

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF COMMERCE
****SPECIAL** PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Wednesday, September 16, 2015
2009 Township Drive
Commerce Township, Michigan 48390

CALL TO ORDER: Chairperson Haber, called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

ROLL CALL: Present: Larry Haber, Chairperson
Tom Jones, Vice Chairperson
Brian Winkler, Secretary
Bill McKeever
Jay Czarnecki
John Hindo
Russ Schinzing
Also Present: Amy Neary, Planning Consultant, McKenna Assoc.
Jason Mayer, Township Engineer, Giffels Webster
Mark Stacey, DDA Director
Susan Averbuch, DDA Member
Mike Labadie, Township Traffic Engineer
Randy Thomas, Insite Commercial

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Jones, supported by Czarnecki, to approve the Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes of August 3, 2015, with one correction on Page 1 to reflect the year 2015.

Discussion -

Jones discussed text on Page 4 regarding the setbacks and his statement that it was a "done deal". After discussion with Amy Neary, it was clarified that moving the setbacks was going to be a requirement of the petitioner. No changes were made to the minutes in this regard.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES

Chairperson Haber welcomed Russ Schinzing to the Planning Commission. Russ provided a brief summary of his background. He moved to Michigan in 2006, and into Commerce Township in 2010 where he started his business, an electronics remanufacturing company. After meeting with Tom Zoner, he had an interest in getting involved in the local community.

Bill McKeever – Zoning Board of Appeals

- Nothing to report.

John Hindo – Township Board of Trustees

- We had our second round of interviews yesterday for a potential new Planner. We interviewed 3 individuals.
- We are also working on the budget.

****Special** Planning Commission Meeting**

Brian Winkler – Downtown Development Authority

- I believe everybody received the minutes from the August DDA meeting.
- Aikens gave a presentation on Parcel B which is on the northeast corner of Martin Parkway and Pontiac Trail.
- GMA delivered their preliminary presentation on the Martin Parkway standards for signage, landscaping, et cetera.

Randy Thomas added that he and Mark Stacey would be back in front of the Planning Commission in the near future to provide an overview on the various stages of developments in the DDA area.

Amy Neary – Planning Department

- No comments.

PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None

>>Chairperson Haber suggested that Item 3 be reviewed prior to Items 1 and 2. There were no objections from the Commissioners.

ITEM 1: PSP15-0026 - BARRINGTON – TABLED FROM JULY 13, 2015

M. Shapiro Development Co., LLC of Farmington Hills MI is requesting site plan approval for a multiple family rental development located west off of the Martin Parkway, north of Pontiac Trail. Sidwell No.: 17-24-300-070 & 071

MOTION by Jones, supported by Czarnecki, to remove Item PSP15-0026 from the table. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Amy Neary, Planning Consultant, gave a review. The remaining items to be discussed on this matter are traffic issues, elevations, and open space maintenance plan which will be addressed between the Township Attorney and the applicant, and any approval would be subject to this agreement. Any approval would also need to include the additional parking spaces as previously discussed. Approval is recommended subject to those items being revised and the site plan being submitted and reviewed further administratively, as well as the other items identified in the letters of the other reviewers.

Jim Galbraith, M. Shapiro Group, 31550 Northwestern Hwy # 220, Farmington Hills, MI, was present to address the request. He delivered a presentation, reviewing the updates to the elevations since the last meeting. He handed out revised plans to the Commissioners and explained the efforts to avoid monotony, provide variation and avoid a cookie cutter appearance within the development. Jim discussed the continuity and variations in the three elevations of the ranch style 4-unit buildings. He reviewed the positioning of the alternating designs on the 50-acre site, the topography including the bog parcel with the wetland conservation easement and the boundaries of the project area, bordered by Welch Road and Martin Parkway.

****Special** Planning Commission Meeting**

Jim explained that some of the building concepts on the parcel were removed, at Amy's suggestion, as they were not part of the site plan that is currently being submitted for approval. He was still requesting that the approaches to that piece of land be approved and he has approval for the curb cuts from the RCOC. He continued his review, addressing access, parking, layout of the project in relation to the elevations, et cetera. He explained that the parking requirements are a bit skewed because much of the parking is interior within the 2-car garages.

Schinzing - Could you go back to the site plan where you've labeled the variations as A, B and C?

