Point has been in the senior housing business for over 35 years and they currently operate about 2500 units of senior housing. He explained that this project will generate payroll of over \$3,000,000 for the community and they will have a staff of about 100 people, with 40 of those positions being full time and benefit-eligible positions.

Mr. LaBelle handed the applicant a document for Selfridge Air National Guard.

Mr. Joseph asked if the petitioner had an opportunity to see the document from Selfridge?

Applicant stated that he had not.

Mr. LaBelle remarked that he had just received and gave the applicant a copy of the document. He asked the applicant if he had received the paperwork from AEW and CPM as of yet?

Applicant replied yes.

Mr. Joseph asked if the applicant had any concerns about the AEW report?

Applicant replied that they review the comments prior to the meeting and they have no concerns with the reports from AEW or Community Planning.

Mr. Eckenrode had no questions.

Mr. Leonard commented that looking at the elevation at the front of the buildings, he asked if there was there a percentage of brick versus siding in this type of project because this would not be considered commercial?

Mr. Meagher stated that this would be considered multi-family residential and the requirement would be 51% for brick content on the façade.

Mr. Leonard asked the applicant if he knew what the percentage of brick and siding would be used on the buildings?

Applicant replied no, he does not know the exact percentages because they have yet to send it out subcontractors for quantity take-offs. He stated that typically they run the brick three feet high all the way around the buildings with accents in certain areas. They were made aware of the brick or better ordinance and they have increased it quite a bit by covering the first floor and in certain areas extending beyond it. He explained that the columns and in many areas up to the roof line will be brick, but he does not have the exact information at this time.

Mr. Leonard asked they type of siding they would be using?

Applicant replied that they would be using vinyl siding.

Mr. Leonard asked if they would be using shakes at the gables?

Applicant replied yes.

Mr. Leonard asked if it would be standard vinyl siding?

Applicant replied that it would be standard quality double fours.

Mr. Leonard stated that the only problem with vinyl siding is the rippling effect that shows up. He asked if this was commercial siding because there is siding with backers with Styrofoam that is integrated into the siding and it looks really nice even after time.

Applicant answered that the siding they would be using is commercial grade vinyl siding.

Maureen Diehl, 51559 Stern Lane, Chesterfield addressed the board.

Ms. Diehl stated that she lives adjacent to this project and she is hoping the Commission approves this plan. She would much rather see a residential building on that property instead of a strip mall.

Gary Gendernalik, 52624 Laurel Oak Lane, Chesterfield, MI addressed the board.

Mr. Gendernalik commented that in his opinion there should be some interconnected driveways and they should try to hook up where the road is by Georgetown Apartments or to Gordon Foods, Panera and Target strip mall. It would make the project more viable for people that want to get out and not just stay in their room.

Mr. Alexie commented that there was a project that they had some trouble with that did not have a second exit.

Greg Bono, 2430 Rochester Ct., Troy, MI 48309 addressed the board.

Greg Bono stated that the Fire Department considers a Boulevard entrance as two separate approaches should there be an emergency. He explained that if there would be traffic on one side they could access the development from the other side.

Mr. Meagher expressed that he thought it was still something that the Fire Department would take a look at because typically when a secondary access is required there is a certain angular cut off for that second access and a distance between the two.

Mr. Palin explained that he believes that the applicants did receive comments from the Fire Department concerning this matter because he sent them the paperwork. He stated that he was not sure why the Commission did not have the comments in front of them tonight. He reiterated that he believed that the applicants already received the comments from the Fire Department and there was no issue regarding the access.

Applicant stated that they did receive the paperwork from the Fire Department.

Mr. Bono agreed and remarked that he believed that previously he was just restating the comments from the Fire Department with regard to the access.

Mr. Miller asked if there was a possibility to get a cross access agreement with the strip mall over there?

