

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CHESTERFIELD  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**August 22, 2017**

A regular meeting of the Charter Township of Chesterfield Planning Commission was held on Tuesday, August 22, 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  
David Joseph  
Jerry Alexie  
James Moran  
Ray Saelens

Absent: Frank Eckenrode, *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. Moran

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

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

5. **PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

- A. **REZONING #346:** Mariano Talluto, 19186 Thornberry, Macomb Twp., MI 48042. Request is to rezone a vacant 12.669 acre parcel on the west side of Scheuer Road, South of Hagen from A-1 (Agriculture Residential) to R-2 (Two Family Residential)

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to open the Public Hearing

**Supported** by Mr. Saelens

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

Petitioner was not present when the meeting started and Mr. Miller took Public Comments on the matter.

Allen Polkowski, 55415 Scheuer Rd., Chesterfield, MI addressed the board.

Mr. Polkowski stated that he owns the farm that borders this property to the south. He remarked that he is against this rezoning and informed them that he also submitted a petition signed by 11 of their neighbors which was submitted to Mr. Palin from people who are also against this rezoning. He explained that he and his wife bought their farm in a foreclosure about 7 years ago. They put thousands of dollars into restoring the property and the buildings. He mentioned that they have livestock, 35 fruit trees, grass and hay pastures, a historic barn and a home. He mentioned students from Dakota High School have visited their farm for a field trip to study the 200 year old restored historic barn. They are against any rezoning of the property by Mr. Talluto which would spot zone property in an agricultural area. He mentioned that there would be 4 zoning changes from A-1 to R-2. He stated that before they purchased the property, they spoke to Janice who was the Supervisor of Planning who looked at the Master Plan and stated that there was no problem and the Township was going to keep this area agricultural. He commented that Mr. Talluto could have gone to Planning before purchasing the land and inquired about the zoning; he would have found out that they want to keep the zoning in this area agricultural and preserve this historic site. He mentioned that they offered to purchase the property from Mr. Talluto so they could grow local hay for their horses. He stated that Mr. Talluto is a nice man, but if the zoning is approved, he has the right to sell the property immediately after the rezoning or he may be delinquent on his taxes as he was in 2016 which was confirmed by Macomb County Treasurer. He stated that Mr. Talluto has had building materials on the site for over two years and it is unsightly and attracts nuisance animals. He commented that if approved Mr. Talluto could also build

many multi-family homes and rent them. He remarked that Mr. Talluto could have purchased property in many other areas in the Township and built these multi-family homes. He mentioned that on the property there are two wide ITT and DTE easements on the land for power lines and there is a gas line through the middle of the property and he is pretty certain that they do not want any additional impediment to their easements. He added as far as infrastructure, there is no existing sewer, natural gas or city water on Scheuer Road. He reiterated that he and his neighbors are against the rezoning of this property.

Mr. Saelens asked if Mr. Polkowski was directly south of this property.

Mr. Polkowski replied yes.

Mr. Palin stated that the applicants in this matter did not get the sign out on the property for the full 15 days so at this time they should Table this matter to the following meeting.

Mr. Joseph stated that he wanted to speak on the speaker's comments and also from a procedural standpoint. He explained that Mr. Palin's made comments about the lack of follow-thru with regard to posting the sign of the rezoning and it seems that they have a number of people present who are adamantly opposed to this. He asked if they are obligated to keep the public hearing open?

Mr. Miller replied that they would like to keep the Public Hearing open because the sign was not up for 15 days and to make a decision it has to be up for 15 days.

Mr. Joseph asked whose responsibility is it to post the sign?

Mr. Palin replied that it is the applicant's responsibility. He stated that the Township adopted a resolution that if the sign is not on the property for 15 days that the Public Hearing shall remain open until that time requirement is met.

