

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF LYON
PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
May 12, 2003**

Approved as submitted June 9, 2003.

DATE: May 12, 2003
TIME: 7:00 PM
PLACE: 58000 Grand River

Call to Order: Chairman Hemker called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Roll Call: Present: Brent Hemker, Chairman
Mike Barber, Vice Chair
Laura James, Secretary
Ray Bisio, Trustee
Richard Crook
Ted Soper
Laura Williams

Also Present: Dave Gillam, Township Attorney
Chris Doozan, Township Planner
Megan Masson-Minock, Township Planner
Chris Olson, Township Superintendent

Guests: 28

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Mr. Crook made a motion to approve the agenda as submitted. Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion approved.

**2. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA:
- Special Meeting Minutes of March 13, 2003
- Regular Meeting Minutes of April 14, 2003**

Some typographical errors were noted for the Recording Secretary to correct.

Mr. Barber made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda consisting of the Special Meeting Minutes of March 13, 2003 and the Regular Meeting Minutes of April 14, 2003 as corrected. Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion approved.

3. COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:

Troy Schilling, 57780 Twelve Mile Road, questioned if the Planning Commission knew that there is a meeting scheduled for Thursday to review the Mill River development. Mr. Soper stated that he just found out about this. He stated that there is a meeting scheduled for Thursday night at 7:00

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 there is no new information. He noted that Ray Cusineau of the Bob Harris Group is here. He asked Mr. Cusineau to give an update of where they stand.

Mr. Cusineau stated that they are not ready for this evening's agenda. They are still revising the plans and hope that they will be submitted to the Township this week. He stated that they would like to request a continuation of the tabling at this time. He noted that Mr. Harris would like to leave the option open for a special meeting, if possible.

Mr. Soper made a motion to table AP-00-32, Woodwind Planned Development, for up to sixty days. Mr. Barber supported the motion.

Ayes:	All	Voice Vote:
Nays:	None	

Motion approved unanimously.

6. NEW BUSINESS:

AP-03-02, Lyon Oaks Industrial Center, site plan review, Lyon Oaks Drive, industrial building, Grand River west of Napier.

Ms. Masson-Minock explained that this is a site plan for 2.4 acres in the Lyon Oaks Industrial Center. She reviewed the comments indicated in the May 1, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter. She stated that they would like the Planning Commission to comment on the proposed architecture, the bicycle path and any other item that they deem necessary.

Scott Morrison, Architect, displayed a color rendering of the proposed building. He briefly discussed the proposed landscaping for this site and along Grand River.

Mr. Morrison explained that the building will have several tenants. Each space will have a small office portion in the front and a warehouse portion in the rear. The building will be constructed of split face block. There will also be standing seam metal roofing.

There was discussion with regard to what steps need to be taken next. Ms. Masson-Minock reviewed the issues that the Planning Commission need to discuss.

Mr. Morrison discussed the bike path that is required. He stated that they would like to have some consistency and continue with the five foot sidewalk. Martin Daniels, Owner, stated that he does not have a problem with putting in either the sidewalk or the bike path, although he would prefer to put in the concrete sidewalk.

Mr. Soper stated that with regard to the front of the building, he thinks that it looks too chopped up.

Mr. Hemker stated that he would like the developer to possibly add some brick in order to bring up the scoring for architectural design. He stated that this building will be very visible from Grand River. He felt that by adding some more brick, the building would possibly be more attractive.

Mr. Soper questioned how many units will there be. Mr. Daniels responded that it is proposed for twelve units.

Mr. Hemker stated that under the open category for discussion, he discussed some of the things that they addressed when Parcel D was approved. He stated that the outside storage of campers, dumpsters and trucks have not been taken care of. He stated that the campers should not be there at all. Mr. Daniels stated that he does not know if this is an issue with him. The business in that building repairs campers. Mr. Hemker stated that there is no outside storage allowed. Mr. Daniels

stated that there is always going to be campers there.

Mr. Hemker questioned if the business would have to have a special use permit to repair campers at this location. Mr. Daniels stated that all they are doing is cosmetic repairs to campers, motor homes, etc. Mr. Doozan stated that automobile repair is generic and covers all type of vehicles and would require a special land use permit.

