

Charter Township of Lyon  
Planning Commission  
Meeting Minutes  
October 24, 2016

Approved: November 14, 2016

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Conflitti at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call: Patricia Carcone, Board Liaison  
Jim Chuck  
Michael Conflitti, Chairman  
Kris Enlow, Secretary  
Stephan Hoffman  
Kurt Radke  
Carl Towne, Vice-Chairman

Guests: 17 +

Also Present: Leann Kimberlin, Township Attorney  
Chris Doozan, McKenna Associates  
Leslie Zawada, Civil Engineering Solutions

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**Motion by Chuck, second by Towne  
To approve the agenda as presented.**

**Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous  
Nays: None**

**MOTION APPROVED**

**APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA**

**A. Approval of the October 11, 2016 Minutes**

**Motion by Towne, second by Chuck  
To approve the minutes of October 11, 2016 as presented.**

**Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous  
Nays: None**

**MOTION APPROVED**

**COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

**Resident** – She asked if she can comment on an agenda item since there is no public

comment for agenda items on the agenda.

**DDA REPORT** – None

**PUBLIC HEARINGS - None**

1. **AP-14-56, Devonshire PD – Final Review. Property located on the north side of 8 Mile Road, west of Napier Road. Final review of a proposed single-family residential development consisting of 84 homes on 71.44 acres.**

**Representing Devonshire PD: Dan LeClair  
Bruce Michael  
Jim Allen**

Mr. Doozan reviewed the McKenna Associates memo dated October 12, 2016. Based on their review of the revised plan, the following observations were made:

1. Compared to the preliminary plan, the layout of the development is unchanged.
2. The landscape plan calls for evergreen plantings along both sides of the Emsley parcel on Eight Mile Road.
3. Amenities for residents include a park with a play structure, play field, and seating area in the south part to the development. A detail of the proposed play structure is on sheet L-3. For clarification, benches must be labeled on sheets 5, 6 and L-1, and a detail of the benches must be provided.
4. The Architectural and Site Design Guidelines on sheet 21 must be updated to match the information submitted on October 4.
5. Note 4 on sheet 11 indicate that “The plans for the off-site water & sewer shall be reviewed & approved prior to execution of the final PD Agreement. The off-site plans shall be included as part of the final PD submittal.” No such plans have been included in the plan set.
6. Sheets 9 and 10 contain a note regarding the “Natural Features Setback.” The meaning of this note is not clear. There are no provisions in the zoning ordinance that would allow a 20-foot reduction in the wetlands buffer.
7. Note 1 on sheet 1 must be revised to indicate 84 units.
8. Note 11 on sheet 1 must be revised to indicate that the subject property is designated Single Family Residential C on the Future Land Use Map.

It was recommended that the Planning Commission recommend approval of the final planned development plan to the Township Board, subject to the revisions outlined in this letter, and subject to any revisions called for by the Township Engineer or Township Attorney.

Ms. Zawada referenced the CES memo dated October 18, 2016. The following comments were mentioned:

**Regarding the Agreement:**

1. Page 8, 10.e., please note that this deposit shall be made prior to a pre-

- construction meeting for Phase 1.
2. Page 8, 13.e, please add the following language at the end of the paragraph: “Only the developers who are part of the Memorandum of Understanding will be responsible for the Oakland County share of the Drain improvements and the Devonshire developer will pay their pro-rata share of the Oakland County portion of the costs of that improvement.
3. Page 8, Section 13.d – Please add the following language to the end of the paragraph: “Building Permits for the individual homes will not be issued until the off-site sanitary sewer and water main are constructed and accepted by the Township.

