CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF LYON
PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
April 14, 2003

Approved as corrected May 12, 2003.

DATE: April 14, 2003
TIME: 7:00 PM
PLACE: 58000 Grand River

Call to Order: Vice Chair Barber called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Roll Call: Present: Michael Barber, Vice Chair
Laura James, Secretary
Ray Bisio, Trustee
Richard Crook (arrived 7:06 PM)
Ted Soper
Laura Williams

Absent: Brent Hemker, Chairman

Also Present: Dave Gillam, Assistant Township Attorney
Chris Doozan, Township Planner
Megan Masson-Minock, Township Planner
Tim Kniga, Township Engineer
Chris Olson, Township Superintendent
Larry Phillips, Building Official

Guests: 61

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The following changes were made to the agenda:
- New Business #4, AP-03-10, Victor PD, was moved up to be discussed with the Public Hearing for the rezoning
- Discussion regarding procedure for receiving plans was added to New Business

Ms. Williams questioned if it would be appropriate to set a time limit for the meeting since it is a long agenda. Mr. Bisio noted that they could follow the agenda and take a break around 9:00 PM and then discuss if they need to hold some of the issues off until another meeting.

Mr. Gillam stated that the Planning Commission has the option to set a time limit. He noted that the Board does this if they have a lengthy agenda. He stated that the Planning Commission could do this also. He stated that they would have to indicate that they will not hear any new business after a certain time that has been agreed upon.

Ms. James asked the members of the audience if the individual applicants are present and if they need a decision on their application tonight. They all responded that they did.

Mr. Soper made a motion to approve the agenda as modified. Mr. Bisio supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None
Absent: Hemker

Motion approved unanimously.

2. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA:
- March 10, 2003 Regular Meeting Minutes

Ms. Williams noted that she did not receive a copy of these minutes and requested that the approval be tabled.

Mr. Crook made a motion to table the approval of the March 10, 2003 meeting minutes for two weeks. Ms. James supported the motion.

Voice Vote:	Ayes:	All
	Nays:	None
	Absent:	Hemker

Motion approved unanimously.

Mr. Bisio noted that this is not the first time that they have not received all the necessary information. He stated that they need to resolve this problem.

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS: NONE

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

AP-03-04, Public Hearing for Community Business Rezoning Proposal, Victor International, south side of Ten Mile near intersection with Johns Road.

AP-03-10, Victor PD, Ten Mile Road and Johns Road, Planning Commission Conceptual Review

Mr. Doozan reviewed the comments indicated in the March 31, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter regarding the rezoning proposal. He also reviewed the comments in the review letter regarding the conceptual review. He noted that they applicant will give a presentation of the conceptual plan.

Mr. Bisio questioned if this is the way they should proceed since this is a public hearing. He noted that Mr. Doozan included information regarding the conceptual plan during his review. Mr. Gillam responded that the public hearing is on the proposed re-zoning. He felt that Mr. Doozan's intention in moving the other issue up and going over the review letters rather than separating it, is for the purposes of background in relation to the public hearing.

Mr. Bisio questioned why these issues were separated on the agenda. Mr. Doozan responded according to the by-laws, this is the order they are supposed to be in, public hearing first and then new business. He stated that if they took the items separately there would be a lot of repetition. He noted that the opportunity exists to consolidate issues when the agenda is approved.

Robert Carson, Attorney, gave a brief presentation. He stated that it is appropriate to look at the the residential portion also, even though the rezoning is only for the section along Ten Mile Road. He stated that it is appropriate and prudent to consider the rezoning along with the residential. The rezoned area is the area that is designated in the Master Plan for commercial.

Mr. Bisio asked for legal clarification of the Master Plan. Mr. Gillam read the paragraph of the Ordinance that deals with the Master Plan's two commercial nodes along Ten Mile Road, one at Johns Road and the other at Milford Road.

Mr. Carson stated that today one of the key "buzz" words in Lansing is "smart growth". He stated that they believe that they are presenting something that fits this:

1. This will allow commercial development in an area that has been long held by the applicant.
2. It will confine the node to the area that is designated by the Master Plan and it makes good sense.
3. It is along Ten Mile Road, which is an appropriate use.
4. It is a commercial center which will service the neighborhood.

5. The use to the west of this site makes commercial a foregone conclusion. There is no doubt that having the FAA Tower and Sprint Building to the immediate west, would make this the best potential use.

