

**FINAL
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF COMMERCE
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING**

Thursday, May 28, 2020

2009 Township Drive

Commerce Township, Michigan 48390

Due to Governor Whitmer's Executive Order to "Stay Home, Stay Safe", this meeting was held via Zoom, video conferencing technology.

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

ROLL CALL: Present:

Rusty Rosman, Chairperson
Robert Mistele, Secretary
Rick Sovel
Bill McKeever
Clarence Mills

Also Present:

David Campbell, Planning Director
Jay James, Engineer/Building Official
Paula Lankford, Assistant to the Planning Director
Ben Sebrowski, Director of Technology

Chairperson Rosman introduced the Members of the Board to those present, as well as Dave Campbell, Jay James, Paula Lankford and Ben Sebrowski. She reviewed the requirements for receiving a either a dimensional and/or sign variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals, including the fact that all standards are to be met by the applicant. She assured the applicants present that the sites of the proposed variances have been visited by the members of the Zoning Board. She also explained that if a petitioner's variance request is granted, they will receive their letter of approval by mail. It is imperative that the letter be presented when applying for a building permit. A variance is valid for 365 days from the date of the approval letter. If the variance is used, it runs with the land; however, if it is not used, it expires.

B. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

MOTION by Sovel, supported by Mills, to approve the Zoning Board of Appeals Regular Meeting Agenda for May 18, 2020, as presented.

Discussion -

Sovel – On the item that is being withdrawn, should there be a brand new 2020 item number for the revised request?

Dave Campbell – Paula and I discussed this. We thought giving it a new number might create confusion. We decided it made sense to maintain the same number.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Sovel, Mills, McKeever, Rosman, Mistele

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

MOTION by Mistele, supported by McKeever, to approve the Zoning Board of Appeals Special Meeting Minutes of January 23, 2019 as presented.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Mistele, McKeever, Sovel, Mills, Rosman

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION by Sovel, supported by Mills, to approve the Zoning Board of Appeals Regular Meeting Minutes of January 23, 2019 as presented.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Sovel, Mills, McKeever, Rosman, Mistele

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:

Dave Campbell – I would clarify, we are going to hold a public hearing specific to the petition for the proposed new house on Watuga.

This is an opportunity for the public to comment on anything that is not on our agenda.

E. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES IN COMMERCE TOWNSHIP:

Rick Sovel – Township Board & Library

- I missed the first meeting we had two months ago, I was under quarantine and I was not allowed to attend the Board Meeting. Then, we had a Zoom meeting.
- I know we have limited facilities right now. We're making progress on getting things opened.
- We did approve various forms of technology and prevention type items for the Library for social distancing. Obviously the Library is an issue and a concern as to how we can deal with the books.
- The Board did make somewhat of an emergency purchase for the brand new Library building to put in a drive-through window so that people will be able to pick-up books.

Jay James – I met with a couple contractors at the Library today. They're going to get me bids next week. We will order the windows and it takes two weeks for delivery. The drawer might be an additional week. I'm hoping before the end of June we should have the window open.

Rosman – Very nice. I'd like to interject. I met the new Librarian when I was walking around the Library the other day. She is excited to be part of Commerce Township, and is very much looking forward to opening the Library. Meanwhile, she has a cart that every single day she takes back into the Library, replenishes and brings it back out, and everything on that cart is free for anyone to take, and/or to add books to that they would like to donate. She does that every day. There's children's, adult's, games, puzzles, all kinds of things, and it's constantly used. I'm there every day and it's a wonderful thing to see.

You know me and the Library, I like the Library, and I like my garbage service. Which by the way, garbage pickup is a day later this week.

Bill McKeever – Planning Commission

- We had an agenda item that we acted on.
- We had a legally nonconforming zoning at 1652 Union Lake Road that we recommended to the Board for approval to rezone from Office to R-1D.

F. OLD BUSINESS:

MOTION by Sovel, supported by Mills, to remove Item PA18-0012 from the table.

Discussion –

Dave Campbell – This has been on the table since January 2019, not for lack of effort. Mr. Mojica and his neighbors have been working with the Township, and with Jay James in particular, to secure the necessary easements they would need to do fill on either side of his property to bring his grade up.

His basement was high enough off the grade that by definition, it was no longer a basement. It was actually a 3rd story, and the Zoning Ordinance only allows 2.5 stories. He was able to secure the easements so he is withdrawing his petition. That requires a motion from the ZBA to remove from the table and accept his withdrawal.