Regarding the Memorandum of Understanding:

1. The date in paragraph 9 has to be revised and the Memorandum re-executed prior to the execution of the Final PD.

Regarding the Final PD Plans:

1. Detailed engineering review and approval is required prior to the commencement of construction.
2. The right of way from ITC for the section of road through their property that will connect to the proposed Windridge PD will be required prior to scheduling a pre-construction meeting for Phase 1.
3. Fire Department approval is required.
4. The exact configuration of water main, sanitary sewers and storm sewers will be reviewed during detailed engineering review and the applicant has noted this on the plans.
5. An offsite extension of public water and sanitary sewer will be required for this project as part of a five-property consortium. The plans for the off-site water and sewer shall be reviewed and approved prior to execution of a final PD Agreement. The off-site plans shall be included as part of the final PD submittal and the applicant has noted this on the plans.
6. Approval from the MDEQ shall be required for this development for work in regulated wetlands.

The additional items will be addressed during detailed engineering review.

Ms. Kimberlin referenced her memo dated October 17, 2016 which has comments regarding the Planned Development Agreement. She also noted as delineated on sheet 25 of the PD Plans, 14.57 acres have been designated as a wetland conservancy area to be donated to a land conservancy or the MDEQ. Item 6 of the PD Agreement requires that the Association maintain vacant common areas in perpetuity, but the Agreement does not include the requirement for donation of the land to a conservancy or the MDEQ, so this must be addressed. Also, item 7(b), page 5 – this section allows the Developer to transfer responsibility for installation of the sidewalk immediately adjacent to a unit to the builder of each unit. It should be confirmed whether this provision is desired for this particular development, as well as being a common provision for other developments. Item 27(a) regarding sidewalks may require revisions.

Mr. Conflitti asked for further clarification regarding item #6 in the McKenna Associates memo. Mr. Doozan explained it is confusing and needs some more explanation.

Mr. LeClair commented regarding item #6 that those areas are proposed crossings of the wetlands. In order to meet the ordinance requirements and maintain a 25' setback they would have to fill the wetland 25' out to build the road. The roadway cannot be within the influence of the 25' setback. It would require them to fill more wetland than what they would want to. The wetlands that they are proposing include keeping that wetland narrower. They are trying to minimize the disturbance of the wetland areas by pulling the clearing limits back. As part of the DEQ they are putting a conservation easement in. The plans look essentially the same, some of the comments pertained to the landscaping before, and they are going to add more landscaping along the Emsley's property.

Treasurer Carcone stated that the Board wants a connection between the two properties and to make sure that the Emsley property was properly screened. Mr. LeClair stated the area is about 350' between the two properties and the location where there could be a crossing will also have sanitary sewer and water main. Early on, they did have a few layouts with a road connection, and that was a sticking point with the Planning Commission. He commented that there is the ITC Park on the north side. Treasurer Carcone stated that park is not in the Township, and they would have no jurisdiction about that park.

Mr. LeClair explained the Conservation Easement will be dedicated to the MDEQ.

Mr. Enlow questioned how Riverwood was handled in regards to the wetland crossing. Mr. Doozan stated it's the same situation that they have here. In that case, the road went through the wetland and there is wetland on either side of the road without having the 25' buffer. Ms. Zawada stated in some cases they can have a sidewalk only on one side of the road to lessen the impact.

Mr. Hoffman stated that regardless of a connection it would be a minor connection and he suggested putting another play structure on the north side and save the wetland area. It's never going to feel like one sub no matter what they do.

Mr. Enlow suggested having a boardwalk connection with an observation deck and work the easement around it.

Mr. Radke commented that the ITC Park is a fantastic park, and he felt that the people in the north side would utilize it.

Mr. Chuck stated there is a bigger picture; it goes beyond where there will be recreational activities, it is a sense of belonging and connectivity. Mr. LeClair stated a boardwalk can be constructed, but they are always concerned with the maintenance of those structures. They would agree to do that if that was something the Planning Commission wanted.

Mr. Towne commented that the Township Engineer is against boardwalks. They have looked at this project for a 1.5 years and now are in the final stages. He would rather preserve the wetlands. Mr. LeClair stated that the one acre of wetland that will be filled are a lot of little areas that coincide with the roadway.

Mr. Conflitti agreed with Mr. Towne and Mr. Hoffman that preserving the wetlands is very important and that Ms. Zawada has said she is against boardwalks. The ITC Park is across the street.

