

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

Monday, August 12, 2024  
2009 Township Drive  
Commerce Township, Michigan 48390

**A. CALL TO ORDER:** Chairperson Parel called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

**ROLL CALL:** Present: Brian Parel, Chairperson  
Brian Winkler, Vice Chairperson  
Joe Loskill, Secretary  
George Weber  
Brady Phillips  
Sam Karim  
Absent: Bill McKeever (excused)  
Also Present: Dave Campbell, Township Planning Director  
Paula Lankford, Senior Planner

**B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**MOTION** by Loskill, supported by Phillips, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda of August 12, 2024. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION** by Winkler, supported by Weber, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of July 1, 2024, as written.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**D. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES**

Brian Winkler – Downtown Development Authority

- The following is a summary of the July 16, 2024, DDA Meeting.
- The DDA welcomed Susan Spelker back to the DDA Board. She was reappointed as the DDA Finance Committee Chair at the meeting.
- The DDA also welcomed Spencer Schafer as the newest member of the DDA Board.
- The Sheriffs announced the OCSO Commerce Substation Open House that was held on Saturday, July 20<sup>th</sup>. The event was well attended! Both of my granddaughters went and had a blast.
- Insite Commercial Report: Parcel B1; Phase I - Aikens 5 & Main: The Pre-Construction meeting has been held. Land balancing is underway and underground sewer work has commenced. Bruce will give the DDA an update at the August 20<sup>th</sup> DDA meeting.
- The resolution for Jim Gotts was provided to his wife Patricia and son Jimmy at the July Township Board meeting. Tim Hoy was recognized for hosting a gathering for Jim last month. Jim will be missed by all.

George Weber – Township Board of Trustees

- I'd like to echo Brian's comments. Deb read a heartfelt resolution for Jim Gotts, much deserved, and his family was very appreciative.
- We had three presentations and lengthy discussions.
- The first was regarding intersection studies within the Township. We have, I believe, eight intersections being studied, with the desire to figure out how to

move more traffic through in a safe manner. This was Phase I for the consultants and within the next month or so, we should have final recommendations on actions we can take to help improve traffic flow, specifically on the east side of the Township.

- We also met with Plante Moran and had a discussion regarding the financial health, internal controls and overall financial items from their audit. The audit showed that the Township is in good health financially, and we have our hands on the proper internal controls, both from a cybersecurity standpoint, as well as a general fund handling process.
- We met with Alyson and discussed the Library strategic plan, how we're going to move forward with the Library and what, if any, new actions she will be taking to help keep the Library as vibrant as it presently is.
- We established two SADs:
  - Demarist and Barkley Street for street maintenance
  - Lagoon and Point Streets for sanitary sewer
- As Brian mentioned, we appointed Spencer Schafer to the DDA.
- We also approved Susan Spelker to the DDA, taking Bob's place.
- Finally, the only other note, we transferred a Class-C liquor license. As most of us know, Andale closed shop at Carroll Lake and Commerce Road, but we have a new Mexican restaurant going in called the Blue Cactus Cantina. So, I'm sure the tacos and tostadas will be just as good.

Loskill – They're wonderful. I've been there twice.

Phillips – So have my wife and I.

*Jay James – Building Department*

In Jay's absence, Dave Campbell noted that Jay had provided his standard update of the permits issued.

*Bill McKeever – Zoning Board of Appeals*

In Bill's absence, Dave Campbell reported the following:

- The ZBA met on Thursday, July 25<sup>th</sup>.
- There was one petitioner on that agenda. It was for a commercial property owner along the south side of Oakley Park, just west of Martin; one of those multi-tenant office buildings. The petitioner wanted to put in a new freestanding monument sign. The sign would have been too close to the right-of-way for Oakley Park. He wants to put it on top of the landscape berm that runs across those properties. His contention was that if he put it where it was permitted, it would have been in the middle of his parking lot, and it would have been behind the berm. The ZBA did approve a variance for that sign to be closer to Oakley Park Road than what the Zoning Ordinance would otherwise allow.
- There was also some healthy discussion amongst the ZBA members regarding, in general, how variance petitions are received by the ZBA. Some members feel they are held too stringently to the six criteria within the Zoning Ordinance that are meant to apply to any variance. Discussion was about whether all six should apply, or whether the ZBA should have more flexibility to be able to grant variances.

**E. PUBLIC DISCUSSION ON MATTERS FOR WHICH THERE IS NO PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULED**

Chairperson Parel opened to Public Discussion on matters for which there is no public hearing scheduled.

No comments.

Chairperson Parel closed Public Discussion on matters for which there is no public hearing scheduled.

**F. TABLED ITEMS**

None.

**G. OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**H. SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None.

**I. NEW BUSINESS**

**ITEM 11. 8275 COOLEY LAKE ROAD – CONCEPTUAL REVIEW**

Chris Sciacca owner of CCS Design of Wixom is requesting a conceptual review for the redevelopment of 8275 Cooley Lake Road (building known as Chi-Town Union Station). PIN#'s: 17-01-209-005 & 17-01-209-001, -002, -003, -004, & -016

Chairperson Parel – This is a conceptual review; an opportunity for us to have a non-binding, informal discussion with the petitioner. Dave, I'll turn it over to you for a summary.