Jay James – I did speak to Mr. Mojica’s builder today. He said they have not obtained the easement yet. They’re still working to get that.

Rosman – It has been over a year. Isn’t that time that we have to do something with it, and then he has to reapply?

Dave Campbell – There's not necessarily a timeline that something can remain on the table, but six months is a pretty good threshold. Jay, if they have not officially requested a withdrawal, I don't see the harm in giving them between now and the next ZBA meeting to either address it, or bring it back.

Sovel – We could table it again.

Paula Lankford – He did send me an email formally withdrawing his request.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Sovel, Mills, McKeever, Rosman, Mistele

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PA18-0012 – ERIC MOJICA – TABLED FROM JANUARY 24, 2019

Eric Mojica of Commerce MI is requesting a variance from Article 6 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance to construct a new home that will exceed the maximum number of 2 ½ stories allowed located at 8147 Farrant.

Sidwell No.: 17-01-431-008

MOTION by Sovel, supported by Rosman, to accept Eric Mojica’s withdrawal of his request for Item PA18-0012.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Sovel, Rosman, McKeever, Mills, Mistele

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION by Sovel, supported by Mills, to remove Item PA19-0010 from the table.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Sovel, Mills, McKeever, Rosman, Mistele

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

PA19-0010 – LAURA FETZNER – TABLED FROM NOVEMBER 21, 2019

Laura Fetzner of Commerce MI is requesting variances from Article 6 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance to construct a new single-family home that will encroach into the required rear yard setback and both required front yard setbacks on a corner lot located at 3990 Watuga. Sidwell No.: 17-15-252-013

MOTION by Sovel, supported by Rosman, to accept Laura Fetzner's withdrawal of her previously tabled request for Item PA19-0010, in order to proceed with her new request listed under Item G1.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Sovel, Rosman, McKeever, Mills, Rosman, Mistele

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

G. NEW BUSINESS:

ITEM G1: REVISED - PA19-0010 – LAURA FETZNER – PUBLIC HEARING

Laura Fetzner of Commerce MI is requesting two variances from Article 6 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance to construct a new single-family home that will encroach into the required side yard & the required front yard setbacks on a corner lot located at 3990 Watuga, corner of Ulmus. Sidwell No.: 17-15-252-013

David Smith, 8615 Richardson, Commerce Township, was present, along with Mr. and Mrs. Fetzner.

David Smith – We've come up with a revised plan that is more in line with what the Board and Township requested. In your packet, it says we are requesting two variances; however, we are only requesting one variance and that would be a front yard variance off Watuga.

Chairperson Rosman – Mr. and Mrs. Fetzner, is there anything you would like to add?

Mr. Fetzner – She says no.

Dave Campbell – Since we are treating this as a new petition, we are required to have a new public hearing.

Chairperson Rosman opened the public hearing at 7:18pm.

Keith Strucel, 3948 Tahoe, Commerce Township – I live right across the street. My concern doesn't necessarily have to do with the zoning. It's a couple other issues. Number 1, they've already dug a hole in our street and destroyed my driveway to turn the gas off. I guess the gas company came out and did a [sub-par] job to repair it. I'm just concerned about contractors tearing up the neighborhood. The roads out here are pretty fragile because of the proximity to the lake and the soil underneath the road. Number 2 is the retaining wall that's located on that side of the street. Since you've all been out there and seen the property, you know the wall is moving toward the street. It's a concern of everybody that uses Ulmus Street. When that wall falls onto the road, who is going to repair it?

Ken Mangrum, 3996 Watuga, Commerce Township – I live next door. I've got a question about the variance. Did they say 18-feet toward the road, looking for a variance?

Chairperson Rosman – They're asking for an 18-foot variance from the road. They're required to be back 25-feet. They only want to be back 7-feet.

Ken Mangrum – Okay, well that's my concern.

Keith Strucel – The 7-feet, is that from the road edge or from the road easement?

Dave Campbell – The minimum front setback along Watuga is 25-feet from the edge of the road right-of-way. They are proposing to be 7-feet from the edge of the road right-of-way. The road itself is somewhere in the middle of that road right-of-way. Watuga is not centered directly on the right-of-way, which is not uncommon. We measure setback relative to the right-of-way line.