Jim Galbraith discussed the variations with Schinzing and clarified the pages in the packet that included the renderings.

Jim continued his review, highlighting the 6,000 square foot community building which includes the rental office, manager's office, maintenance garage, community meeting space, pool and fitness center. He discussed the open space maintenance requirements and questions that arose. This is required by the Overlay District. He and Amy will be reviewing this further, but a lot of the site will be subject to the wetland conservation easement. The south side will remain in a natural state, and the majority of the other space around the buildings, interior and perimeter, will be traditionally sodded, irrigated and landscaped. The open space maintenance agreement will be put together indicating that those items will be maintained accordingly.

Amy Neary noted that the entrance design will be subject to specific requirements. Jim Galbraith stated that the entrance has not yet been completed. He explained that they will continue to work with GMA and the DDA in this regard to coincide the design with the standards as they are developed to promote unified branding throughout the overall development of the DDA area. Therefore, these details would be worked out at a later date administratively.

Susan Averbuch inquired about ingress/egress and no-left turns. Jim Galbraith reviewed the circulation plans, including connection to Library Drive and preventing southbound to eastbound cut-thru traffic from Welch Road which was addressed with Mike Labadie, Traffic Engineer, and with the RCOC. The no-left turn will be signed accordingly. Discussions continued regarding the private internal roads for the project, stringent requirements for maintenance of the roadways to be built into the master deed, speed limits and other circulation related matters.

Chairperson Haber explained that although this was not a public hearing, he would allow time for a resident to inquire.

Linda (Cheers), 9095 Campbell Creek Drive, Commerce Township, MI - My question is, what kind of material are you going to use for the north boundary of the property? Will it be natural wooded area, or cinder block, or fencing of some kind?

Jim Galbraith explained that they would make every effort to preserve as much of the existing vegetation as possible in a natural state. He couldn't speak from a grading standpoint whether that area would be filled or not and he couldn't make any guarantees, however he noted that there would be significant landscaping along the boundary line and the setback is 50' from the parcel that is owned by the Walled Lake School District which runs between that line and Campbell Creek. He added that M. Shapiro is always sensitive to landscaping and encouraged Linda to look at the other properties in the area that they had developed as the same approach would be applied to this project.

Chairperson Haber inquired with Mark Stacey regarding the signage and branding of the DDA area. Mark explained that the DDA is working with GMA to put together a cohesive sign package for the entire district. The bridge design provides the springboard for the types of materials that will be seen on the project. GMA has been working now for about 60 days on developing their recommendations and they recently delivered a preliminary presentation. The goal is cohesiveness, similar high-end materials, building upon what is already there and expanding upon it. Discussion continued regarding the Wyncliff entrance, the branding concept, and leaving items such as lighting, signage, et cetera, to be administratively approved, in conjunction with the DDA, until the final decisions are made with GMA.

Chairperson Haber introduced Mike Labadie, Township Engineer. Mike Labadie reviewed the traffic study report. He had been asked to review the overall project in 2014 and he presented the findings. He noted that Jim Galbraith had reduced the anticipated number of units from the original 404 down to 300 and that was a major improvement for traffic. He spoke of the concerns with left-turn cut-thru traffic which have been addressed.

Mike stated that the Township and DDA have been gracious in conducting the overall traffic study on Martin Parkway as they attempt to forecast increasing demands and traffic planning management for the potential impacts. He addressed congestion issues, the creation of the roundabouts, the traffic patterns now in place, and the network that was designed in an attempt to accommodate these demands. The traffic patterns do not match what was originally predicted and this presents challenges. Future refinements and internal improvements will continue to be necessary. Open discussions continued regarding peak traffic periods and bottleneck issues along Union Lake Road.

Commission Comments:

Winkler - I think the petitioner did an excellent job of addressing the issues. He has offered sufficient variations as requested, along with responding to the other items as noted in the amended letter.

Schinzing - Nothing to add.

Jones - No comments.

****Special** Planning Commission Meeting**

Czarnecki - I'm good with the development and everything we asked has been addressed. Mike, as for the next phase in addressing the traffic issues, who determines when you will move forward?

Mike Labadie - The county owns everything as far as the roads, so that's kind of a difficult question. I don't want to speak for the RCOC, but one important thing about the study is that it is a big traffic model and that needs to look like it does during a peak hour. Whether or not they agree with the findings of what has been done so far remains to be determined. The Township needs to control its own destiny.