Mr. Joseph stated that he would prefer to make a decision on this tonight because he sees no viable reason to rezone this property from A-1 to R-2. He commented that there are a number of problems and before they investigate easements and infrastructure and utilities, they just need to look at the Master Plan and what that property is and what it could be. He explained that this is so far outside of the scope of what direction the Township is going in as far as development. He mentioned that he spoke with Mr. Palin and it seems that every effort was made to convey to the petitioner that this was not a viable plan. He stated that statutorily the applicant can make the request and pay

8-22-2017

the fee, but this is riddled with problems and he does not see any scenario that says this is a good move for the surrounding community or the Township as a whole. He remarked to put something R-2 in the middle of an A-1 district. If they change the property to R-2 floodgates are opened as far as developers who would potentially come in behind that.

Mr. Alexie stated that he agreed with Mr. Joseph and would be willing to vote on the matter tonight.

Mr. Moran commented that he partially agreed with Mr. Joseph especially when it comes to sticking to the Master Plan.

Mr. Stabile stated that he has lived in the community for 40 years and that application caused him to take a ride out in the country. He stated that this rezoning has nothing to do with the Master Plan. They have all agreed with the new Master Plan that all new development would stay back in the areas that are already developed. He agreed with Mr. Joseph and he would like to get this thing put out of the way tonight if there is any legal way to do it.

Mr. LaBelle related that he agreed with everything that has been stated this evening. However, he did not agree with is voting today. He explained that nothing is going to change from tonight to two weeks from now. He commented that in order to make sure all our "i's" are dotted and our "t's" are crossed they should wait to the next meeting to vote. He stated that they can leave the Public Hearing open and make the decision in two weeks.

Mr. Miller stated that he too was against rezoning the property, but legally they have to wait to vote.

Mr. Stabile asked if they could close the Public Hearing?

Mr. Miller replied no.

Mr. Meagher stated that in the resolution about the 15 day sign posting was adopted by the board and it has been followed up to date and he would strongly recommend that they follow due process and follow the regulations in place. He explained that typically if there are any questions or problems this would be tabled to the next meeting for a decision. He commented that he thought that they have great concerns about the rezoning and all the signs point in one direction and he would hate to see that lost by not following due process and not adhering to the adopted sign posting resolution. He added that all that being said, he would strongly recommend postponing their decision to the following meeting.

8-22-2017

Mr. Joseph remarked that he did not think anything would change in two weeks. In his opinion, the spirit of the requirement for the 15 day posting is to ensure that they do not have objections to be heard because the residents were not afforded notice of the hearing. He stated that it was the petitioner's responsibility to post the notice and the petitioner failed to put up the sign. He stated that in spite of that they have a response and there is nothing that he has heard which states that this is a good idea. He remarked that strict interpretation of this is really only benefitting the applicant who did not even show up for the hearing. He does not know if they would be disenfranchising anybody by going forward with the vote.

Mr. Miller thought that legally this should be tabled for two weeks.

Mr. Joseph stated that he could be wrong, but he thought the petitioner just arrived to the meeting.

Mariano Talluto, 19186 Thornberry, Macomb Twp., MI addressed the board.

Applicant stated that he just wanted to build a duplex for him and his daughter.

Mr. Miller told the applicant that he could just as well put two houses on the property. He stated that there is no water, sewers or gas lines on the property.

Applicant replied that the gas line and water is only about  $\frac{1}{4}$  of a mile from their property.

Mr. Miller asked how far the water was from that area?

Mr. LaBelle responded that a water hydrant at 25 Mile Road.

Mr. Joseph stated that he thought that there was a language barrier. He addressed the applicant and stated that there is nothing in the plan that is consistent with the Township Master Plan. He stated that this proposal is a bad idea. He asked if the applicant could relate to the board why he thinks this is a good idea?

Applicant replied that he thought it was a good idea.

Mr. Joseph stated that he understood why the applicant thought it was a good idea for his family, but he was speaking about the Township. He related that the applicant is surrounded by agricultural and they are trying to change it to two-family residential and that does not fit with the Township Plans.

Applicant stated so it is impossible.

8-22-2017

Mr. Joseph replied nothing is impossible, but this is highly improbable.

Applicant asked what Mr. Joseph suggested that he do?