David Smith – We would be about 22-feet from the edge of the gravel road, the traveled portion.

Jay James – Do you want me to put the aerial on the screen?

Chairperson Rosman – Yes, I'd like to see it.

Jay James reviewed the property line and the setback measurements, along with clarifying the proposed variance and the distance from the traveled road.

Keith Strucel – So their house is not going to be 7' from the road.

Jay James – Not from the road, from their property line.

Dave Campbell – The right-of-way is 60-feet wide. The road itself is probably 20 to 25-feet wide.

Chairperson Rosman closed the public hearing at 7:24pm as there were no additional questions or comments.

There were -0- returns and -0- letters.

Sovel – Rusty or Ben, could you let the public know that there's no back-and-forth at this point now? Mute everybody so that it's just the Board Members talking at this point.

Chairperson Rosman – I will be glad to. The public portion of the meeting has been closed which means that we are not entertaining anything from anybody in the public, only the Board Members until the motion is completed.

Board Comments:

Mistele – I think this lot is definitely unique and it makes it a challenge to build anything on there. I am happy to see that they are only asking for one variance. I'm not overly

concerned with the front yard setback. I don't think it will cause any visibility issues. I don't think the garage corner is that detrimental in the grand scheme.

Chairperson Rosman – I wanted to share with everybody all the original requests and where we are today. In November, the original ask was for three variances for a house of 1,781 square feet. We weren't happy with three variances and we discussed the difficulties.

We suggested that the owner sit down with Jay and work out what could be on that property that would not require as many variances, understanding that there would need to be a variance on one side or another due to the uniqueness of the lot. We asked Jay to sketch out a house that would fit on the lot that would not need as many variances, and he did. The house Jay drew was 1,750 square feet that would only require a 6-foot variance from Watuga. Jay's suggestion was 31 square feet smaller than the original request of 1,781 square feet.

The newest request is 2,630 square feet, a difference of 859 additional square feet from the original ask. They are asking for one variance, which we were delighted to see, but they're asking 18-feet from the 25-foot requirement. My contention is, this is a brand new build. As difficult as it is to fit exactly, perfectly on the lot, and recognizing that there's a need for a variance, I again push that we need to go for the least amount of variance necessary to put a house on this lot that will work for this family.

I have driven the streets twice now, and this house would be the closest to the road of all of them. I just don't see that it needs to be that close to the road. I recognize they can't make this house work without a variance, and I recognize that our job is the least amount of variance necessary to make it work.

I am not happy at all that they are going to be 7-feet from the property line, not at all. I think that they can and should make it work with a lesser variance.

Sovel – What caused the house to be so much larger?

David Smith – Let me clarify the fact that we are almost within the footprint of what Jay did, and Jay came up with about 1,700 square feet, but he didn't think of a second story. We just added a second story. Our house footprint is less than that at 1,619.

Sovel – Compare the footprint from the current house to this one. What's the footprint square footage?

David Smith – Our house is significantly less.

Sovel – If it's less, why did they have to move it closer to the road?

David Smith – We had to choose a variance, either we go closer to Ulmus or closer to Watuga. We eliminated two of the three variances, and we chose Watuga because we felt more comfortable. That is where the garage would be because of the topography, it will be a walkout. You would always put the garage on the high side of the lot.

Sovel – I'm looking at the survey, and I'm not great with reading drawings and maps. Is this just because one corner is closest to the road? What are the two distances with what you're proposing from the road?

David Smith – Our garage will be 22.6-feet from the traveled portion of the road. Also, our original footprint was with the garage to the right, and on one floor, was 2,221 square feet. Now we've reduced that first floor square footage to 1,619 and kept within the 35-foot setback from the rear. Another thing, this lot is part of two different subdivisions, and there's a right-of-way change in there on Ulmus which is 60-foot. Part of our lot, to the north, is a 30-foot right-of-way.

Sovel – Is this positioned in a way that gives the least amount of variance without having to use two or three variances?

David Smith – Correct, and more in line with what Jay drew.

Sovel – Jay and Dave, can you confirm that?

Dave Campbell – The footprint that Jay came up with still would have required a variance relative to Watuga. It was a lesser variance than what the petitioner was asking for this evening. In order to fit a house that meets the minimum square footage in this particular zoning district, a variance would have been required one way or another. The least amount of variance Jay could come up with was relative to the Watuga side, although not as much of a variance as what the petitioner is asking for.