Mr. Hemker stated that if this tenant wants to continue doing this, they would require a special land use permit. He stated that it is an eyesore when you drive down Grand River to see the campers and the dumpsters.

Ms. James made a motion to approve the site plan subject to two conditions:

- a. minor plan revisions outlined in the May 1, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter paragraphs 3, 4 and 6 through 9
- b. that they be permitted to install a five foot concrete sidewalk in lieu of the ten foot asphalt bike path

Mr. Bisio supported the motion.

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

Motion failed.

Mr. Crook made a motion to table AP-03-02, Lyon Oaks Industrial Center, for up to sixty days to allow the applicant time to submit revised plans. Mr. Soper supported the motion.

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

Motion approved.

AP-03-07, Aspen Group PD, 10 Mile and Milford Road, Planning Commission Conceptual Review

Mr. Doozan explained that this is a proposal for a single family residential development on the south side of Ten Mile Road between Milford Road and Griswold Road. He reviewed the comments indicated in the May 5, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter.

David Goldberg, Aspen Group/Lyon LLC, stated that this development is basically made up of four different parcels, which he pointed out on a displayed plan. He stated that they are attempting to bring a unified, integrated plan together which otherwise could be four separate developments. By bringing one development it will enable Milford Road to connect Ten Mile Road to Nine Mile Road as well as going half way to Eight Mile Road with the dedication of a park to the Township. He stated that Aspen Group is representing all four owners.

Mr. Goldberg stated that with him this evening is Brandon Rogers from Brandon Rogers Associates, who is a Planning Consultant who has represented numerous communities as well as platted developers. He will be available to address any questions regarding the site as it relates to the Master Plan and how the proposed PD is consistent with it. Duane Bennett from Duane Bennett and Associates is the Project Engineer and is responsible for the site plans before the Commission.

Mr. Goldberg stated that what they are presenting today is not something that they have thrown together. He stated that they have been working with Mr. Doozan, Mr. Olson and other staff to bring what they thought and hope is a plan that the Township is looking for when they look at a PD.

Mr. Soper stated that page two of Mr. Doozan's letter brings up properties that have a problem due to water table and wetlands. Mr. Goldberg stated that what Mr. Doozan addressed in his letter was certain sections of their underlying plan. He stated that the underlying plan is stating that they could develop the property this way. He stated that at the time that the underlying plan was prepared the Township's Ordinance did not provide for a wetland setback. He noted that since

this time a wetland setback has since been adopted and would impact these lots. He stated that since they received notice of this Mr. Bennett has been working with the plan to try and make some adjustments.

Mr. Goldberg stated that if it is saying that the underlying plan is said to have ten less lots, then they will concede this at this time and possibly request a density increase. He stated that they would revise their underlying plan accordingly for the next submittal. He stated that if it requires an adjustment to the density, they would request this at that time. Mr. Soper stated that he really does not want to see this at a 38% density bonus, it is too high. Mr. Hemker stated that he feels that 31% is too high.

Mr. Bisio questioned if the developer has determined who would be building the homes yet. Mr. Goldberg responded that they have not determined this at this time. Mr. Bisio stated that it is mentioned in the information that they received, that the developer is willing to pave Nine Mile Road from the entrance of this development west to Griswold Road. Mr. Goldberg stated that the Traffic Engineer was not able to attend tonight, therefore, they cannot answer questions with regard to traffic. He stated that the Traffic Engineer, in his interpretation, misunderstood what they proposed. He stated that the PD Ordinance requires that the road be paved along the frontage of the property. He stated that the proposed plan does show the paving, but they do not intend to pave Nine Mile Road from Griswold Road up to the entrance. They intended to pave the frontage as required by the Ordinance.

Mr. Goldberg stated that he has not done the calculation of the distance from the entrance to Griswold Road. He stated that since the entrance to the development is so close to the western portion of the site, it would probably be almost an equivalent, if they paved from Griswold to that point and not beyond. He stated that it would probably be an equal amount of paving.