Ms. Zawada stated her preference would be a surface connection, asphalt or gravel, it's much cheaper to replace than boardwalks are.

Treasurer Carcone stated this is one subdivision and if she was paying homeowners dues and she couldn't use that play structure without driving to it, she would be upset. Mr. Chuck liked Ms. Zawada's idea and if there is a way to do it he felt it would be a good thing so there is a connection.

Mr. LeClair stated that this is the opportunity as they are developing the annual costs with the association, obviously there is the initial cost of installing a boardwalk or pathway, but the annual maintenance is something they could contemplate. There is an extremely large amount of water coming through there, he would rather see a boardwalk rather than fill it in so the water can get through. It would be his preference to do a boardwalk. As long as the residents know it's there and they replace a few boards every year the maintenance cost will be minimal.

**Motion by Chuck, second by Hoffman**

**To recommend approval of AP-14-56, Devonshire PD – Final Review. Property located on the north side of 8 Mile Road, west of Napier Road contingent upon the CES memo dated 10/18/16, the McKenna Associates memo dated 10/12/16 and the Attorney memo dated 10/17/16.**

**Stephen Emsley, 51824 Eight Mile** – Mr. Emsley stated one of the bigger issues about the separation is that the PD ordinance states that the open space needs to be contiguous and accessible. The distance is over 1 mile between the two properties. Essentially, these are 2 separate subdivisions. He felt they are putting the cart before the horse. He asked where is the actual agreement is from ITC? The applicant has submitted to the DEQ, but a public hearing has not been held yet. It says on their own document on Page 1 item 20 that they need a DEQ permit prior to the Planning Commission recommending approval. When you look at why they don't want to touch the actual wetlands and you hear the number .98 acres, it's because 1 acre is a trigger threshold. So of course they need to reduce on the protected wetlands and keep it under 1 acre, or they will face additional scrutiny and possibly the EPA. He pointed out the 3 detention ponds that look like greenspace on the plans. They have no ITC agreement, no MDEQ permit, nothing from the Water Resource Commission; they have nothing. He could not see any real plan to buffer his property. The Planning Commission wanted the conservation easement delineated prior to approval. The Drain Commission did not guarantee how it will be paid. It's being split between 3 counties, and they could not promise that he would get an SAD on his property. This is also a FEMA floodplain, and there has been no documentation that FEMA will change that. RCOC recommended a left turn lane to protect traffic on 8 Mile and his family. You are missing so much critical data; there is nothing here. His property is 700' long, 20 trees won't do anything. It needs to be tabled until these answers are provided with the connectivity, he has no doubt this will be approved eventually, but it needs to be done right. The property cost nil because it was tough.

Ms. Kimberlin explained as part of the PD, it is contiguous land; there is no issue with that. She questioned when the approvals from the MDEQ will be in. Mr. LeClair stated right now they are in the preliminary stage of the development and have submitted the offsite utilities. The wetland permit has gone to the MDEQ and will go through their process and develop a conservation easement and will be part of the wetland permit. Ms. Zawada stated that she has continuously stated she will not allow this project to move forward without this information. Mr. LeClair noted the wetland permit can be amended for the boardwalk. Ms. Zawada stated that the risk is on the applicant. If they can't get something, then a PD Amendment will be needed. If they can't get the ITC Agreement, then this plan would come back before the Planning Commission and the Board.

Mr. Enlow stated that item 11 in the PD Agreement needs to be re-worded. If they don't get the connection, then they are way over the 660' feet of a maximum dead end cul-de-sac. He has learned from past experience that the further along we get, the harder it is to get plans changed. Ms. Kimberlin stated she thought that verbiage of "unfeasible" could be removed. They could reword it to say they either get the connection or they come back.

Mr. Emsley commented that the Township has never come to him to get this easement for water and sewer. They offered to extend water and sewer to his property, but no one has come to him for an easement. Ms. Zawada explained there are numerous easements to obtain, but she will not do that until the plan is approved.