Sovel – Is it a correct statement that a house could not be built without a variance on this lot?

Dave Campbell – In order to meet the minimum square footage that we require for this zoning district, a variance would have been necessary.

Sovel – So a variance is going to be needed regardless, okay.

Jay James – When you add the garage in Rick, that's what is sticking out from the face of the house.

Rick Lindbeck – That's correct.

Jay James – I did not account for a garage. What is the distance to the house, Dave?

David Smith – The house is set 4-feet back from the face of the garage.

Jay James – So it's 4 more feet.

Dave Campbell – I would say the entirety of the house encroaches on the 25-foot setback, and the garage extends the most into the required setback.

Sovel – What's the size of the proposed garage?

Dave Campbell – 579 square feet.

Sovel – Ok, so pretty much a minimal garage then.

David Smith – It was hard to get it in this configuration to get a car to park in there.

Sovel – Okay. I definitely agree with what Bob Mistele is saying. It is a challenging lot to work with. I know it's our job, as Rusty said, first to see if it can be done without a variance, and we know the answer to that is no. The next step is to try to do it with the least amount of variance, but it also has to be usable to fit in with the neighborhood too. I'm good at this point.

Chairperson Rosman – I want to clarify, it's from the lot line versus the road bed. Our concern is the lot line, not the road bed.

Dave Campbell shared the site plan on the screen and reviewed for the Board Members, detailing the 25-setback line, the 60-foot right-of-way line of Watuga, showing the encroachment measurements, and the garage where it extends the furthest into the setback. He also showed where the road itself meanders.

David Smith – The existing house is only 11.6-feet from the right-of-way line now and encroaches into the setback and right-of-way.

Dave Campbell – 11.6? So you would be coming 4.5-feet closer to the road than the house that's there now?

David Smith – Exactly, just on the garage side. We would be further away at the porch than the existing house.

Discussion continued regarding the garage encroachment and the need for a variance of 18-feet.

Sovel – I'm good. It looks like 7-feet at the garage corner, and 12.1-feet at the opposite corner of the house.

Mills – Can you review that again, where you're talking 7-feet? That's the closest point to the right-of-way?

Dave Campbell – Yes.

Mills – The difference between the 7-feet and the required 25-feet is what we're talking about as far as the variance.

Dave Campbell – Correct, they're asking for an 18-foot variance.

Mills – Okay, thank you.

McKeever – Is there a reason the garage couldn't be slid back, closer to that diagonal side yard, to be in line with the front of the house?

David Smith – To make it functional, we would either have to ask for this variance, or not have a garage at all because it becomes an unusable garage.

McKeever – I'm not talking about making it smaller. I'm talking about sliding the entire garage.

Jay James – So can the proposed garage be slid back?

David Smith – It could be possibly be slid back 2-feet. I would have to verify that but yes, I believe so.

McKeever – Which would be 2-feet less of a variance.

Dave Campbell – I thought I heard earlier, Dave Smith, that it's a 4-foot offset from the face of the house to the face of the garage?

Jay James – That's what they said.

Dave Campbell – If that's correct, then seemingly you would be sliding it back 4-feet.

McKeever – Well, we still want to maintain the minimum side yard setback of 4-feet along the diagonal side yard.

David Smith – Within reason, we could possibly slide the garage back 2-feet.

McKeever – I think that would help. My concern is having a driveway that is a car long. The road is tight as it is. I appreciate the effort that has been made to reduce the number of variances, but I would still like to see that 2-feet if we can get it.

David Smith – Let me check something. Excuse me for a second.

McKeever – On a side note, we keep talking about the minimum square footage allowed in this district. Could a size variance be granted?

Dave Campbell – It could. If we did go that route, obviously they'd have to revise their design and we'd have to re-notice it.

David Smith – I think we can just say we can revise it. I can do some quick calculations and we can ask for a lesser variance.

Chairperson Rosman – We don't have to repost for a lesser variance.

Dave Campbell – I think Dave Smith stepped away when we were still talking about sliding the garage back, but when he stepped away, Bill McKeever asked if the house could be made smaller than the minimum floor area that we require by Zoning Ordinance, and could they get a variance for that.

McKeever – From a property value standpoint...

David Smith – You'd be looking at a trailer.

McKeever – Yes, are we doing more harm than good.