Mr. Joseph replied that his suggestion is to build a house

Applicant replied that he wanted to build two houses one for him and his wife and one for his daughter.

Mr. Joseph stated that the Planning director could probably help Mr. Talluto with that.

Mr. Stabile commented that the applicants were late and missed a lot of the comments that were made. He stated that if the sign does not create a problem, he does not see why they cannot just make their comments again. Or is the lack of not having the sign up long enough still an issue?

Mr. Miller stated that the legality of that sign is the problem.

Mr. Saelens remarked that they have to follow their procedures.

Mr. Joseph asked procedurally if the sign never goes up, then they would continue an open public hearing indefinitely?

Mr. Saelens replied there would then be no public hearing, because there would be no notice of that.

Mr. Joseph stated that if the applicant decided not to post the sign, then the public hearing is open in perpetuity.

Mr. Meagher thought that because they are only talking about a one day issue, he does not see any reason to violate or even risk a due process violation.

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to Table Rezoning #346 for Mariano Talluto with the Public Hearing left open to Sept 12<sup>th</sup>.

**Supported** by Mr. Joseph

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**B. SLU #2017-15: Allison Ludwig 50867 Seaden Dr. Chesterfield, MI 48047 Proposed Lil' Grads Daycare Facility located on the south side of 23 Mile, west side of Seaden.**

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to open the Public Hearing

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

Allison Ludwig 50867 Seaden Dr. Chesterfield, MI addressed the board.

Applicant stated that she has a day care on Seaden and the church next door is being relocated so their lease is available. She is requesting to expand her daycare to the church which is directly next door. She plans to take her older children to the church building and keep the smaller children in the current location.

Mr. Saelens asked if she planned to connect the two buildings?

Applicant replied that she would actually like to eventually buy the property and make changes as far as the parking lot, change the roof and make everything even better, however she does not know about connecting them.

Mr. Saelens asked the size of the children's play area?

Applicant replied that the play area is currently over 1200 square feet and there is an additional 2200 square feet that she could use for a play area. She would just have to get permission for a fence.

Mr. Miller asked Mr. Palin how many square feet is the applicant required to provide for each child?

Mr. Palin replied that the State requires 150 square feet per child and a minimum of 5,000 square feet.

Mr. Miller asked how many children does she have right now at the daycare?

Applicant replied she currently has 129 children on a daily basis and a lot of them are younger and just go on walks in buggies. She stated that the playground meets the requirements for the State and obviously they don't go out at the same time. There is a toddler area and a preschool area so two

classrooms will go out for their specific time and when they go inside, then the next group goes out.

Mr. Alexie asked doesn't the State have to go through and issue a permit for the daycare?

Applicant replied that the State inspects the facility and issues a certificate.

Mr. Alexie asks if the State goes through there and dictate how many children they can have?

Applicant replies yes.

Mr. Moran asked since there will now be a second location would the applicant be hiring new staff.

Applicant answered that she would need more teachers and a few of the part time employees would now be working full time.

Mr. Miller asked the hours of operation?

Applicant stated 6 AM to 6:30 PM.

Mr. Saelens asked if all of the children are dropped off behind the building?

Applicant replied that right now they are dropped off at the front in a little half-circle driveway. She stated that usually they are done dropping off at 9 AM and they don't start picking up until about 4 PM.

Mr. Saelens asked if the parents come in to drop off the children or does the staff come out to get them?

Applicant replied that the parents bring the children into the building.

The parents part on one side and at the back parking lot and use the sidewalk there to drop off the children. However, they mainly use the parking that is connected to the sidewalk.

Mr. Miller asked how many parking spaces does the facility have?

Applicant replied that the new building has 100 parking spaces.

Mr. LaBelle stated that one of the concerns that he has is the pass through for Rosie O'Grady's and when people are coming out of Rosie O'Grady's or

Leongs and with the traffic from those two buildings, how can the applicant protect those children?