Mr. Carson stated that they number of acres comes from what is the most likely and efficient size of a project that will bring success so that the property can be attractive and beneficial to the community. It should be economically viable in its use and should service the needs of the community.

Mr. Carson stated that looking at what is coming to this area, this is an appropriate place for a commercial node. He discussed how this will be implemented into the proposed development.

Mr. Carson gave a brief history of what the developer, David Johnson, has done. He stated that David Johnson is a high quality, award winning developer with great credibility.

David Johnson stated that he and his family have owned this property for over 40 years. Using the displayed plans, he explained the proposed development.

Bernie Fekete discussed the surrounding areas and what is being built. He noted that they do have a traffic analysis done for this site and that there is some work that needs to be done. He stated that this has been submitted to the Township. He briefly explained what improvements to the roads will be needed.

Ralph Noonez, Landscape Architect, discussed the landscaping for the proposed development. He noted that there is 1-1/2 miles of trail system, 13 acres of woodland preserve, 8.1 acres upland area and 4.86 acres in the residential component of open space.

Ms. James felt that it would be helpful for the public to know exactly where they are procedurally and exactly what type of decision they are being asked to make tonight.
Mr. Doozan explained the process to the public and what action can be taken by the Planning Commission this evening.

Mr. Barber asked for clarification on the number of acres zoned for commercial and the number of acres that the applicant is proposing. Mr. Doozan responded that that Future Land Use Map shows 20 acres of commercial, which is half on the Johnson property and half on the Sprint property.

Mr. Barber questioned if the 10 acre Sprint site is part of this development. Mr. Doozan responded that it is not. He state that the applicant is proposing to rezone 20 acres to commercial.

Mr. Barber stated that the applicant is asking for 10 more acres than what is on the Future Land Use Map. Mr. Doozan responded that this is correct.

Mr. Johnson stated that with all the market research they have done, the 20 acres would contain roadways, open space and landscaping for the residential component as well as the commercial component. He noted that the specific commercial component is less than 20 acres. He stated that to get high quality end users, they need more than 10 acres for the commercial.

Mr. Soper stated that his question would be "If the developer cannot develop this size of a development, then would he still be interested doing any commercial?" Mr. Johnson responded that he feels that the Township would be dissatisfied with what the results would be. He stated that they cannot remove the FAA Tower and that there is no question that there will be some type of commercial there also.

After further discussion, Mr. Barber opened the public hearing at 8:09 PM.

Sanford Green, Hartford Equities, explained they own 50 acres of property east of this site, at Ten Mile and Napier Road. He noted that they submitted a request for rezoning to commercial last week for a portion of this property. He briefly discussed the how he felt that this would be the better location for commercial development.

Phil Mitchell, 27541 T.F. Hicks Court, stated that part of the justification was to have this close in proximity. He stated that in a farming community, chances are that a person would go to the store once a week. The convenience to him is not necessarily going to be more economical and save on gas, it is a matter of usage. He stated that as a point of order, he still believes that the issue of whether or not this is rezoned is more important than a specific application. He stated that if they are going to look at the application first and then decide rezoning, it would be getting into spot zoning. He stated that the question is "Is the zoning necessary regardless of who is applying?". He also felt that they really need to define the meeting of "node". He stated that they have talked about someday having a downtown New Hudson, but if there are big clusters of commercial, it will take away from the focus of downtown.

Chris Roberts, 56645 McKenzie Lane, stated that he would kill for a Starbucks but isn't sure that this is the right location. He stated that the Planning Commission has been spending a lot of time on the Future Land Use Map and the Zoning Map, and he would really like to see these reconciled. He stated that he would like to see this project tabled until these maps are reconciled.

Cindy Groene, 54808 Greenlefe Circle, stated that her biggest concern would be the traffic. She noted that there is a High School that is being built there and there will be young, inexperienced drivers going in and out of this location. She stated that even though this does look like a lovely project, the concerns should be taking the Township's growth slowly, making good decisions and looking for the future. She stated that she would hope that the Planning Commission does not make Ten Mile Road commercial/housing all the way into town. She suggested that pedestrian crossings should be taken into consideration also because of amount of additional traffic that will be generated.

Ms. James stated that the Planning Commission has been asked to basically choose to either put the commercial node at Ten Mile Road and Johns Road or put it at Ten Mile Road and Napier Road, not in both locations. She stated that there will not be commercial in both locations.