Dave Campbell – One of the two conceptual discussions that on our agenda tonight are for the existing commercial property at 8275 Cooley Lake Road. (Dave brought up the aerial and reviewed the site on the overhead.)

The most recent use of the building was the Chi-Town Union Railroad Station, which was a model railroad display museum. It was quite cool if you ever had a chance to visit. The gentleman who operated it has passed away, and his family was not looking to continue operating it, so the building is for sale, along with the adjacent properties. The prospective buyer is Chris Sciacca. Chris is looking to buy the existing building and the adjacent properties, redevelop the existing building and also expand on the property with the conceptual plan that you see on the screen.

The yellow building is the existing building, about 10,000 square feet. The red buildings are actually two attached buildings totaling 10,800 square feet. Chris is going to be able to describe his business better than I can, but I know his business is based in part on some 3D printing for the automotive sector. Chris is also in the custom dock fabrication business. Those uses would be located within the existing building and also within the two proposed buildings.

They would share the existing parking lot. As you can see, he would propose to utilize some of the area to the rear of the existing store. If I go back to the aerial, that property is a little bit of a different animal because all of these properties are currently zoned B-2, Community Business, with the exception of that one property behind the existing building. We will call that the landlocked property because it doesn't have any frontage

on any of the public roads. That property is zoned R-1D, Single-family, even though as far as we can tell, it has never actually had a house on it. Aerial photos go back as far as 1940 when this was all farmland, but more recently in 1963, you can see the Food Town building, it was pretty new at the time. We have a building permit that says it was built in 1961. You can see that was the parking lot for the Food Town. Through the years, it was then either parking or outdoor storage for all of the users between 1963 and today.

So, for Mr. Sciacca to be able to utilize this area for parking or for storage, in an effort to assemble all of these six properties and utilize them, it would probably be cleanest if this property were rezoned from R-1D to B-2 so that the entire site would have the same zoning. To do that, there is a process involved for rezoning that the Planning Commission is familiar with; obviously, a formal recommendation from the Planning Commission would be required, and a formal action from the Township Board. Before we go down that road with that process, and with Mr. Sciacca making the investment with his engineer and/or his architect on the formal site plan that would be necessary for this development, we wanted to get in front of the Planning Commission and get everybody's gut reaction to see if we are on the right track relative to layout and land uses. The land uses he is proposing are permitted in the B-2 zoning district.

This would be one of those instances where we are looking at an existing, nonconforming site. I can go to Google Earth to remind everybody of the current visual of the building. This is a site that could certainly use some reinvestment and some TLC. In these instances, where you have a nonconforming site; in this case the site would be nonconforming because that building would, if nothing else, not meet our architectural standards of today. So, when someone is looking to reinvest in an existing site, this Planning Commission is tasked with trying to achieve reasonable compliance with the current standards of the Zoning Ordinance. What we consider to be reasonable is for that compliance to be proportionate to the improvements that the petitioner is seeking. Mr. Sciacca is looking to build two new buildings, so the idea would be to bring the rest of the site into reasonable compliance with our standards of today, relative to things like parking, landscaping, lighting, building materials and architecture, having a sidewalk along the frontage.

We were talking before the meeting about how the new buildings would be required to connect to the Township's sanitary sewer which runs along Cooley Lake Road. One of the questions was, would we require that the existing building also connect to sanitary sewer? There is certainly some logic to doing so, while the rest of the site is being redeveloped. I think Mr. Sciacca is open to the idea of connecting the existing building to the sanitary sewer.

We also want to have a conversation with our Fire Marshal. We're still waiting to get some feedback from him with respect to fire suppression. I believe the building size by itself does not warrant the need for fire suppression; however, based on the use proposed, particularly 3D printing and the filament, the plastic that is used for 3D printing, there are thresholds for how much of that you can have under the roof before you are required to fire suppress a building. Mr. Sciacca would certainly want to understand that with the Fire Marshal because that would be a significant investment to fire suppress the existing building.

Within our overview dated July 31<sup>st</sup>, we mentioned some of the potential improvements to the existing site that the Planning Commission may want to discuss with Mr. Sciacca so that he has a sense of what this Planning Commission would be looking for in terms of bringing the site into reasonable compliance and making an educated decision as he looks to move forward with developing a formal site plan that hopefully will come back in

front of the Planning Commission within the next couple months. With that, I'll see if there are any questions for me, and otherwise, I will turn it over to Chris.

Weber – Dave, maybe one question. For what Mr. Sciacca wants to do, which is assembly, and I don't know if there's any manufacturing involved; is that a permitted use in B-2 versus Industrial?

Dave Campbell – It is permitted. Some of what he's describing, the uses are permitted in B-2. Oftentimes yes, heavy assembly and heavy industrial belong in our Industrial zoning district, but with some of the more fabrication type uses that he is describing, and the retail component that goes along with them, a retail storefront for the 3D printing, that is certainly appropriate within our B-2 zoning district.