Applicant stated that he could speak to that and as to the prior gentleman's comments. He explained that as far as their residents go out of 120 independent residential units and the 42 enhanced units, they average around 30 residents that actually drive cars at their communities and most of them do not drive them because they have vans and shuttles to take the residents out in the community. He stated that as far as interconnectability between them

and Gordon Foods, at their facilities they prefer to have their own access and the reason being the safety of their residents and people not using their community as a cut-thru. He stated that their preference is not to have an access to the strip mall unless it is required by the Fire Department.

Mr. Leonard mentioned that maybe only thirty residents would have vehicles, but there may be a lot of visitors and there could be a lot of extra traffic flow in and out of there. He goes in those stores all of the time and it is one of the worst roads when trying to exit the area and he thought a cross access was a good idea.

Mr. Miller stated that he could see the applicants point too because if he is at Applebee's and he wants to get onto Gratiot, he may just drive down that parking lot into their facility and go out there.

Mr. Leonard stated that he understood both sides, but the more it is developed, the worse the traffic is going to get.

Mr. Joseph stated as far as Mr. Alexie's comments about the other project with the multiple exits to get in and out of the development, he commented that that was a very spread out subdivision. He explained that the debate over multiple ingress/egress points had to do with emergency vehicles reaching any part of that entire subdivision. He stated in this case it is a very confined space with the emergency need being centralized in one general vicinity. He commented that it is dramatically different than trying to get into a subdivision that may be a mile deep. He thought that in terms of emergency response, if there are several points where the Fire Department could access the property and get in emergency equipment, unlike the other property where it was discussed that they may have to drive between houses to get to certain properties. He would not want to encumber the project by presenting them with the daunting task of having to dual ingress and egress points to the property.

Mr. Leonard stated that it sounded as if the Fire Department addressed the situation and they were good with the way it is showing.

Mr. Alexie also wanted to address the amount of parking spaces that they will have. He knows that only a small amount of the residents will have cars, but they have to provide enough parking for visitors. He stated that would be addressed at engineering for them to follow the codes. The last thing he wanted to mention is the sidewalk at the front.

Mr. Miller asked if there was a sidewalk included in the plans?

Applicant replied yes.

Mr. Miller mentioned that at the last meeting the applicant stated that there would be a walking path for the residents.

Applicant stated that they have circular sidewalks all the way around the project. He mentioned that they have entrances up front and a 300' long and 150' deep courtyard in this area. There are sidewalks all around the center gathering area, hardscapes and tables with umbrellas. He explained that at the last meeting they asked if they would use the greenbelt in the back for a walking path, but operationally that does not work with how the communities function. They would not want residents wandering around back here with the ponds because they could potentially fall or need emergency help and may not have a staff member close by. He stated that they would have pathways throughout the courtyard.

Mr. Stabile stated that he wished they had the comments from the Fire Department because he finds it difficult to believe they would not want a second access. He mentioned that they have worked very hard to make sure cross accesses are put in and with a new building being put in he just does not see it happening without a cross access. He mentioned that the applicants are concerned about people going through their project. He stated that they want them to do that because they do not want traffic coming in and out of the busy streets.

Mr. Meagher commented that he does not think there is a right or wrong way of handling that. He does know that with many senior facilities because of safety concerns and for general modeling of that type of environment for seniors; they really do try to discourage any type of through traffic or connectivity. They may offer pedestrian connections but typically they do try to limit the access through those areas. He has worked on many of these projects, some privately, and yes they enjoy the joint access philosophy but they also must see the applicant's thoughts. He stated that if he is in Gordon's or Target and he has to make a left turn, he may go down two sites and take that left out of the senior facility parking lot and at whose expense, maybe his grandmother who may be living at that facility. There are two different philosophies and he just wanted the board to consider both sides of that before making a decision.

Mr. Miller mentioned that the facility will have a shuttle that will take their residents for shopping and for errands. He commented that he did not think the cross access is necessary in this case.

Mr. Alexie asked if the road would be one way?

Applicant replied no it would be multi-directional.

Mr. Miller asked if the egress going out is a left turn and a right turn?