Mr. Goldberg stated that he hears mumbling that there is too much density, but additional improvements to the infrastructure do come at a cost. Mr. Bisio questioned that as it stands right now, is there a proposal to pave from the entrance on Nine Mile Road to Griswold Road. Mr. Goldberg responded that as it stands right now, there is not, the proposal is to pave the balance. There was further discussion with regard to what the developer is proposing to pave.

Mr. Barber questioned the location of the long cul-de-sac. Mr. Goldberg indicated that it is in the middle of the development. It was noted that there should be a second point of access for emergency vehicles.

Ms. James questioned the amount of open space that is actually buildable. She also questioned what the total wetland acreage is on all the parcels. Duane Bennett stated that there are considerable wetlands in the open spaces but they have a lot of usable open space above and beyond the wetlands. He stated that each of the individual drawings in the Commissioner's packets has an individual overlay of the wetlands for each parcel. These individual drawings show the wetland areas on each individual parcel. There was further discussion with regard to the amount of wetland and buildable open space.

Mr. Bennett stated that if they were to adjust the setbacks, the lot sizes would remain the same, the buildable areas within the lots would be revised. He stated that what the Ordinance is asking them to do is rather than having a 35' front setback, it is asking for a 40' front setback. He stated that the lots are deep enough that if they increase the setbacks, in most areas it would not affect the open space. He stated that because of the typical house sizes that they are talking about, if they were to go with the setbacks, then some of the lots, especially the pie shaped lots, they might have to be a little deeper to accommodate the same size building envelope. He noted that this would get into reduction of open space. He stated that they would not start changing lots because of wetlands.

Mr. Bennett stated that some of Mr. Doozan's comments about lots that need to be removed because of the wetland setback they don't agree with. He noted that they could modify some of them so that they would only lose five lots in lieu of ten lots.

Mr. Doozan stated that the 53 acres of wetlands in his letter is the addition of all the wetlands

indicated on the drawings. He stated that it does include the wetlands on the 60 acre parcel. Ms. Masson-Minock stated that they did not receive a wetland survey for the south portion of the Raney parcel. Mr. Bennett stated that this is correct. He stated that they can provide one. He stated that Mr. Raney is currently farming most of his land. The wetlands may only come into the Raney parcel just a slight amount.

Ms. James stated that when they worked with the Elkow's who have 600 acres, the Township Board and the Planning Commission were asked to rank several types of things that they would look at in terms of density bonus. She stated that the number one issue was wetlands. She noted that this is a critical issue in the Township. She stated that she does not believe that they can move forward without specific details on this issue.

Ms. James stated that she concurs with Mr. Hemker in that 31% density bonus is unreasonable. The record given for density bonus is 10%. She stated that as far as she can see the only justification for density bonus at this point is the 68 acres for a park, which is half un-buildable and paving of the road. She noted that the road will probably have to be paved anyway.

Ms. Williams questioned if the developer is proposing to make the road improvements indicated on page 4, item 4 of the McKenna Associates, Inc. letter. Mr. Bennett responded that the traffic study had to be revised for some things that were happening further up Ten Mile Road. He noted that the recommendations came back before they could get the changes on the plans in time for this meeting. He stated that they would make the improvements subject to the Road Commission's approval.

Mr. Bisio stated that they have a real problem with traffic on Ten Mile Road. Mr. Hemker stated that with an additional 31% of homes, it would put that much more traffic on the roads.

Mr. Barber discussed the possibility of another entrance out onto Nine Mile Road. He felt that this would relieve a lot of the traffic out onto Ten Mile Road. Mr. Bennett stated that there is a lot of wetlands in this particular area and it would be very difficult to put an additional entrance.

Mr. Bisio stated that he likes the lot sizes. He questioned what the price range would be for the homes. Mr. Goldberg responded that they would probably sell in at the starting point of \$300,000 to \$350,000. Mr. Bisio questioned if the homes would be 50% or more brick with side entry garages. Mr. Goldberg responded that they would probably mostly brick with some type of hardi-plank siding. There would not be any vinyl siding.