Dave Campbell – I would have to look at the average square footage for the houses in the area. My guess is that it would be a significantly smaller house than most of the other houses in the neighborhood to make it fit without requiring any variances.

McKeever – I would like to see the additional 2-feet that we can squeeze out of that frontage.

Chairperson Rosman – I agree. I like that idea very much. Then instead of being 18, it would then be 16.

Dave Campbell – David Smith, if you can look at your screen. It is a 4-foot offset from the face of the house to the face of the garage. Then it looks like a 5-foot offset toward the back. Is there any reason, based on grades, that the garage couldn't be slid back the full 4-feet.

David Smith – I'll tell you now.

Sovel – While he's looking at that, if it does come back the 4-feet...

Chairperson Rosman – Then it's 14-feet instead of 18.

Sovel – Right, and if it is currently at 11.6, now we're only talking 2.5-feet?

Chairperson Rosman – Difference.

Sovel – Difference, right.

McKeever – We're minimizing the amount of the variance.

Chairperson Rosman – Exactly, and instead of it being 18-feet, it would be a 14-foot ask if he can move the garage.

Sovel – Right, and so the public understands, it's not like he's going to be moving it 11-feet closer to the road. We're only talking potentially 2.5-foot difference from where it's at.

Jay James – From where the existing house is.

David Smith – I can move it 2.5-feet away from the road.

Chairperson Rosman – So now you're talking 15.5-foot instead of an 18-foot?

David Smith – 25-feet minus 9.5-feet.

Jay James – 15.5-feet.

Chairperson Rosman – So we're now talking about 15.5-feet.

David Smith – We'd be asking for a 15.5-foot variance.

Chairperson Rosman – I want to reiterate that we all know, in order to put a livable house that fits into the ordinance of the Township, and the livability for the family, a variance is necessary. We all recognize that, and we recognize the least amount necessary is what we're after.

Dave Campbell – Dave Smith, if you were to slide this garage back 2.5-feet, does this corner here become the closest corner?

David Smith – Let me check.

Jay James – While Dave is looking at that, I'll make a comment. The gentleman earlier had a comment about the retaining wall. If you look at the double line on the far side of that site plan, where it calls out the retaining wall, that is not on the Fetzner's property. That is in the subdivision right-of-way of the street and it would be my opinion that if it were to fail, it would be the responsibility of the subdivision to fix.

Chairperson Rosman – Thank you for clarifying that. It's helpful.

David Smith – Thank you for that, Jay. Dave Campbell, you're absolutely right we would be 9.5-feet from the front, 4-feet from the back, and the porch would be the closest corner of the house at 9.2-feet.

Dave Campbell – So we'd be looking at a variance of 15.8-feet?

David Smith – Correct.

Chairperson Rosman – 15.8-feet.

Dave Campbell – I'd like to hear from the Fetzner's on this. If we slid this garage back 2.5-feet, then actually this corner, the porch, now becomes the closest point to the right-of-way line, which is 9.2-feet from the right-of-way line. 25-feet is required, so 25 minus 9.2 is 15.8-feet. That would be the variance the ZBA would be considering.

Chairperson Rosman – Also, because it would be a lesser amount of variance, it would not have to be reposted. We can't do more, but we can always do less.

Dave Campbell agreed and reiterated the lesser variance request.

David Smith – It would be more inline with the existing house.

Chairperson Rosman – Does anybody want to say anything else?

Dave Campbell – Nothing to add.

Paula Lankford – No, thank you.

Chairperson Rosman – David, are you comfortable?

David Smith – I am.

Chairperson Rosman – How about the Fetzners, are you comfortable with what we're talking about?

Mrs. Fetzner – Yes, we're good.

Mr. Fetzner – Yes. The only thing I would say about the idea of moving the garage back is that would then move the garage closer to our neighbors. We would still be within our building rights and not require an additional variance, but we kept that in mind with the design.

Chairperson Rosman – We understand that. Thank you very much. If there's no other discussion, the Chair will call for a motion.

Dave Campbell – I know the builder, Dennis Yashinski is on the call. He's muted currently. Can we see if he has any thoughts on sliding the garage? Is there anything he can think of that could be a challenge?

Dennis Yashinski – I don't think that would be a problem. Actually, the architect is on with us. Rick?

Rick Lindbeck – Yes, I'm here as well. No issues whatsoever. I've been following along. Pushing it back 2-feet or 2.5-feet, we will confirm. The rooflines work well, the porch works great, the flow works well. The biggest thing was the handicap accessibility in the floor plan and we're still maintaining that. That was a real key to this whole house.