Applicant replied that there is an acceleration lane with a slight cut to the right as well as on the entrance, they are showing a deceleration lane, but it is right out or left out. He mentioned in regard to traffic, they have done studies at other facilities and they average about eight vehicles going in or out per hour.

Mr. Miller verified so it is two lanes?

Applicant replied yes it is two lanes wide. He stated that both of them are balanced, so the entrance is the same width as the exit.

Mr. Meagher asked if the county has taken a look at that design?

Mr. Bono replied yes. He stated that part of their comments was to add the deceleration lane.

Mr. Meagher verified but they were okay with the general concept.

Applicant replied yes.

Mr. Eckenrode asked if it was gated or there was some kind of security? He asked about how many entrances were there to the building?

Applicant stated that the front entrance open with a sliding door and there is a reception desk inside and the rear entrance is open as well with a sliding door and a reception desk inside. He stated but the side entrances are restricted to residents only with key fobs.

Mr. Leonard again asked about the siding that would be used on the project.

Mr. Bono stated that the siding they are going to be using is commercial grade, but it does not have Styrofoam insulation that they are talking about.

Mr. Leonard stated that he is not familiar with commercial grade siding. He mentioned that the reason he is concerned is because there is a third story here which increases the percentages of brick and siding and it looks like there is twice as much siding here than is allowed and he is concerned that the siding is not rigid enough.

Mr. Bono stated that if the siding is secured tight to the wall, so that it cannot expand or contract, the siding will get that oil canning. So the installation is important.

Mr. Leonard stated that it is still more siding than is normally allowed. So he is proposing maybe more brick, or less standard siding...

Applicant replied that they can get the plans out to sub-contractors and get some quantities and find out where they are as far as percentages. He stated that if they are low on the brick, they are certainly not opposed to increasing the amount of brick used.

Mr. Leonard mentioned that the insulated vinyl siding lays better and instead of the double fours, there is a 7 inch profile.

Applicant stated that he was not familiar with that type of siding.

Mr. Stabile stated that he agreed with Carl about the more rigid siding because otherwise it can be wavy-looking.

Applicant stated that they can certainly looking into alternate vinyl products.

Mr. Stabile asked if they agreed with the 51% brick?

Applicant reiterated that they are certainly not opposed to increasing the amount of brick used and would be willing to comply with the 51%.

Mr. Miller asked in lieu of the vinyl, could they use Hardee Board?

Applicant replied that they typically do not want to use Hardee Board because of the maintenance issues because they will have to paint it every 10 years and that is quite a hefty paint bill.

Mr. Palin stated that he did have the comments from the Fire Department and they do consider the boulevard as two means of egress, so they are satisfied with that. There was also a comment stating that all complexes shall be required to be connected to surrounding property for purpose of looping of the utilities and emergency access for this location. He stated that one of the connection points is in the Target Plaza at the rear north edge of the property.

Mr. Meagher asked if he was correct in his understanding that the Fire Department would like some type of emergency access at that point as well or are they just indicating that they want the utility access.

Mr. Palin stated that his understanding is that they are asking for the cross-access for emergency vehicles.

Mr. Miller asked if it would be gated?

Mr. Meagher stated that typically they require an access that would be siren activated.

Applicant stated that they are willing to satisfy all of the Fire Department's concerns.

Motion by Mr. Miller to close the Public Hearing

Supported by Mr. Alexie

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

Motion by Mr. Miller to Table PUD #2016-20 for up to two meetings so the applicants can get the brick plan done for them and address the comments from the Fire Department.

Supported by Mr. Alexie

Applicant asked if they could look into a conditional approval with confirmation that brick coverage needs to be at least 51% through the Engineering and Building Department process.

Mr. LaBelle stated that their architect can get the answers for you on that pretty quick.

Applicant replied yes, but instead of having to come back in front of the Planning Commission, is there a way to do this administratively?

Mr. LaBelle stated that they were Tabling it anyway so they have the opportunity to gather that information.