Scott Sargent, 54765 Greenlefe Circle, stated that his biggest concern is the traffic. He noted that Ten Mile Road is turning into the alternate I-96. It is what Green Oak takes into town. He stated that this is probably the reason they want to build on Ten Mile. He stated that the speed on Ten Mile is amazing. It has gotten very noisy.

Ben Reisner, 52401 Ten Mile Road, stated that he is also very concerned about the amount of traffic on Ten Mile Road. He noted that it often takes him a long time to pull out of his driveway onto Ten Mile Road. He also shares Mr. Sargent's concerns with regard to the speed of the cars driving on Ten Mile Road.

Barbara Broadlee, 54839 Greenlege Circle, stated that she is also concerned about the traffic. She questioned if Ten Mile Road would be straightened out. There are a lot of hills along Ten Mile Road, which makes it difficult to see when you are pulling out.

Jim Graham, Assistant Superintendent, South Lyon School District, explained what road improvements the School District would be doing in conjunction with the construction of the schools at Ten Mile Road and Johns Road.

Chuck Lewis, Architect for the School District, stated that traffic on Johns Road is going to be limited to parent drop-off and buses.

Greg Dobson, 54829 Greenlefe Circle, suggested that this issue be tabled tonight. He stated that there is a lot of work that this Board has to do all along Ten Mile Road in order to determine what is going to happen there. The traffic is horrendous in the morning. He felt that there needs to be some sort of traffic control.

Art Grimsey, 23660 Spy Glass Hill, stated that he concurs with the comments made by the other residents. He is also very concerned with the amount of traffic. He stated that he does not like the idea of having commercial all up and down Ten Mile Road.

Since the schools are going in at Ten Mile and Johns Roads, Mr. Crook questioned if it makes sense

to have commercial going in right across the street. Mr. Doozan responded that his biggest concern is the traffic. He stated that the issue of whether or not the development becomes a hang-out for students, he is not too concerned about this. He stated that this would depend on the nature of the businesses that are put into this development.

John Peyto, 23546 Sawgrass Court, stated that he concurs with the comments that have already been stated. He too, is very concerned about the traffic situation.

Troy Schilling, 57780 Twelve Mile Road, stated that the developers always come in with some nice looking plans. He noted that looking up at the Township logo he sees rural character, but in looking at the plans he does not. He stated that the Planning Commission is set up to plan and something like this is in his mind not planned in a sense that there is a node on the Future Land Use Map that says ten acres here and ten acres there, that is practically across the street from each other.

Mr. Barber closed the public hearing at 8:43 PM.

Mr. Carson briefly addressed some of the issues. He stated that they agree that the traffic is something that needs to be planned constructively. He noted that there are site plan issues and that they are eager to work on those. There has been a traffic study completed. He stated that they contemplated having a well planned intersection and would look forward to working with the School District on it. He stated that because of the stage of development, they need to know now so that they can move forward. He further discussed the plan that they are proposing.

Mr. Carson stated that they need the Planning Commission to take action on this tonight and not table it.

Mr. Barber stated that he felt that with regard to the conceptual plan, there are too many homes. He stated that he would like to see some coordination between the two properties for commercial. He stated that they are looking to see what the developer can do for the good of the whole community. He stated that they do have a Master Plan, which they have been working on for a while. He stated that he is leery of making a decision on commercial tonight.

Ms. James stated that the original plan for residential, which was submitted about a month ago, preserved a huge portion of hardwoods, but now the plan has been changed and most of the trees will be removed. She stated that a 58% bonus on the residential is being requested and she does not see the justification for it. She quoted a sentence from the Master Plan on page 168. She stated that there is a wetlands issue that has not been totally addressed. She stated that at some point the wetland issue is going to have to be fully addressed and resolved.

Ms. James stated that there are three things that are in the developers favor:

1. the FAA Tower, which is an eyesore
2. the Future Land Use Map and the fact that somebody talked the prior Planning Commission into putting commercial here and the fact that the Planner wants to see commercial there
3. as developers go, you are the best

She stated that with this said, there are a couple of problems. There is public opposition to strip malls and the traffic problems cannot be understated. She stated that basically what is being asked for is double the acreage for commercial than what is on the Future Land Use Map, and this is where she has to draw the line. If the request before them tonight is to rezone 20 acres, she stated that in her mind, it is too much and she would have to say no.