Mr. Goldberg stated that according to his calculations they have over 145 acres of open space. This still leaves 100 acres that is not wetland. He stated that it might be integrated along wetlands. Mr. Bennett stated that since the wetland issue is a big issue, they could do an overlay for the combined area of the wetlands. He further discussed the wetland areas.

Brandon Rogers briefly addressed the sections of the Master Plan that the developer feels that they have addressed.

Mr. Bisio questioned how many homes could be built on the 68 acres that it intended to be donated to the Township as a park. Mr. Goldberg indicated that they could build, using the cluster option, 29 clustered units. Mr. Bisio questioned how many acres of the donated land is actually wetlands. Mr. Bennett responded that the site is 68 acres of which 27 acres are wetlands and the remaining acres are uplands.

Ms. James noted that the railroad tracks in this section are very heavily used by freight trains at all hours of the day. She questioned if this area would even be buildable because of this.

Mr. Bennett stated that if they were to develop this area, they would use the 29 lots as a base density. He stated that they would not develop all the way to the back, they would do a cluster option of attached condominiums. Ms. James stated that the R-1.0 zoning does not allow for condominiums. Mr. Bennett stated that the R-1.0 zoning does allow for a cluster option, which is what they would propose.

Ms. James questioned why the developer wants to donate 68 acres to the Township. Mr. Goldberg stated that they are here to present a plan that provides some benefits to the Township. He noted that their studies have shown that the Township does not have a lot of park area in this section of the Township. He stated that it does not make for a better development to have all the land used. He stated that there is a cost savings in clustering, but it would not be such a savings that would make the project undoable.

Mr. Goldberg stated that there a lot of additional costs in this site that would not necessarily be there in a regular development. He explained what he feels that these costs are. He stated that the Commission should not just look at the site plan and see 31% density bonus, they should look at what they are trying to do. He felt that this is a good start for the first time being here. He stated that they are willing to talk and work with the Township. He stated that they have heard everything that was said tonight, they will revise their plan and come back for another go around.

Ms. James stated that if they give a density bonus for donation of wetlands, then they will have a line out the door because every developer will want the same thing. Mr. Goldberg stated that, other than Quadrants, only they can offer the first half mile of Milford Road. Mr. Crook stated that this is where the developer earned the 10% right off the bat. He stated that to him, this is the only single most important thing of this project. Mr. Goldberg stated that this is one of the main reasons they went with the PD process.

Mr. Crook stated that they have to answer to the residents of the Township and they have to be able to justify 30%. He stated that what the residents are going to hear and read in the paper is 30% and off go the Commission's heads. Mr. Goldberg stated that he totally understands this. He stated that this is why they are going to come back and show the economics of what a 10% increase does and what the economics of a 30% increase does. He stated that they will also show what types of things they can do with a 10% increase and with a 30% increase. He stated that the constituents will then understand that a developer is not just getting 21%, that they are incurring "x" amount of dollars of additional costs in order to obtain this. He stated that at the end of the day, it turns out not to be that great of a benefit for the developer, but they do get a more unified plan.

Mr. Crook stated that there is a lot going for the plan. Mr. Barber stated that paving Nine Mile Road is real important.

Rick Rosen, Aspen Group, discussed the zoning of the surrounding properties. Mr. Bennett stated that everything around them is zoned R-1.0, except for the other side. There is Cattails, which is also zoned R-1.0. He stated that west of the park piece is industrial zoning. There is a mobile home park to the south of this.

Mr. Rosen stated that it is a concern to them to preserve the wetlands. He stated that the wetlands are a benefit to homeowners. It can be made as an amenity.

Mr. Soper questioned if there would be 10' wide sidewalks. Mr. Doozan responded that 10' bike paths would be 5' wide sidewalks within the development. The 10' wide sidewalks would be along the main roads.

Mr. Soper stated that he was impressed with what is laid out. He stated that he would like to see less density. He stated that he does feel that the developer has done a good job. He stated that with regard to the park, this is a benefit for both the developer and the Township. He noted that the developer does not have to put in the road infrastructure in this area and by moving the homes to another area, it saves them money. He stated that overall, he feels that this is good, but would like to see less density.