Czarnecki - So if this goes forward, will they do something about the roads or not?

Mike Labadie - Commerce Township is going to need support from the RCOC to do something about the bottleneck issues at Richardson and Union Lake Roads. More work will need to be done to determine how that can be resolved.

Hindo - I'm good.

McKeever - My question relates to approval of the curb cuts and approaches to that portion of the site that is not being developed, the site to the east. It seems a little unorthodox for us to approve this without the site plan for that portion. I would not vote to approve this part of the request. What if the developer changes in the future? Would we be locked into these?

Discussion took place regarding the curb cuts to the site which are permitted by the county. Jim Galbraith explained that he has agreed not to construct the approaches at this time; however, this is a critical element and he would not consider withdrawing that part of his request. If he is going to invest, he would have to have those approved also. The Commissioners discussed Jim's reasoning and why the access was important to him in the process, which was related to marketing of the property. Amy Neary noted that Jim would still return in the future with the site plan for approval, so that area would be reviewed again. Haber stated that there is a simple fact that if something would be built there, access would be needed. McKeever addressed encouraging shared access.

Chairperson Haber initiated discussions with Jim Galbraith. They addressed the design variations, mixing things up in the development, breaking up long expanses, side entry garages, access, the driveways, shared drives, visitor parking, additional staggering of the buildings and elevations, the water meter and sprinkler system, Fire Department access, and the proposed construction timeline.

Eric Nagler, 9065 Campbell Creek Drive, Commerce Township, MI commented on the traffic study. He discussed the morning and evening rush hours, issues along Welch road, and potential issues with the additional traffic stacking up as they turn at Welch road at this development. He expects this will impact the other subdivisions in the area along Welch Road also. He wondered if there would be a possibility for a stop sign at

****Special** Planning Commission Meeting**

the intersection, or anything that might alleviate some of the congestion. Mike Labadie responded and explained that more units in the area would be more cars and more trips, however he did not anticipate stacking would occur based upon the volumes that are there now. Discussions continued regarding ways to curtail certain traffic related issues, however, Haber clarified that there will be development and therefore there will be more cars. That's just the way it is and corrections will continue to be made as this is a work in progress. Eric Nagler appreciated that the Township is flexible and agreeable to continue re-evaluating the situation and is attempting to address the challenges ahead. Mike Labadie concluded that the Township has been doing a great job and actively going in the right direction, unlike many other communities who do not work proactively to address anticipated traffic concerns.

MOTION by Jones, supported by Czarnecki, that the Planning Commission **approves, with conditions**, PSP15-0026, Barrington, the request by M. Shapiro Development Co., LLC of Farmington Hills MI for site plan approval for a multiple family rental development located west off of the Martin Parkway, north of Pontiac Trail. Sidwell No.: 17-24-300-070 & 071.

Approval is for the reason that the information submitted by the applicant and the information presented to the Planning Commission demonstrates that the proposed meets the requirements and standards of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance.

Approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. The Planner's Report dated September 10, 2015.
2. Site plan must comply with the requirements of the Township Engineer and the Giffels Webster review dated June 23, 2015.
3. Landscape plan must comply with the requirements of the Township Landscape Architect and the Giffels Webster review dated June 22, 2015.
4. An open space maintenance plan must be provided to the satisfaction of the Township Attorney.
5. The number of parking spaces provided in excess of the maximum permitted are approved because they will not have an adverse impact on the site or adjacent properties and are reasonable based on the proposed use and design of the site.
6. Exterior lighting, entrance landscaping, and signage must meet the applicable requirements of the zoning ordinance and the design standards ultimately approved for the Towne Place project area. Detailed plans must be submitted to the Township for administrative review and approval.
7. The concrete pathway shall be extended along both sides of Library Drive.
8. Crosswalks should be constructed with textured stamped concrete or pavers.
9. All references to future building locations, parking, access drives, etc. have been left in the plans for the future commercial development portion along Martin Parkway as future development and it the applicant has agreed that he will not construct them at this time.
10. Building façade locations must be labeled on the site plan and distributed evenly throughout the development.
11. The review letters of Giffels Webster, the Commerce Township Fire Department and Fleis & Vandenbrink.