Mr. Soper stated that he would agree that maybe with ten acres a quality development could not be done, but he agrees with the other Commissioners. He stated that he would like to see the developers work with the Sprint people to see if they could get one development rather than two twenty acre development. Mr. Johnson stated that they have tried, but have been unsuccessful. He stated that he is not yet convinced that they need this commercial. He stated that he has a problem with putting commercial right across the street from schools. He discussed the density of the residential portion of this development.

Ms. Williams stated that she concurs with the comments that have been made by the other Commissioners and the residents. She noted that east of this location at Ten Mile and Beck Roads there is a strip mall that is virtually empty. She stated that she is not convinced that there is a need for commercial at this location. She is also very concerned with the traffic.

Mr. Bisio stated that the other Commissioners covered all the issues with regard to density and traffic. He stated concurred with the comments already stated.

Mr. Crook stated that as far as the conceptual review, he feels that they are putting the cart before the horse. He stated that there is a single means of ingress and egress. He noted that it has always been important to him to see a second means of ingress and egress. He stated that having commercial across from the High School is going to be a tough sell for him. He stated that he would believe that if the past commission, who put the commercial node there, had the knowledge of the schools going in there, they probably would not have put a commercial node there.

Mr. Gillam stated that with regard to the rezoning, the Planning Commission has three options tonight:

1. Table the rezoning request
2. Make a favorable recommendation to the Township Board
3. Make a negative recommendation to the Township Board

He stated that he would recommend that if the Planning Commission takes any action other than tabling, they should make reference to the nine point in Mr. Doozan's memorandum and the criteria set forth in the Zoning Ordinance when reviewing a request for rezoning.

Ms. James made a motion to recommend denial of the rezoning for the 19.9 acres for AP-03-04 for the reasons outlined by the individual Planning Commissioners tonight incorporated by reference the comments received by the public tonight and the March 31, 2003 letter from McKenna Associates, Inc. Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Mr. Bisio asked Legal Counsel if everything necessary was included in the motion. Mr. Gillam responded that they could probably stated some of the issues that the Commission felt were significant.

Ms. James amended her motion to include the Planning Commission's concern about the traffic density for a twenty acre parcel of commercial in this area. She amended her motion to reflect the fact that the Future Land Use Map calls for ten acres of commercial as opposed to twenty acres so if we want to abide by the Future Land Use Map we have to reject the request for rezoning of the commercial property.

Ms. Williams asked if they could also include that the conditions have changed and the Future Land Use Map was created before there was knowledge of the schools being constructed in this area. The motion was so amended.

Mr. Soper supported the amendments to the motion.

Voice Vote:	Ayes:	All
	Nays:	None
	Absent:	Hemker

Motion approved unanimously.

The Commission took a five minute recess.

<u>Public Hearing for Amendment to PD Regulations</u>

Mr. Doozan stated that this involves an amendment to the Zoning Ordinance. In the past several months they have gone through reviewing Planned Developments and have become aware of portions of the Planned Development Regulations that need to be revised. He stated that they have drafted revisions to Article 7, which he explained.

Mr. Gillam stated that these are proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Commission's obligation is to make a recommendation to the Township Board. He stated that this recommendation does not necessarily have to be done tonight, this can be tabled for additional discussion or information. He stated that the action by the Planning Commission tonight would be to table, recommend approval or recommend denial. He stated that it might be more appropriate to table and ask for modifications. He stated that some of what is here is good but there are some things that could be fine tuned.

Mr. Soper noted that they received so much information on Friday that he has not had time to review all the information. Ms. James stated that she would like to see this tabled. She noted that there are two items she would like to discuss at a later time. Ms. Williams stated that she also has some issues with these amendments that she would also like to discuss.

Mr. Doozan suggested that the Commissioners put their comments in writing and submit them to him. He will then summarize them for discussion at the next meeting.

After further brief discussion, Mr. Barber opened the public hearing at 9:23 PM.

Troy Schilling, 57780 Twelve Mile Road, questioned what initiated these changes. Mr. Doozan responded that it was observation of the way the Planned Development Regulations have been working or not working in the past. Mr. Schilling questioned if there would be time for public comments once this is presented again. Mr. Gillam responded that he felt that this would be appropriate as a result of discussion of changes that are going to be made. He stated that the changes would be put into a hard copy and would be available for the members of the Planning Commission and the public. He stated that after the Planning Commission is done with this and there is a recommendation to the Township Board, there will have to be two readings at the Board level. The comments will not have to end at the Planning Commission level, although the only public hearing will be held at this level.