Treasurer Carcone briefly explained the sump drain meeting she attended. The developers said they would pay for it.

Mr. Conflitti questioned the left turn lane. Ms. Zawada explained if the Road Commission deems a left had turn lane is a requirement, then it will be a requirement. Mr. Emsley commented it was a recommendation, item number 7.

Mr. LeClair stated he looked at sheet 9 and it will be part of the requirement for them to get a road permit from the Road Commission and all the details will come through when they submit, drainage, and traffic, and that will come through that process.

Mr. Enlow questioned if there is a left turn lane. Mr. LeClair stated whether it's a left turn lane or a passing lane, they are still going through that process. If it's required, they will do a left turn lane.

Ms. Zawada stated the roads are under the jurisdiction of the Road Commission, she thinks their approval should be tied to the permit approval; it's up to the Road Commission. Ms. Zawada stated they haven't gone through their whole review with the Road Commission, so she didn't know how quickly there would be an answer. If the Road Commission is recommending it, her hunch would be that the developer would have to put in a left turn lane.

Ms. Zawada suggested adding language to the PD Agreement that says "along the road frontages of 8 Mile and Napier as well." Mr. Doozan stated he would add that language.

Mr. Towne stated that he didn't think the crossing was needed. There was discussion regarding the boardwalk location. An 8' boardwalk was agreed upon. Mr. LeClair explained there will be a concrete walk way up to the boardwalk and after the boardwalk. He showed the Commissioners where he felt the best location would be that would be the least harmful to the wetlands. The Commissioners agreed with the location.

**Mr. Chuck added to his motion that an 8ft. boardwalk between lots 24 and the cul-de-sac on Exmoor Court will be constructed with concrete bollards at the ends, for further protection. Mr. Hoffman continued support of the motion.**

Mr. LeClair explained the county drain project. He stated that these developers all understand there is a fix. If the number is too high that comes back, they would end up having to do it as a private project instead of through the County Drain Board. They understand there is a problem out there.

Mr. Michaels stated that the ultimate number for water and sewer will come in at a similar number that they have already seen; they are not going in completely blind. Ms. Zawada stated that the developer will pay their pro rata share of the Oakland County portion.

**Roll Call Vote:     Ayes: 6  
                          Nays: 1 (Enlow)**

### **MOTION APPROVED**

Mr. Enlow noted that he voted no because he didn't feel comfortable with so many outstanding issues.

- 2. AP-14-57, Shadow Wood PD – Final Review. Property located on the northwest corner of 8 mile Road and Chubb Road. Final review of a proposed single-family residential development consisting of 133 homes on 76.92 acres.**

Mr. Doozan reviewed the McKenna Associates memo dated October 6, 2016. Based on the review of the revised plans, the following observations were made:

1. The reviewed plan provides for 8 fewer lots than proposed on the preliminary plan, resulting in 133 lots, which is consistent with the number shown on the parallel plan, and is consistent with the number approved by the Township Board on December 7, 2015.
2. The development layout is basically unchanged, compared to the preliminary plan layout.
3. Fifteen acres of suitable open space are provided, which complies with Ordinance requirements.
4. The reviewed plan preserves more of the wooded area in the northwest part of the development, compared to the preliminary plan.

Mr. Doozan explained that the applicant has strived to address the concerns of the Planning Commission and Township Board. Consequently, it was recommended that the Planning Commission recommend final approval of the plan for Shadow Wood Planned Development subject to the following conditions:

1. Subdivision entranceway signage shall be subject to administrative review and approval.
2. The plans and Planned Development Agreement are subject to approval by the Township Engineer and Township Attorney.