Discussion -

Haber - With regard to the concrete pathway, if they don't improve the site within 5 years, they would have to put the pathway in?

Amy Neary - Yes, the commercial site, because this is along the north part of the commercial property.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM 2: PSP15-0025 – TWIN ACRES GROUP – TABLED FROM JULY 13, 2015

Martin Smith representing the Twin Acres Group of Commerce MI is requesting approval for a façade change to an existing building located at 2605 East Oakley Park. Sidwell No.: 17-13-300-081 **REMAIN TABLED**

ITEM 3: PZ15-0007 – COMMERCE TOWNSHIP – TEXT AMENDMENT – PUBLIC HEARING

Charter Township of Commerce is requesting an amendment to the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance No. 3.000, Articles 9, 10, 11, 12 & 27 to amend and add residential dwelling design standards for all new single and two family residential developments.

Amy Neary, Planning Consultant, gave a review. She noted an exception on Page 7 of the report that deals with *dwelling units that were constructed in compliance with these regulations at the time of initial construction shall not be subject to these standards for any future building, addition, alteration or other structural modification*. That provision was to address the concern with what happens 10 or 20 years down the road, keeping track of this, enforcement, et cetera. As long as the initial development did not have a cookie cutter appearance, it would be in compliance.

Also included was the exception for new dwellings that are constructed in condos and subdivisions that were approved prior to this, so those would be exempt as well.

Vice Chairperson Jones discussed the text amendment with Jim Galbraith of Shapiro and asked for his feedback. Jim Galbraith felt that the stakeholders in the building industry were unaware of the text amendment. He recommended that it be tabled until developers could be contacted for their input prior to moving forward on this legislation to make subjective decisions on the design criteria. Amy Neary added that the text is not meant to be subjective. Although developments will need to meet the criteria, the actual design will not be decided by the Building Department.

Chairperson Haber opened the public hearing.

Randy Thomas, 3797 Carrie Lane, Commerce Township, MI - My first opportunity to review this was last Friday. I was trying to figure out the objective but I couldn't determine it. I know Amy was given some direction that it was to prevent cookie cutter homes or developments; however, I think there are better, more concise ways to do this than what's in this document. I'm in agreement with Jim. I think you should pause, really look at what's here and get feedback from developers because you're reacting to a market place. One example is Hunter Pasteur's development, Wyncliff, and by virtue

****Special** Planning Commission Meeting**

of what's written in here they may have to have 9 to 10 different models in a 37 home development. I'm not sure that's the intention of the directives that were given. There are also definitions in here that don't relate back to Article 2. They really need definitions, for example, silhouette is mentioned here and it needs context as to what it means in relation to this.

Lastly, as you look long-term on what's being decided today, when this board is not in here, I really think there is some element of subjectivity to this and from a continuity standpoint, I'm not sure it will stand the test of time. I'm also unsure how you can enforce or administrate it. There are some very good things in here, but I think we should listen to the market place, in particular the stakeholders as to how this would impact what they're doing today and things in the future. When there's a rush to judgment then the Ordinance will continue to get amended. Having the previous honor of sitting on this board, I think it would be prudent for everybody in the Township to pause and get some feedback before recommending or adopting it.

Randy Wertheimer, Hunter Pasteur Homes, 27351 Victoria Rd, Novi, MI - We are currently building the Wyncliff development, and we built Orchards of Commerce. In reading this, I share the sentiments that Jim and Randy shared. It seems to be an attempt to attack the issue with a broad stroke, and not all developments are the same. In the last 3 developments we've done, homes ranged in price from \$250,000 to \$550,000, and you can't have the same standards on these varying priced homes. Commerce Township does a nice job with diversity and it's one of the reasons people enjoy living here.

However, if a developer is building \$250,000 to \$350,000 homes, this document would suggest that 70% would require side entry garages, that doesn't work. Those would be 60' lots and what's wrong with front entry garages? It would be a very nice community. The higher priced homes could have a certain percentage of side entry garages, but it should be case by case to get the best out of every development.