Applicant replied that she spoke with the person from the church from whom they will be leasing the new building and he came up with a few ideas. She stated that they could put up a couple of temporary or permanent stop signs or yield signs or children at play signs at both egresses. They also talked about putting in a few cross walks and painting them at both egresses. She also mentioned that they could put in a sidewalk for the new building so they would have to only cross at the front drive there and then across both egresses. She explained that they could make it better by painting a bright cross walk for everybody if the signage is something that could be approved. She thought that would help with the traffic from Leong's, Rosie's and the party store. She mentioned that they watch even people from the neighborhood out of the windows walking in that area and possibly this could even make it safer for them. She mentioned that they have a system for walking with the children as well. They already cross the children over there and into the neighborhood. They have a rope system with a teacher in the front and the back and she thought this would make it even safer for everybody.

Mr. LaBelle asked if they ever thought of putting a play area at the back of the existing church building if they are not crossing there?

Applicant replied that they had also discussed that option.

Mr. Stabile stated that he knew they would have two buildings with different age children. He asked if the staff would be shared sometime?

Applicant stated probably only if someone would call in sick and then they might have to share teachers. However, for the most part the teachers that teach the preschoolers would be in one building and the other teachers for the nursery would be in the other building.

Mr. Stabile verified that it would still be operated as one business, not two.

Applicant responded yes. She did speak with the representative from the State and they may have to change their certificate number because they will be operating out of two buildings, but it would still be considered one business. She added that one would be Lil-Graduates Preschool and the other would be Lil-Graduates Nursery.

Mr. Miller stated that there was one letter opposing the expansion of the daycare from Tony and Maria Balcerzak at 50805 Seaden Drive.

8-22-2017

Mr. Miller stated that their only concerns would be for the play area and the parking and they would like to have more accurate numbers for the size of the area where the children will play. Other than that he did not think anyone had a problem with the expansion.

Mr. LaBelle asked the applicant if she could get that information and do the calculations for them by the next meeting?

Applicant replied yes.

Mr. LaBelle stated then Mr. Miller will close the Public Hearing and they will vote at the next meeting.

Applicant stated that at that time she could talk about the size and the different increments during the day.

Mr. LaBelle stated that they really appreciate the business in the community and mentioned that they just want to make sure that there little citizens are safe.

**There were no Public Comments.**

Mr. Palin stated that if they are going to close the Public Hearing, they just might want to give the applicant a little more time to get back with the information and Table it for up to two meetings. He stated that if she comes back with the information earlier, it can go on the next meeting.

Applicant stated so they want the measurements of the playground and the increments of times that the children would go out.

Mr. Miller replied they also wanted information on the parking.

Mr. Palin stated that the applicant can meet with him and he can go through the information with her. He stated that she had until August 31<sup>st</sup> to get it on the next meeting.

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to close the Public Hearing

**Supported** by Mr. Saelens

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to Table SLU #2017-15 for Allison Ludwig 50867 Seaden Dr. Chesterfield, MI 48047 for up to two meetings.

**Supported** by Mr. Moran

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

6. **REVIEWS:**

A. **SPECIAL LAND USE #2017-13: Conscious Senior Living Properties, 5920 St. Clair Hwy, East China Twp. MI 48054 Requesting special land use approval for a 58 unit housing for the elderly located at 29829 & 29891 23 Mile Road tabled on 7-25-2017.**

Mr. LaBelle asked about the location of the detention pond because there are no detention ponds allowed at the front of the building? He stated that of course this is an engineering issue but he would just like to know for his piece of mind. He mentioned that they have exceeded the amount of parking required and have removed the dumpster behind the building and they have also added a brick band around the other three sides of the building. He stated that they have done everything the Commission has asked them to do.

Mr. Miller stated that the detention pond is an engineering issue.

Mr. Stabile asked if anyone ever went out to take a look at another one of their facilities.

Mr. Miller replied no.

Mr. Stabile stated that his concern would be doubling up the beds.

Mr. Miller asked if there was enough room to put two beds in a room?

Scott Bell of Lapham Assoc. 116 5<sup>th</sup> St., West Branch, MI addressed the board.