MOTION by Rosman, seconded by Mills, to approve Item G1., Revised – PA19-0010, the request by Laura Fetzner of Commerce MI for a variance from Article 6 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance to construct a new single-family home that will encroach into the required front yard setback on a corner lot located at 3990 Watuga, corner of Ulmus. Sidwell No.: 17-15-252-013

Based upon the presentation and the comments we have heard, I believe the applicant has satisfied the criteria of Section 41.09 of the Township Zoning Ordinance for granting this dimensional variance, and therefore, I make a motion to approve the request for a variance of 15.8-feet from the requirements of Section 6.01 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance.

Discussion –

Sovel – Good job everybody.

Mills – I think the parties should be commended. A lot of effort went into making this work.

Dennis Yashinski – The people at the Township worked with us so beautifully to make this effort worthwhile, and Paula does an incredible job.

Sovel – Thank you.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Rosman, Mills, McKeever, Sovel, Mistele

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Chairperson Rosman commended everyone involved for a job well done.

H. OTHER MATTERS:

None.

I. CORRESPONDENCE:

None.

J. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

- The Planning Commission had a Zoom meeting also. They reviewed the Zainabia Center on Crumb Road, a Special Land Use request to build a gymnasium. The Commissioners tabled the request due to concerns from local residents regarding parking issues. They will be coming back on June 1st.
- The Planning Commission also heard a concept plan from 84 Lumber. They are looking to acquire three properties along Pioneer Drive along Martin Road. They received positive feedback and will be coming back with a Conditional Rezoning request for a lumberyard.
- We get a lot of questions about the status of the Aikens development at Pontiac Trail and M-5. He has a 7/31 deadline to close on the former Library property. He will potentially be asking to extend that purchase offer. In general, his plan is going to change as a result of the pandemic and it's a challenging environment for tenants.
- Benstein Grille purchased an acre of vacant cemetery property from the Township. They are working to expand their parking lot. The work is getting attention from those who have loved ones buried there, and those who use the pathway. Benstein Grille is being respectful as they work. Hopefully over the next few weeks, they will get the landscaping in, curbs replaced, asphalt down and the pathway reopened. Everybody will be happy with the final product.

Chairperson Rosman – It is wonderful to see all the Parks and Recreation areas being used regularly. Compliments to Commerce Township and the Parks and Recreation for what they have created. I spend a tremendous amount of time everyday at Dodge V – the Library. It's incredible to see so many people of all ages.

Dave Campbell – Yes. Unfortunately we had some vandalism at Dodge V with the new Scarlet's Smile playground, which is a real shame. Notwithstanding, that playground is getting wrapped up and hopefully kids will be allowed to go use it sometime soon.

K. ADJOURNMENT:

- **NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: JULY 23, 2020 @7:00PM**

Chairperson Rosman – We don't know if the next meeting will be in-person or via Zoom.

Paula Lankford – Apparently the Clerk's Department had limited dates to have election training. One of those dates that they had chosen was July 23rd. They asked me that if we have any cases for that meeting, could we move it to July 30th. I don't know if we'll have a meeting yet or not. We may not have a case, so we may be able to cancel it. Please check your calendars and let me know your availability.

Sovel – Can we hold it in the smaller room, the kitchen?

Paula Lankford – I didn't even think about that, unless she is utilizing all the rooms. She just asked me for the Board room. I will double check that.

Dave Campbell – We had two Planning Commission members step down recently. Russ Schinzing is the Vice Chair. He announced at the May 18th that he is stepping down. Literally the next day, Tom Jones also said he will be stepping down soon also. If anyone has any folks in mind who might be a good fit for these vacancies on our Planning Commission, please let me know and encourage them to reach out to Supervisor Scott to express their interest.

Chairperson Rosman – Thank you very much. It's nice to see all of you. A special thank you to Ben for handling the roll call votes and everything.

Ben Sebrowski – Happy to help.

Chairperson Rosman – And for everybody who made this possible because I know it's not easy. Thank you everybody for coming. Congratulations to the Fetzners. We look forward to a new, beautiful house.

MOTION by Mills, supported by Mistele, to adjourn the meeting at 8:03pm.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Mills, Mistele, McKeever, Sovel, Rosman

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Robert Mistele, Secretary