Ms. Zawada referenced the CES memo dated 10/18/16. She had the following comments:

#### Regarding the Agreement

1. Page 8, Section 12.d – Please add the following language to the end of the paragraph: “Building Permits for the individual homes will not be issued until the off-site sanitary sewer and a water main are constructed and accepted by the Township.
2. Page 8, Section 12 – a subsection shall be added to address the improvements to the Sump Drain. That paragraph shall read as:
  - a. Repairs to Intercounty Sump Drain. Developer and other developers are working with the Intercounty Drain Commission to cause certain repairs and improvements to be made to the Intercounty Sump Drain. If the Developer desires to commence construction of drainage facility in Shadow Wood prior to the marking of such repairs and improvements, such construction shall be at the Developer’s own risk. The Developer shall pay its pro-rata share of the Intercounty Sump Drain repairs and improvements as determined by the Oakland County Water Resources Commissioner. The township will require that the Developers pro-rata share of the Sump Drain improvement funding be deposited into an escrow account at the Township prior to the issuance of building permits for any phase of the Planned Development. Only the developers who are part of the Memorandum of Understanding will be responsible of the Oakland Count share of the Drain improvements and the Shadow Wood developer will pay their pro-rata share of the Oakland County portion of the costs of that improvement.

#### Regarding the Memorandum of Understanding

1. The date in paragraph 9 has to be revised and the Memorandum re-executed prior to the execution of the Final PD

Detailed engineering review and approval is required prior to the commencement of any construction.

Ms. Kimberlin referenced her memo dated 10/17/16. Her concerns are with the Planned Development Agreement and item 8(b), page 6 – the front yard setback of 25 ft. should be confirmed.

Mr. Towne stated they talked about the garage being 5' forward, this was discussed at length. Mr. Towne commented that this project is really nice, it turned out well.

Mr. LeClair explained this project has gone through quite a bit of scrutiny. They went to the Township Board last December, and the Board was uncomfortable with the 5% density bonus. They took the lot count down from 144 to 133 lots. There were some large costs with this project, mainly the paving of Chubb Road. The roadway network was basically the same, and the lots were enlarged and should not encroach into the side yard setbacks. He noted with 95' lots, there is plenty of room to put side entry garages. He provided a brief PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Hoffman questioned if these are the same floor plans and elevations that they are planning on building. If so, it's a concern because this will be the 4<sup>th</sup> subdivision with the same plans. He commented that 2 story arches aren't done anymore, and he would hate to see South Lyon have the same floor plans. He would behoove anyone to add variety and a different style.

Mr. Enlow stated he liked the reduction of lots and the expansion of lots. He is leery of the northwest corner with the detention basin and the heavily wooded area, the homes there will be 24' higher than the high water mark on those ponds. He would prefer the wooded areas be saved, but they are getting less density. The realignment of Chubb Road is his favorite public benefit. However, some items listed are not a public benefit. He felt some of those were embellished.

Mr. Radke asked that the architecture be addressed. Mr. Healy commented that the plans that were on the prints are a few years old. They do update them and they custom build about 1/3 of their homes. He agreed that taste changes and coming up with new floor plans is a smart idea. Mr. Hoffman commented on the architecture.

**Motion by Radke, second by Chuck**

**To recommend final approval to the Township Board based on the McKenna Associates memo dated 10/6/16, the Attorney memo 10/17/16 and the CES memo dated 10/18/16.**

**Roll Call Vote:      Ayes: Unanimous  
                             Nays: None**

**MOTION APPROVED**

- 3. AP-15-61, Rathmor Park III PD Final Review. Property located on the west side of Napier Road, north of 10 Mile Road. Final review of a proposed planned development consisting of 50 single family homes on 41 acres.**

**Representing Rathmor Park:      Randy Wertheimer  
   Andrew Milia  
   Whitney Findlay**

Mr. Doozan reviewed the McKenna Associates memo dated October 14, 2016. Since there has been no change to the layout or number of units compared to the preliminary

plan, which was approved by both the Planning Commission and Township Board, it was recommended that the Planning Commission recommend final plan approval for Rathmor Park III to the Township Board, subject to the following conditions:

1. The planned Development Agreement must be finalized upon receiving input from the developer, Township Engineer, and Township Attorney.
2. A tree survey and plan must be provided.
3. Approvals by the Township Engineer and Township Attorney are required.