Applicant replied that there are some units with two rooms, but there will only be single occupation bed rooms.

Mr. Stabile asked if the rooms could be split with a divider and end up with two patients instead of one?

Applicant replied no. There will be no room dividers.

Mark Kinzon, 5920 St. Clair Hwy., China Twp., MI addressed the board.

Mr. Kinzon asked if they got the information they needed?

Mr. Saelens asked if he meant about the retention pond.

Mr. Kinzon replied no the beds.

Mr. Meagher replied that was asked and answered.

Mr. Miller stated that they wanted to know about the retention pond.

Applicant stated that he was not really sure what was asked about the retention pond. There was a comment that detention was not permitted in the front yard. He explained that by front yard he presumed they meant front setback 50' off the right-of-way and they removed that and pushed it back and expanded it on a revised plan. He mentioned that the sign was also pushed back.

The Applicant then went up and showed the Commissioner's the revised plan showing the pond and he made some additional comments away from the microphone that were inaudible.

Mr. Stabile remarked that the detention pond is still at the front of the property.

Applicant replied but it is not in the front setback.

Mr. Miller stated that is something that has to be answered at engineering anyway.

Mr. Stabile stated that it is difficult because they are looking at a big detention pond at the front right next to this property. However, the ordinance got changed about 10 to 12 years ago and that one was the last detention pond in the Township that was put at the front of the property. He mentioned that even if the pond is not in the setback, it would still be at the front of the property.

Applicant replied that was a matter of definition. He presumed when they referred to the front, they meant the front yard setback. He thought that would be something handled by the engineers later in the process. He also wanted to point out that they also put in a Fire Access and moved two parking spaces to a different location on the property. He stated that they have put in a call to the Fire Inspector and about the Fire Access and they have not received a return call as of yet.

Mr. Stabile asked if Mr. Meagher thought that pond would still be considered in the front?

Mr. Meagher replied that is an engineering requirement and they will defer to engineering on that issue. If the engineer determines that the pond is in the front, they will have to rework the retention pond layout and deal with it at that time.

Mr. Stabile stated that the detention pond next door is pretty ugly.

Applicant agreed and remarked that one is very deep and is on the right-of-way. He referred to the AEW letter from July 25<sup>th</sup> with their comments were that "The proposed detention pond shall not be within the front yard setback unless a variance is granted." He commented that was where he got his interpretation that they did not necessarily have a problem with the front of the building, but within that front yard setback.

Mr. Palin read from the ordinance that "The detention pond shall not be constructed between the road right-of-way and the front building set back line."

Mr. Joseph stated that the petitioner has been in front of them twice and during the Public Hearing there was fairly robust dialog and there were questions posed to the petitioner which clearly hinged on more of a business model than the State licensing and items dealing with their business. He mentioned that in spite of that the applicant answered every question posed to him and the comments raised by the commissioners a month ago have been addressed. He commented that this is a unique opportunity for the Township and while the parcel is not consistent with the ordinance, the project is a perfect fit for this parcel. The building is a single story, low intensity usage between apartment and condominiums.

**Motion** by Mr. Joseph to approve SLU #2017-13 as written in the agenda

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

Mr. Miller stated that he knew that the applicants were going to the ZBA the next day and they would be informed that the Planning Commission has approved the SLU.

Applicant thanked them for their recommendation to the ZBA.

**B. SIGN REVIEW #2017-75: Sign Emporium, Inc. 11035 E. 9 Mi. Warren, MI 48089. Proposed new wall sign located at 48724 Gratiot for Jack Pot Café Gaming Center.**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the proposed sign was too large. He remarked that the applicant has agreed to reduce the size of the sign to 24 square feet.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2017-75 at 24 square feet

Mr. Miller asked if they would be removing the LED lights around the windows?

Mr. LaBelle replied that the representative from the sign company would go back and make sure the lighting is removed.