Mr. Palin explained that it is standard procedure for the Planning Commission to Table items when there is a Public Hearing to give them time to address any questions they may have for the applicants to address and clarify the concerns from the Fire Department. He stated that it would only be for two weeks, so if they get the information in quickly they would be on the next meeting.

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

6. **REVIEWS:**

- A . **PUD #2016-25: (APPLICATION PHASE) JPB Car Wash, 29939 S. River Road, Harrison Twp., MI 48045. Proposed 10,216 square foot addition to Dockside Auto Wash for detailing facility located on the one half mile north of Cotton Road at 47391 Jefferson Public Hearing closed, tabled to 2-14-2017.**

Dennis DeWulf, DeWulf Associates, 27938 Worthington, St. Clair Shores, MI 48081 addressed the board.

Mr. Alexie had no questions.

Mr. Moran had no questions.

Mr. Stabile had no comments.

Mr. LaBelle commented that currently the car wash is non-conforming because typically, and correct me if this is wrong, they have a car wash in C-3 location and this is a C-1 location.

Mr. Meagher stated that is correct.

He remarked that, in his opinion, this does not meet their Master Plan. He commented that their Master Plan has a different idea of what if going to happen on Jefferson.

Mr. Miller had no questions.

Mr. Leonard had nothing more than he had heard so far.

Mr. Eckenrode had no comments.

Mr. Joseph stated that he typically looks for any opportunity to allow a property owner to do, within reason, want they want to do with their property. He operates from the concept that an owner should be able to develop their property. He mentioned that at the last meeting there were comments about how this was not a good investment, it didn't have the traffic to support it and it was not a valid business. At the time, he rejected those arguments because he thought it was outside the bounds of what they should be considering. He then mentioned the comments from Mrs. Natske about her health and at that point there was a sentiment involved. He stated that they have a duty to do what is prudent as it relates to the ordinance.

Mr. Joseph commented that they have a very nice community over there and he was impressed with all the residents that came forward. He mentioned that in this particular case he would like to commend the Planning Department and Mr. Meagher's work on this and he appreciates the comments that are in his recommendations. He added that specifically that the rezoning puts an excessive burden on this neighborhood given the additional commercial feel. He agrees with the other Commissioners that it does substantially change the landscape of the community in a way that is not consistent with the Master Plan. He reiterated that he looks for ways to allow property and business owners to do what is in their best interest when it relates to their property. He stated that, in this case, this is going above and beyond what would be considered relief from the ordinance. He remarked that he cannot support this and he would like to commend the residents who came out and spoke so eloquently to protect their community. He stated that he is not in favor of this.

Motion by Mr. Joseph to deny the petitioner's request for the variance

Supported by Mr. Moran

Mr. Joseph amended his Motion stating that the reason for the denial would be those items that are outlined in Mr. Meagher's recommendation items 1. through 3. as the basis for the denial recommendation.

Mr. Moran continued support

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

Mr. Miller stated that this is only a recommendation and the Township Board has the final decision on this matter. He asked Mr. Palin how long it would take to get to the Township Board.

Mr. Palin responded that their process is not as lengthy as Planning's and he will have it on for the March 6th Township Board Meeting.

B. SITE PLAN #2017-03: Dorchen/Martin Associated, 29895 Greenfield Rd., Suite #107, Southfield, MI 49076. Proposed renovation to the existing McDonalds Restaurant located at 28320 23 Mile Road.

Frank Martin, 29895 Greenfield, #107, Southfield, MI addressed the board.

Mr. LaBelle stated that the dumpster enclosure has to be made with the same material as the structure of the building. He remarked that the McDonald's was going to be brick and the dumpster façade would also have to be constructed of brick.

Applicant replied that it said that on the drawing.

Mr. LaBelle remarked that he saw CMU on the drawing.

Applicant replied that the plans state that it will match the building. It will be constructed out of CMU on the interior and the outside will match the brick of the building.

Mr. LaBelle stated that on the plans it shows the McDonald's sign. He reminded the applicant that this was for the renovation of the building and there was no signage included in this decision.

Applicant replied that was fine and he understood that fact.