Ms. Zawada referenced the CES memo dated October 17, 2016. She noted the following:

#### Final PD Plans

1. The water main loop will be required during phase 1.
2. The exact configuration of water main, sanitary sewers and storm sewers will be reviewed during detailed engineering review. Detailed engineering review and approval is required prior to the commencement of any construction.

#### Site Plan – Sheet 2

1. There is an existing DTE Easement shown to be vacated. Currently, this easement affects lots 17, 18, 19 and 20. This easement will be required to be vacated prior to the pre-construction meeting and if it cannot be vacated it would require a PD Amendment.

Ms. Kimberlin referenced her memo dated October 17, 2016 with comments referring to the Planned Development Agreement. She also noted item 5, pages 3-4 the following language should be added to the end of this section: “As shown on the Plans, the existing DTE Easement affecting units 17, 18, 19 and 20 shall be vacated prior to the pre-construction meeting. If such vacation is not possible, an amendment to this Agreement shall be required.” Also, on item 8(b), page 5 – Information about perimeter setbacks, not adjacent to the road should be provided: “along the perimeter, but not adjacent to a road; 40-ft., except that units 1-10 and 35-39 shall be subject to a 35-ft. setback.”

Mr. Wertheimer stated that nothing has changed with the plan.

Mr. Towne asked when the 2<sup>nd</sup> phase will begin. Mr. Wertheimer stated that they sold phase 2 to Pulte, but that they plan on starting phases 2 and 3 at the same time. He stated he is happy that there is a solution concerning the intersection and he felt that roundabouts are safer. He agreed that they wouldn't be asking for a Certificate of Occupancy in 2017.

Mr. Enlow stated he doesn't like the 52% density bonus. The public benefits increased, and that is appreciated. But he just can't do it with the density bonus.

#### **Motion by Radke, second by Towne**

**To recommend approval to the Board of AP-15-61, Rathmor Park II Final Review. Property located on the west side of Napier Road, north of 10 Mile Road based on the McKenna Associates memo dated 10/14/16, the Attorney memo dated 10/17/16 and the CES memo dated 10/17/16.**

**Voice Vote: Ayes: 6  
Nays: 1 (Enlow)**

**MOTION APPROVED**

**ADDITIONAL BUSINESS**

**4. Master Plan Discussion**

Mr. Doozan noted that there is a drafting error on the Future Land Use map in the 10 Mile and Milford Road area. He explained that the church in the northeast quadrant is actually on the parcel south of where it's shown on the map. Ms. Kimberlin did not think an amendment would be needed since in reality it's easy to tell that it's a graphing error, but she would want to verify.

An excerpt from the minutes dated June 22, 2015 was discussed. Mr. Doozan felt that the paragraph was confusing and he felt that the intent was that they were going to take the commercial away from Dandy Acres and leave the rest of it as commercial. He noted there were 4 or 5 times that the map came back to the Planning Commission and it was reviewed and every time. This adopted map was shown no changes were made. He is confident that this was the intent. He is confident that it was reviewed thoroughly over a series of several months.

Mr. Enlow stated he reads the minutes as keeping Dandy Acres as R-1.0 and the "L" shaped property as R-1.0. He does not recall making that potential commercial area larger than the CVS property across the street. Mr. Doozan stated he didn't think that was the intent because the map was modified. Each of those times, the map came back to the Planning Commission and there was never any discussion about the northeast corner of Ten Mile and Milford Road.

**Cathy Fucinari, 57235 Meadow Creek Circle South** – Ms. Fucinari did not hear when the northeast corner was changed from residential to commercial. When they signed their purchase agreement they looked at the map, and it was zoned residential in 2013. It's been changed since then, and it's her understanding that they are currently looking to do something like a CVS. Mr. Doozan stated there are two maps that they are looking at: the Future Land Use Map and the Zoning Map. She stated now that is going to change. She is concerned that if this is a habit, if they can't rely on the Master Plan being what it is. If they don't respect the Master Plan, she would have reconsidered her investment if it was commercial through there. She thinks it's a valid point, and people are concerned with it.