**Supported** by Mr. Saelens

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**C. SIGN REVIEW #2017-76: Phillips Sign & Lighting, 40920 executive Dr. Harrison Twp., MI 48045. Proposed new wall sign located at 45400 Market Place Blvd. for Subway Sandwich Shop located inside the Chesterfield Wal-Mart.**

Mr. LaBelle commented that Walmart is full of signs and they have granted multiple variances for signage.

Mr. Miller mentioned that they had already turned this sign down previously for Subway.

Rebecca Godin, 9601 Dolan, Columbus, MI addressed the board.

Applicant replied that she was not aware of that. She stated that the sign they are proposing is 13.4 square feet which is small for the building. She understands that Walmart has a lot of signs but this would be for a tenant inside of Walmart. Subway has no signage and no recognition that would bring people into the building. She mentioned that the ordinance has no mention of businesses or renters inside large shopping plazas like that.

Mr. LaBelle stated that the applicant might be willing to move one of their other signs from the building.

Applicant commented that she highly doubt that they would do that. She stated that they could table it and she could ask; but they are not going to want to take down one of their signs off for Subway.

Mr. Miller mentioned that he thought Walmart even up 6 directional signs that are six feet high, that they did not even approve.

Mr. Joseph stated that the business is supported by their relationship with their landlord. He stated that the benefit of being a Subway inside of Walmart is that Walmart does all the advertising. Walmart brings in the population and Subway is really catering to Walmart shoppers. He stated that the inherent base is contained within the advertising of the storefront. He mentioned that if they approve this sign then other tenants will also want signs and then they will be like Walmart's version of NASCAR with logos and signs all over the place. He reiterated that Walmart is a self-contained entity like a mini city and the relationship with their tenants is related to the price of their rent.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to deny Sign #2017-76

**Supported** by Mr. Stabile

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**D. SIGN REVIEW #2017-77: Intercity Neon, P.O. Box 3762, Centerline, MI 48015. Proposed new front wall sign (north elevation) located at 50912 Gratiot Ave. for Olga's Kitchen**

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

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2017-77

**Supported** by Mr. Moran

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**E. SIGN REVIEW #2017-78: Intercity Neon, P.O. Box 3762, Centerline, MI 48015. Proposed new (side) wall sign (east elevation) located at 50912 Gratiot Ave. for Olga's Kitchen**

Mr. LaBelle stated that the applicants have asked that they remove this sign review from the agenda.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to remove Sign #2017-78 from the agenda

**Supported** by Mr. Miller

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**F. SIGN REVIEW #2017-79: Intercity Neon, P.O. Box 3762, Centerline, MI 48015. Proposed new (rear) wall sign (north elevation) located at 50912 Gratiot Ave. for Olga's Kitchen**

Mr. LaBelle stated that according to the Township ordinance a business is allowed to have a sign at the rear of the building that is ½ the size of the sign at the front.

**Motion** by Mr. LaBelle to approve Sign #2017-79

**Supported** by Mr. Moran

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

**7. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PRIOR MEETINGS:**

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to approve the meeting minutes from 8/8/2017.

**Supported** by Mr. Alexie

**Ayes: All**

**Nays: None**

**Motion Carried**

8. **COMMUNICATIONS: None.**

9. **OLD BUSINESS:**

There was no old business.

10. **NEW BUSINESS:**

There was no new business.

11. **PLANNERS REPORT: None**

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

Mr. LaBelle asked for volunteers for the next Pre-Planning meeting on August 22<sup>nd</sup>?

Mr. Alexie and Mr. Leonard both agreed to attend Pre-Planning.

Mr. Palin brought up the MAP Conference being held at Mackinac Island and asked the Commissioners to let him know as soon as possible if they would like to attend.

There was a discussion among the Commissioners on the September Conference.

13. **PROPOSALS FOR NEXT AGENDA:**

There were no proposals for the next agenda.

14. **ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion** by Mr. Miller to adjourn at 8: 18 PM

**Supported** by Mr. Saelens

**Ayes:** All

**Nays:** None

**Motion Carried**

---

*Rick LaBelle, Secretary*

---

*Grace Mastronardi, Recording Secretary*