Mr. Bisio questioned who the developer usually uses as their builder. Mr. Goldberg responded that they have used Pulte Homes, Gary Kadian Homes, Ivanhoe-Huntley and several others.

Mr. Goldberg stated that they want to work with the Township. They want to create something that everybody is happy with. They don't want to spend their time and effort going in the wrong direction.

This was a conceptual review, therefore, no formal action was taken on this issue.

Call for Public Hearing on AP-03-14, Community Business Rezoning Proposal, Hartford Equities, southwest corner of Napier and Ten Mile.

Ms. Masson-Minock stated that the only action that is needed is to schedule a public hearing for this issue. She noted that the earliest date for the public hearing would be June 9, 2003.

Mr. Soper questioned what is already on the agenda for June 9th. Ms. Masson-Minock responded that at this point, the issues would be Woodwind and Lyon Industrial Center, both of which were tabled. She noted that the next applicant, Rainbow Recreation, also calls for a public hearing and the earliest date would be June 9th, as well.

Mr. Crook made a motion to schedule a public hearing for AP-03-14, Hartford Equities for June 9, 2003. Mr. Barber supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
 Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

Call for Public Hearing on AP-03-11, Rainbow Recreation, site plan review and special land use, commercial building and warehouse, 53535 Grand River, southwest corner of Grand River and Haas Road.

Ms. Masson-Minock stated that they would also like to conceptually review the plan tonight for two reasons, one is to provide input to the applicant for the special land use hearing and also the applicant needs to go to the ZBA for a variance. She noted that before the applicant can go to the ZBA, they need to have conceptual review before the Planning Commission.

Ms. Masson-Minock stated that they did receive revised plans the day the Commissioner's packets went out, therefore, what was received in the packets, the review letter did not track. She noted that a number of items that were mentioned in the letter that was included in the packets have now been resolved.

Ms. James stated that the agenda tonight called for scheduling a public hearing so she never looked at the plans.

Mr. Hemker stated that the problem he sees is that some of the issues that are presented tonight and possibly resolved wouldn't be commented on at the public hearing. He felt that the public needs to be aware of everything that is talked about.

Mr. Doozan stated that the sequence they have always followed is that the public hearing is scheduled and the site plan is reviewed at that meeting. He stated that the applicant is anxious to get going with this project. He stated that they are entirely comfortable in doing this in the same sequence that they have always done it, schedule the public hearing and then review the site plan at the next meeting. He noted that Ms. Masson-Minock is ready to review this, if the Planning Commission wishes.

Mr. Hemker stated that he would prefer that they follow the regular sequence. He stated that all the Commissioners received the information in their packets but did not look at it because it was on the agenda only to schedule a public hearing. Mr. Soper noted that he did review the information.

John Sarkesian, Architect, stated that they have been working with Ms. Masson-Minock and with Mr. Doozan and were under the impression that they could submit for site plan review just like they would if there were no variances or special land use required and the separately submit for the special land use. He stated that the special land use is a separate issue. They would do the project whether or not they received the special land use. He stated that they did not realize until they

received the documents back from the Planner that this was only going to be on the agenda to schedule a public hearing and that the two would be tied together. He stated that they have responded to all of the review comments and have resubmitted.

Mr. Hemker stated that none of the Commissioners are ready to review this for site plan approval.

Mr. Sarkesian stated that the reason this is time sensitive is because of the nature of the business. It is a seasonal business. He stated that his client would like to operational for the next season of selling playscapes.

Mr. Hemker stated that in all fairness to the applicant and the public to have a full presentation tonight and the Commissioners not having a chance to review the information, this would most likely get tabled. He stated that if this is going to be tabled anyway, then why shouldn't they follow the same protocol as they always have in the past.

Mr. Bisio questioned the fence area and what has to go before the ZBA. Mr. Doozan responded that the applicant has to get a variance for this. He stated that the sequence that they follow on this is that the issue has to come before the Planning Commission and be tabled and then the applicant would have the ability to go before the ZBA. He noted that the applicant should have their variance in place so that the Planning Commission can deal with this all at the same time.