Susan Averbuch, 9005 Campbell Creek Drive, Commerce Township, MI - I am here speaking as a resident. I have a great respect for the developers, but when we say stakeholders, I want to remind the Planning Commission and the Township Board that stakeholders are also the residents of Commerce Township. I know John is on the Township Board and they had asked for these types of standards so it's not just something that Amy has been asked to do; it's the sentiment of the Board over the past years. I know that there's economic restraints, but the residents have to look at the new communities. I recommend that everyone work together on this, the residents, DDA, Township Board and Planning Commission.

Brad Botham, Pinnacle Homes, 1668 Telegraph Rd. Ste. 200, Bloomfield Hills, MI - I agree with the gentlemen who've spoken and they've touched upon all the points that I was going to make. As a builder and a developer in Commerce Township, we would be more than willing to sit down and go over some things in this document to work out solutions for the builders, developers and the residents.

****Special** Planning Commission Meeting**

Chairperson Haber closed the public hearing as there were no additional questions or comments.

Commission Comments:

Haber - I don't think there's a problem with listening to the stakeholders on this. It's a good idea. It doesn't mean we necessarily have to agree with them, but I think we certainly should listen to them. I'm not sure how to reach out to all the stakeholders, but if there is a way to advertise it, I have no problem.

McKeever - No comments.

Hindo - I agree. I think there are some very good points in here made by everybody and we shouldn't rush through this. It would be a worthwhile effort to sit down and understand the concerns from the developers' perspectives and how to make this more beneficial to everybody, globally and for the community. Amy, you might have some suggestions as to how to coordinate a meeting with all of the developers and reach out to them. Randy Thomas probably knows everybody in town.

Amy Neary - I think maybe to start, we will reach out to the developers that are here as well as other residential developers in the community. We can do that administratively by giving them a draft of the Ordinance, then talk to them and see what their issues and concerns are. I can bring a summary of those to the next meeting and depending on what they are, there may be some additions to the language we're looking at.

Jones - The next meeting might be too soon.

Haber - You may want to advertise it too.

Amy Neary - We can put something in the paper. Just to clarify, this affects single-family and two-family only. This one isn't for multiple beyond two-family. Also to clarify, with the garage doors, the draft shows 70% could have a front entry garage, and 30% would need a variation.

Discussions continued regarding the impacts the text amendment would have upon existing and future developments.

Schinzinger - I appreciate the builders and there is a probability of issues. I would like to hear specifics of the problems that they see will arise, maybe even dollar amounts, et cetera.

Winkler - We've gone from Point A, which is the existing format, to Point C which is what we're looking at today. I think in line with what other Commissioners have said, we can find a happy medium in working with them.

Haber - I think there's some good points in this revision and I definitely think we should hear from the stakeholders. I would suggest that someone make a motion to table this

and that we instruct the Planning Department to contact as many people as we can to provide feedback. I would like to do this in one of our meetings and not in a closed session. I think people should be here and we can all listen to the comments.

Amy Neary - We can do that, but that doesn't give any opportunity to draft anything alternatively for you to consider at that meeting.

MOTION by Jones, supported by Winkler, to **table** Item PZ15-0007, Commerce Township Text Amendment, the request by the Charter Township of Commerce for an amendment to the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance No. 3.000, Articles 9, 10, 11, 12 & 27 to amend and add residential dwelling design standards for all new single and two family residential developments.

The item is tabled to allow for the Planning Department to contact as many stakeholders as possible so that the Planning Commission can receive adequate feedback from them regarding this matter.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM 4: PSP15-0029 – ALDI FOOD MARKET

Aldi Inc. of Webberville MI is requesting conceptual review of a site plan for a new Aldi Food Market located at 2155 Haggerty Road. Sidwell No.: 17-25-226-009

Amy Neary, Planning Consultant, gave a review.

Chris Grzenkowicz, Desine Inc, 2183 Pless Drive, Brighton, MI was present along with David Kapazanski, Developing Director for Aldi, 2625 N. Stockbridge Rd, Webberville, MI.