Mr. Olson suggested that they should maybe continue this public hearing at a later date with the comments as noted. He stated that maybe they could get a summary table with the old language and the new language and an explanation of why the changes are needed.

Mr. Barber closed the public hearing at 9:28 PM.

Ms. James made a motion to table the amendments to the Planned Development Regulations until for two weeks. Mr. Crook supported the motion.

Voice Vote:	Ayes:	Crook, James, Soper, Williams
	Nays:	Bisio, Barber
	Absent:	Hemker

Motion approved.

5. OLD BUSINESS:

AP-00-32, Woodwind Planned Development, (Bob Harris and South Lyon Schools, co-applicants), north side of Ten Mile Road, west of Johns Road, final PD review

Mr. Doozan stated that the preliminary planned development was originally submitted in October. Following preliminary plan approval the applicant needed to seek outside approvals from State and County Agencies on the revised plan. He further explained what action needs to be taken on this issue.

Ms. James stated that before Mr. Doozan reviews the long letter, she felt that this needs to be tabled because there are a lot of outstanding issues. Mr. Crook concurred.

Ray Cusineau, Bob Harris Group, stated that they are ready to accept a table on this issue. He explained that they do have some issues that they need to discuss this evening. He stated that

they believe that most of the issues that are noted in the review letter are somewhat mechanical and will be resolved before they come back with a revised planned development plan. There are some issues which they need input from the Commission this evening.

Mr. Bisio stated that whenever this comes back before the Commission, he would like to have the information approximately a week before so that they can review it and be prepared at the meeting. Mr. Cusineau stated that this would not be a problem.

Mr. Cusineau stated that they cannot make any commitments with regard to the bike path or sidewalk on the school's property. He stated noted that the school has committed to put a bike path along their frontage. With regard to roadway improvements along Ten Mile Road, he stated that they have committed to make all the improvements, as recommended by their traffic engineer including a light at the intersection of the daycare location. He stated that the Road Commission has indicated that they would not approve a light at this intersection, even though they are ready to do this. It is on the plans but may not happen.

Mr. Cusineau stated that with regard to unification of landscaping along the frontage. He stated that the schools are willing to provide some level of landscaping on their frontage. Chuck Lewis, Architect for the School District, stated that they are not the design stage as of yet and are not sure what they are going to be done. He stated that when this is done they will be sharing this with the Township. Jim Graham, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, stated that they are willing to work with the Township and the Bob Harris Group.

Mr. Cusineau stated that the school is also proposing a level on improvements along Ten Mile Road in conjunction with their traffic study.

Mr. Cusineau discussed a site plan issue that has arisen in the past couple months that involves a jurisdictional questioned with regard to DEQ. He stated that they do not intend to come back and ask for extra density, if they lose lots on west side because of the floodplain or wetland issues. He stated that they will simply downsize the project accordingly.

Ms. James noted that they received a letter from the DEQ and that she is not going to vote on anything until they receive another letter from DEQ giving them the go ahead. Mr. Cusineau explained that they are aware of the letter and where they are in the process with regard to this.

Phil Atkinson, Attorney, addressed the technicalities of the wetland issues. He stated that there are some interesting details with regard to the allegations that have been made by the DEQ. He stated that some of these allegations are disputed by them and some are disputed by the Oakland County Drain Commissioner's office.

Ms. Williams stated that there is a mound of dirt located behind her house. She stated that she does not believe that all this is from cleaning out the Blackwood Drain. She also questioned a sign that has been posted. Bob Harris responded that they have had a lot of interest in the site so they posted a sign, but they have not taken any deposits. He explained the areas from which the dirt came from. He stated that they will probably be using this material for wetland mitigation. The dirt piles are only temporary.

Ms. James noted that there are about twelve archeological sites in the Township. There are two significant sites on this property, one in Section 23 and one in Section 24. She asked Mr. Harris to contact the State Archeologists office to verify the location of these sites.

Mr. Crook made a motion to table AP-00-32, Woodwind Planned Development, until the first meeting in May. Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice Vote:	Ayes:	All
	Nays:	None
	Absent:	Hemker

Motion approved unanimously.