Mr. Soper made a motion to schedule a public hearing for AP-03-11, Rainbow Recreation for June 9, 2003. Ms. Williams supported the motion.

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

Motion approved.

The Commissioners commented on the color rendering of the building. They felt that it was a very nice building.

Mr. Soper made a motion to table AP-03-11, Rainbow Recreation, until June 9, 2003. Mr. Bisio supported the motion.

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

Motion approved.

AP-03-18, Chili's Restaurant, site plan review, commercial building, Lyon Towne Center, Milford Road, south of Interstate 96.

Mr. Doozan reviewed the comments indicated in the April 28, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter with regard to the site plan review for Chili's Restaurant which will be located in the Lyon Towne Center.

Robert Van, Brinker International, stated that Brinker International is the company that owns and operates Chili's Restaurants. He stated that the sign issue will not be a problem, they will make sure that they meet the 100 square foot requirement. He discussed the north façade of the building. He stated that the elevation is typical of a Chili's Restaurant, although they don't do many that are 100% brick. He noted that the north façade is an all brick façade. He stated that they can accommodate by adding more landscaping on this side.

Mr. Bisio questioned the large pepper that is indicated to be on the building. Mr. Van responded that the pepper is Chili's trademark. He stated that typically they locate the pepper, which is three dimensional, over the entry to the restaurant. The Ordinance requires it to be flush to the building. He stated that if the pepper gets counted toward their square footage signage requirement for signs, then it will probably have to go away. He stated that they would hate to see this happen because it is their trademark. He noted that they don't usually have signage on

the rear of the building, but because of where they are located they felt it was necessary.

Mr. Hemker stated that he would like to have the north elevation look better because everybody driving by on I-96 will see this elevation. Mr. Van stated that it is all brick and will be heavily landscaped.

Mr. Soper stated that he felt that this is a nice building, all sides look finished.

Mr. Crook asked Mr. Van if he has any problems with the recommendation from the Planner. Mr. Van responded that they do not. He stated that they have not yet received final approval from the Township Engineer, but they have received comments and have responded to them.

Mr. Hemker asked Tony Antone, Kojaian, how close the color of the brick and the roof are to Bank One next door. Mr. Antone responded that this is a much darker brick.

Mr. Soper questioned if they are going to see a lot of different types and different colors of roofs in Lyon Towne Center. Mr. Antone responded that they will probably see a lot of different types but not a lot of different colors. He stated that each unit will have their own corporate identity.

Mr. Barber questioned if they have a liquor license. Mr. Van responded that they will sell beer, wine and liquor. They are in the process of getting their liquor license.

There was brief discussion with regard to the signage. Mr. Soper questioned if the applicant would have to get a variance if the pepper put them over the signage requirements. Mr. Doozan stated that the signs are okay.

Mr. Hemker questioned the "To Go" boxes. Mr. Van explained how the boxes would be installed and what they are used for. Mr. Hemker questioned if these boxes are used at other locations. Mr. Van responded that they are.

Mr. Hemker questioned the hours of operation. Mr. Van responded that they open at 11:00 AM every day and close at 11:00 PM Monday through Thursday. They are close at 12:00 on Friday and Saturday at most locations. He noted that they have some locations that are open until 2:00 AM on Friday and Saturday. He stated that he is not sure what they will do at this location.

Mr. Crook made a motion to approve the site plan for AP-03-18, Chili's Restaurant, provided the recommendations in the April 28, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter are met with the addition of a number 4, which is that an evergreen hedgerow be planted on the north side. Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
 Nays: None

Motion approved.

Revisions to the Zoning Ordinance Regarding Performance Guarantees

Mr. Doozan reviewed the comments indicated in the May 5, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter. He stated that if the Planning Commission agrees with the changes, then a public hearing should be scheduled.

Mr. Soper made a motion to schedule a public hearing for June 9, 2003 for the revisions to the Zoning Ordinance Regarding Performance Guarantees. Mr. Barber supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
 Nays: None

Motion approved.

8. ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Hemker adjourned the meeting at 9:30 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Deby Cothery

Deby Cothery
Recording Secretary