Mr. Miller remarked that the parking spaces would have to be 10' as opposed to 9' wide.

Mr. Meagher stated that was an error in the engineer's review. He explained that the ordinance does allow flexibility for 9', 9 1/2' or 10' wide parking spaces and because those are angled spaces they are allowed a lesser aisle width. Therefore, the 10' does not apply as noted in the engineering comments. He complimented the applicant on the very complete plans that were quite thorough.

Applicant mentioned that the owner and construction manager from McDonald's were also at the meeting if they had any other questions. He stated that the building is forty years old and this new structure will be a real improvement and they are looking forward to completing the project.

Mr. Miller asked when this would be taking place?

Applicant replied that construction would probably begin in August and it would be completed in approximately 75 days.

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to approve Site Plan #2017-03: for the renovation to the existing McDonalds Restaurant located at 28320 23 Mile Road. He added that the approval is just for the elevation of the building according to the site plan and has nothing to do with signage at this point.

Supported by Mr. Miller

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

C. SITE PLAN #2017-04: Lehner for Delta Ind., 17001 19 Mile Road, Clinton Twp., 48038. Proposed 4,845 sq. ft. office addition to Dajaco Industrial located at 49715 Leona Drive.

Mr. LaBelle stated that the applicant had received the comments from both AEW and CPM and they wanted to give him the opportunity to look those over. He added that the applicant would like to make some statements to the board.

Tom Kellogg, Lehner Assoc., 17001 19 Mile Road, Clinton Twp., addressed the board.

Applicant stated that they would like to get the Planning Commission's approval tonight subject to the comments by either Mr. Meagher or Mr. Palin. He explained that they were missing some dimensions on some parking spots. He also mentioned some things being brought up about a 20' drive aisle, however that would be between two parallel spots, so there would be no backing out into that aisle. Therefore, he did not see a problem with that. He explained that this was a second story addition and the footprint on the site would not change. They would not be paving anything, and would just be doing some striping to make sure they have enough parking spaces. He stated that the fire lane is what it is because again the footprint has not changed. He stated that the only thing would be the bin storage and all automotive companies have those bins that are brought in and out of the building and are shipped. He added that there might be some way that they could cordon off an area to make sure the fire lane is not blocked.

Mr. Meagher stated that with regard to the parking spaces wherever they had the 20' aisle, they can either verify that the spaces were parallel or 10' wide at those points. AEW just feels that some of the depths of the parking spaces are 18'. He asked if those are the spaces on the outside?

Applicant replied that he is pretty sure they are the ones on the outside.

Mr. Meagher remarked that they have 36' so the ones on the outside could be moved over. He stated that his primary concern is that it be approved subject to and he does not have to address this stuff after the fact. He stated so if the

applicant is very confident, he does not have a problem recommending that the approval subject to addressing this matter.

Mr. Miller asked if Mr. Meagher had a problem with no sidewalk?

Applicant replied that there is only a sidewalk in front of one building there.

Mr. Miller stated that sidewalks are going to be required throughout the Township when there is an addition or modification.

Applicant asked even in a light industrial subdivision?

Mr. Miller responded yes everywhere.

Mr. Leonard remarked that the absence of sidewalks is creating a big problem. Earlier they were talking about traffic and there are people who use sidewalks from time to time. He stated that if this was the only building there it might be deferred down the road, but that is not the case.

Mr. Miller stated that there are people who work in those light industrial facilities along Leona drive that take the bus, so how do they get to Gratiot. He explained that they are trying to provide safety for everybody.

Applicant replied okay, it is not that big of an issue.

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to approve Site Plan #2017-04 for the proposed addition of 4845 square feet at 24973 Leona Drive contingent upon the applicant's adhering to the AEW engineering requirements as well as the items Community Planning has commented on.

Supported by Mr. Alexie

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

- D. SIGN REVIEW #2017-09: Myrna Smith, 6700 Antioch Rd., Suite 300, Merriam, Kansas 66204. Proposed new wall directional signage located at 45400 Marketplace Drive for the Walmart Store.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the sign does meet the Township ordinance.