6. NEW BUSINESS:

AP-01-28, Old Grand River Storage, Request for extension of approved site plan.

Ms. Masson-Minock reviewed the comments indicated in the April 9, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter.

Ms. James made a motion to grant a one year site plan extension for AP-01-28, Old Grand River Storage, and that they approve the reduction of the roof pitch for the buildings proposed in Phase I with the approvals subject to obtaining engineering approval and all outside approvals before the building permit is issued. Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice Vote:	Ayes:	All
	Nays:	None
	Absent:	Hemker

Motion approved unanimously.

AP-03-03, South Lyon Fence, site plan review, commercial building, Grand River and Haas Road.

Ms. Masson-Minock reviewed the comments indicated in the April 10, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter.

Mr. Bisio stated that he does not want to rush through the process. He noted that there were several issues that need to be addressed. He asked Larry Phillips, Building Official, if he sees any problems with this with regard to the Building Department. Mr. Phillips responded that he does not.

Mr. Bisio asked Ms. Masson-Minock if she has a good feeling about what is being presented here. Ms. Masson-Minock responded that she does. She stated that the items that are remaining are very minor.

Mr. Barber questioned if there would be any welding done here or if the fencing is purchased from a manufacturer. John Dolan responded that they do make some gates. He noted that any welding they do is exhausted outside the building.

Mr. Soper questioned if any chemicals are used. Mr. Dolan responded that there are not.

Mr. Soper asked Ms. Masson-Minock if the issues regarding lighting have been answered satisfactorily. Ms. Masson-Minock responded that all they need to do is provide a note with regard to the lighting.

Mr. Crook made a motion to approve the site plan for AP-03-03, South Lyon Fence, provided the recommendations in the McKenna Associates, Inc. letter dated April 10, 2003 are met. Mr. Bisio supported the motion.

Voice Vote:	Ayes:	All
	Nays:	None
	Absent:	Hemker

Motion approved unanimously.

AP-03-08, Lyon Tech Park Building II, site plan review, industrial building, 29665 William K. Smith Drive, Grand River and William K. Smith Drive.

Ms. Masson-Minock reviewed the comments indicated in the April 10, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter.

Ms. James noted that there are Ash trees indicated on the plan. Ms. Masson-Minock stated that the plan has been revised and the Ash trees have been removed.

Mr. Crook asked if there are any problems with making the changes to the Activity Statement. It was noted that the changes have been made and the revised Activity Statement and will be submitted. It was handed to Ms. Masson-Minock who reviewed it and noted that all the information is there.

Mr. Crook made a motion to authorize industrial site plan approval for AP-03-08, Lyon Tech Park Building II, provided the recommendations in the McKenna Associates, Inc. letter dated April 10, 2003 are met. Ms. James supported the motion.

Voice Vote:	Ayes:	All
	Nays:	None
	Absent:	Hemker

Motion approved unanimously.

Revisions to the Zoning Ordinance Regarding Performance Guarantees

Mr. Crook made a motion to table the revisions to the Zoning Ordinance regarding performance guarantees until the May 12, 2003 meeting. Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice Vote:	Ayes:	All
	Nays:	None
	Absent:	Hemker

Motion approved unanimously.

Discussion Regarding Procedure for Receiving Plans

Mr. Soper stated that he does not want to be put on the spot to review something fast. He stated that he would prefer to have the information earlier. He noted that they need a better process in getting their information. He stated that there is some information that he never received. The Commissioners concurred.

There was discussion as to how the process of receiving information could be better handled. Mr. Doozan noted that they could begin to provide the information in pieces, which might be helpful. Ms. Masson-Minock stated that they will begin sending the packets out the Monday before each meeting.

7. DISCUSSION AND COMMUNICATIONS:

Mr. Olson questioned if the Commissioners had any interest in having a joint meeting with the City. The Commissioners indicated that they would like to consider this.

Mr. Olson noted that with regard to the McMullen parcel next to Tanglewood they would like to possibly have a sub-committee to discuss this. He asked for volunteers. Mr. Barber and Mr. Soper volunteered to serve on the sub-committee. Mr. Olson stated that he would contact Mr. Hemker to see if he was interested in serving on the sub-committee.

8. ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Barber adjourned the meeting at 10:44 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Deby Cothery

Deby Cothery
Recording Secretary