Chris Grzenkowicz delivered a presentation for the proposed Aldi store to be located on the 7-acre parcel at the southwest corner of Walnut and Haggerty Roads. The site is currently vacant, zoned B-3 and is in the Haggerty Corridor Overlay District. Chris reviewed the parking plan, which includes 85 spaces, modifications anticipated to the traffic signal with the RCOC, site access and circulation. He expressed their desire to preserve as many of the existing trees as possible along the west side of the property, although some would need to be removed to accommodate infrastructure. He addressed drainage in the natural, low area of the site. He reviewed lighting with LED fixtures, the unique Aldi cart corral storage which requires customers to insert a coin for a shopping cart, the masonry structure of the corral, the masonry exterior of the building, split faced block and limestone cap. He reviewed pilasters and other design features to break up the expansive wall. He presented views of the elevations, described the doors, canopies, the 75 square foot tower Aldi logo sign, truck well, loading dock and that the dumpster would be enclosed in the truck well. He addressed the 6' high masonry screening of the receiving area and that most of it would be located below grade.

Commission Comments:

Haber - Do you own the property?

Chris Grzenkowicz - We have it under contract.

McKeever - I'm fine with it. I appreciate everything that is being proposed and Amy has covered the items that need to be addressed.

Hindo - Nothing to add.

Czarnecki - 78 spaces are recommended and it sounds like you want 85. Would that overage be adjusted?

Haber - We have a lot of petitioners bank parking and you can use it later if you need it. We have had bad experiences in the past with a sea of blacktop, so you are encouraged to bank the extra spaces.

Jones - I don't have a problem with the additional 7 parking spaces. I will note one thing that we have had issues with Kroger over the years with their carts blocking access on the sidewalk. I would insist that you have adequate open sidewalk space without carts, huge containers of melons or other items blocking access.

Schinzing - Nothing to add. I'm excited to see this.

Winkler - It looks good. Amy's updated report lists on the back that the conceptual building appears as if it may meet the façade requirements. Does it meet them, Amy?

Amy Neary - Because the proposed is mostly masonry, it probably does; however, I would need the actual calculations before determining that.

Winkler - If you're satisfied then I am.

Amy Neary - My concern is with the design features of the roof, especially with the aesthetics of the sign. I would want to see the parapet higher to screen equipment and avoid having a wild west faux front.

Discussions ensued regarding the visibility of the building and roof from all sides of the building, the sight lines from grade in relation to the signage, screening of equipment, the potential for awkward proportionality if the parapet is moved higher. Haber agreed with Amy that it should be moved up. Winkler felt it was acceptable at the height proposed.

Haber encouraged the use of trash compactors as opposed to dumpsters; however, the petitioner stated that it would not fill up quickly enough. Discussion took place regarding the cart screening and corral design. Haber noted that the carts should not be seen visually, and they should not be in the parking lot. This must be kept clean. Chris explained the coin return policy again with the Aldi cart system. Haber also suggested incorporating additional windows, awnings and/or canopies to break up the building façade more.

****Special** Planning Commission Meeting**

David Kapazanski noted that some parking could be banked if necessary. Chris Grzenkowicz and David discussed the details of loading area at length as to screening, depth of the truck well, et cetera. Haber encouraged additional landscaping in that area for extra screening. It was noted that no trucks would be parked on site and the petitioners confirmed. David noted that everything is brought in from one distribution facility, and they do not have a lot of outside suppliers besides milk, Coca Cola and a weekly alcohol delivery. He also noted that there would not be any outside storage of any kind.

Chris Grzenkowicz addressed the pedestrian walkways. Haber noted that they are required.

Chris Grzenkowicz reiterated on the tower sign and parapet and elaborated upon the roof line, visibility of the building from all four sides, roof drains, wind loading, increased snow loading, et cetera. He distributed drawings to the Commissioners detailing the roof and parapet. He addressed the mechanical equipment, locations of the units and structural restrictions. David noted that they also have a special concentric heating unit that heats the floor and also coincides with the refrigeration system. Options for screening and signage were discussed at length. David wondered if the "box" could be brought back and made to appear like a second story office on top of the building. Chris also discussed the Zoning Ordinance as it relates to wall signage.

In closing, Haber discussed the expected construction timeline with the petitioners, which they anticipated would commence in 2016 if building permits are acquired by the end of 2015.

OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION

Amy Neary stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting scheduled for Thursday, September 24, 2015, will begin at 5:30pm for a special educational session which she will be conducting along with the Township Attorney. She invited the Commissioners to attend the session as it will be beneficial information for all boards to hear.

The next regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting will be MONDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2015 at 7:00pm.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Czarnecki, supported by McKeever, to adjourn the meeting at 8:58pm.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY



Brian Winkler, Secretary