**Laura Williams, 56645 McKenzi Lane** – Ms. Williams does not see additional traffic studies or market analysis studies. She felt this is a dramatic change from no commercial to over 20 acres of commercial. When she read the Master Plan, the service nodes are to still be small nodes to serve the residents in the area. Going from 0 to 20 acres is a large change, unless there were analyses showing the need for that. Also, in the amendment talk about traffic on Ten Mile Road states no greater density. Yet to add 20 acres of commercial does not jibe with the intent of the plan. Was this a

mistake and confusion among themselves? It also states in the Master Plan that there is too much retail.

Mr. Towne commented that he also remembers that there was to be no commercial on the other side. The plan that was before them was with commercial on the corner and 17-20 houses. He thought the intent was to have a small node on the corner and rezone that on the Future Land Use map. The Planning Commission didn't even see it first; it went to the Board first and he found it very odd. Mr. Enlow stated he remembered the same, based on the discussion and knowing that they didn't want it to be a destination. He recalled it just being the first two pieces at the corner.

Mr. Doozan felt that a change of that proportion would need to be an amendment that would have to go through the entire process. Ms. Kimberlin stated if everyone is in agreement that this is not what they had agreed upon and it went through by mistake or this is not what they intended, then an amendment would be needed. Mr. Enlow stated that the minutes reflect what he remembers. Mr. Doozan felt that the minutes were confusing.

**Phil Crutchfield, 23556 Millwood** – Mr. Crutchfield was here at the public meeting. He moved from 7 Mile and Haggerty, and he was looking for an intersection that didn't remind him of where he came from. There seems to be a rush to rezone it, and he is not looking for a destination point this deep into the township. Please consider that.

Mr. Chuck stated he agreed with Mr. Towne and Mr. Enlow that there was 17 or 18 homes with some light commercial on the corner was the last plan that they saw. Mr. Conflitti also agreed. Treasurer Carcone agreed with the very corner to be commercial. The Commissioners also discussed and agreed that they do not want to extend commercial on the west side.

Ms. Kimberlin stated if what actually went through the process somehow slipped by, if that was not the intent, then it would need to go through a change.

The consensus was to have a draft map drawn up, and Mr. Doozan will bring it back and go from there.

**Chriss Roberts, 56645 McKenzi Lane** – Mr. Roberts applauded this; he also recalled that the corner would just have commercial. It's not his place, but they might consider the preacher's house to go commercial.

**Linda Dabiero, 24116 Meadow Creek Circle East** – Ms. Dabiero explained that she has a direct view to this intersection; she wanted to know the definition of light commercial. The traffic is crazy. There is other infrastructure that needs to be done before justifying any commercial going in. It's a crazy intersection with a lot of noise. She agreed with neighbors, that the benefit of living in the country is to drive up the road to get whatever you need and keep the area quiet. She questioned what drives their decision to change the Master Plan; how does that happen? She questioned how this map was in front of them for months and no one noticed until there was a public hearing 2 weeks ago. That's concerning as a resident.

Mr. Doozan confirmed that the Planning Commission agreed that there will be 1.33 acres of commercial along with the Parson's house as commercial and the rest Single Family Residential A. The Commission agreed.

### **COMMUNITY REPORTS**

Treasurer Carcone provided an update regarding a meeting she attended at the Sump Drain Committee. She reported that the rounding rate for the State is less than 1% this year, it will be .09 which is the multiplier for assessment. She also commented on Supervisor Lannie Young's upcoming retirement.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion by Towne, second by Enlow  
To adjourn the meeting at 9:56 p.m.**

**Voice Vote: Ayes:           Unanimous  
                  Nays:           None**

### **MOTION APPROVED**

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 9:56 p.m. due to no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Kellie Angelosanto*

Kellie Angelosanto  
Recording Secretary