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2017-09

Supported by Mr. Moran

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

- E. SIGN REVIEW #2017-10: David Kretsch, 54065 Carrigan, New Baltimore, MI 48047. Proposed new wall sign located at 47212 Jefferson for Frost & Kretsch Plumbing Incorporated.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the sign does meet the Township ordinance.

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2017-10

Supported by Mr. Joseph

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

- F. SIGN REVIEW #2017-11: David Kretsch, 54065 Carrigan, New Baltimore, MI 48047. Proposed new 2nd wall sign located at 47212 Jefferson for Frost & Kretsch Plumbing Incorporated.**

Mr. LaBelle stated as they all know they allow 50% of the allowable signage at the front of the building for a second sign on a different elevation. He mentioned that the building has two street frontages so it is in compliance with the Township ordinance.

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2017-11

Supported by Mr. Joseph

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

G. SIGN REVIEW #2017-12: Matthew Newman, 72m Pinewood Drive, White Lake, MI 48386. Proposed new wall sign located at 51070 South Foster Road for Strawberry Fields Restaurant.

Mr. LaBelle stated that the sign does meet the Township ordinance.

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2017-12

Supported by Mr. Miller

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PRIOR MEETINGS:

Motion by Mr. Miller to approve the minutes from the meeting on January 24, 2017.

Mr. Leonard stated that there was a comment he made at the end of the last meeting where he mentioned a gentleman in a wheelchair going out into Gratiot Avenue during a car show. He mentioned that fact was actually pointed out to him by Mr. Miller and was something he brought up during the comments at a previous meeting.

Supported by Mr. Leonard

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

8. COMMUNICATIONS:

There were no communications.

9. OLD BUSINESS:

There was no old business.

10. **NEW BUSINESS:**

Mr. Miller mentioned the class that was offered to the board members to become citizen planners. He stated that he thought everyone had already taken the class and thought there was no point in anyone attending since all the Commissioners were already citizen planners. He stated unless Mr. Joseph wanted to become a citizen planner.

11. **PLANNERS REPORT:**

A. **ADMINISTRATIVE REQUEST #174: Andy Wilcox, 49803 Leona Drive, Chesterfield, MI 48051. Requesting approval for a proposed 19' x 28' addition to their existing building at the above address for Authority Flame.**

Mr. Meagher stated that the request is for a 19 x 28 addition that would have very little impact on the site. He explained that they have no objections to approval and he just asked it be subject to Mr. Palin confirming that the façade matches what is out there or is better than what is out there. He mentioned that the engineers are also asking that a utility plan be provided to assure they are not interrupting underground utilities. He stated that if there are no objections, he would ask for approval subject to those two items.

Mr. LaBelle spoke to the owners about the renovation and they are just moving the door out as far as the elevation of the building and they are going to match what is existing on the building now. So there are no changes and they will be using the same type of building materials; they are just moving things out a little bit.

Motion by Mr. LaBelle to approve Administrative Request #174

Supported by Mr. Miller

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

12. **COMMENTS FROM THAT FLOOR PERMITTED BY THE COMMISSION ON AGENDA OR NON-AGENDA MATTERS.**

Mr. Joseph thanked the Planning Commission for their patience with him at the last meeting and bringing him up to speed. He stated that Mr. LaFata and Ms. Vosburg attended the last Planning Meeting and came back to the Township Board Meeting with flattering comments. He related that they and he himself were impressed by all the research and hard work being done by all the Members of the Planning Commission.

Mr. LaBelle asked for volunteers to attend the next pre-planning meeting on February 28th.

Mr. Leonard and Mr. Alexie both agreed to attend that meeting.

13. PROPOSALS FOR NEXT AGENDA.

There were no proposals for the next agenda.

14. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Mr. Miller to adjourn at 8:06 PM

Supported by Mr. Joseph

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion Carried

Rick LaBelle, Secretary

Grace Mastronardi, Recording Secretary