Phillips – I'm just curious, what is adjacent to the south parcel? Is that housing?

Dave Campbell – This is the Russell Beach subdivision. Russell Beach is actually a pretty huge subdivision.

Dave reviewed the site on the overhead, showing the nearby houses and the sewer pumping station.

Phillips – I'm just curious about the buffer it shows to the west and partially to the south, and in terms of the additional buffer that is needed.

Dave Campbell – We did talk about that a little bit with Chris, and I think in this concept plan that he did, he is showing a row of evergreens, I think as an indicator that it is his intent to buffer what he is proposing to the adjacent residential. That is certainly something that would be good to talk about this evening, as to what the expectation might be in terms of screening and buffering between a commercial use and a residential use. Keeping in mind, of course, that this has historically been a commercial retail use since at least 1961.

Chris Sciacca – 1200 La Branch, White Lake, MI. In a nutshell, what was discussed, the proposal that we have will be kind of a twofold. The current building that we are looking at, the 10,000 square foot that's currently there, is going to be an aggressive timeline for us to move CCS Design, from the facility we have already operational in Wixom, to this location. We will be doing a two-prong approach at this, getting it cleared out, getting it spruced up and everything up to a C of O so we can move in and be operational. Then, we will tackle the second component which would be the two extra buildings. The two other buildings are going to be formulated into probably three different components. The smaller 5,000 square foot building is going to be split into two 2,500 square foot units, with one being a retail area for the 3D printing. Stereolithography is a 3D printing process that uses UV cured liquid resin that, if you as a person wanted to go and get something 3D printed that you had, there's no way you can do it. You have to go to an HP place and have it printed; it's going to be expensive. Or, buy your own printer for a single print. That's the model on the 3D printing component. We do use those in our day-to-day operations with our end of arm tools that we do make, so we have the components already, and also the software to bring your design into an STL file.

The other 5,000 square foot, or maybe it is 6,000, will be the warehousing for aluminum and docking components. Right now, to get a dock, you have to have it custom made. It's very expensive. I think there is a market in there for what I call an erector set for docks. If you need five units, you can expand and do whatever you need. If the water level goes down you can add very rapidly and deploy them easily.

The first building is more than likely to have half split off as a cantina for the CCS employees. Currently we cook every day. We don't go out to eat. The thought process on that is to perhaps bring that into a high-end steak house moving down the road, which would not be open to the public but only for two days. I have a certain outline that I have for those thoughts.

As far as bringing the site up to what we're looking at for code and everything else, the building itself is cinder block construction. It does need some TLC on the outside. If you drove by, you would see the overgrowth. With our aggressive approach, we're looking at the end of October to get everything shored up and ready for us to move in; paint, AC units. We do know that the sewer and septic ... Chris Krez, my agent here, just brought an agreement to my attention regarding the sanitary sewer. It might be something to do with the sale of the pumping station; that if they sold that location, connection to the sanitary sewer would be through that unit. I'm not sure, I just got this. I'll give a copy to you and we can take a look.

I've already done some due diligence on the building. If it is connected to the septic, it is blocked or broken. We have had Carter Plumbing out to take a look at it. They scoped it, and on the east side of the building, it's going to need to be dug up and reconnected. So, my thought process on this as we move forward is to have that done for the temporary fix. Then, as we move forward with the other two buildings, I was given a proposal for two options; the one across from Cooley is your high pressure sewer line, and on the other side is the low pressure which is 22 feet down. They said you can go one way or the other.

Weber – One requires a lot more digging.

Chris Sciacca – One is really expensive and the other is not quite as expensive. So, but to connect the three buildings to the sewer has to be investigated a little bit more. As far as screening, we threw the evergreens in there just to show that we understand that's residential. We will look at any screening that might need to be done, whether it's a fence or ... Right now, there is a privacy fence running on the small leg to the upper right. (Approached the overhead.) I believe I see a fence here and a partial here, and then it's chain link going around. This is a larger, higher chain link, and this is all overgrowth. The pumping station is down here, and I believe there's another fence. It's kind of hard to see with the overgrowth.

Chris Krez – We just learned that the portion where the pumping station is was actually sold to the Township to put the pumping station in. The [Adler's] were the ones that owned it prior, and there was an agreement, which is what I just brought to him, that I just found going through title work, between them and the Township that they would be able to hook up to the pumping station, but for some reason it never happened.

Dave Campbell – What year is that?

Chris Krez – 1998. So, we don't know exactly why it didn't happen. The deceased owner bought the property in 1999, and the agreement was in 1998, so that might have

something to do with it. They did sell that parcel behind to the Township with the idea of putting the pumping station there.

Dave Campbell – It's the first I've seen it too. Chris, maybe a question for you. In terms of timeline, the idea would be to occupy the existing building ASAP, with all of the proper building and occupancy permits. Assuming that happens, what timeline are you predicting for starting on the new building and the rest of the site?

Chris Sciacca – I would like to break ground at least on one of them starting next year. So, whether that second one comes up, it would depend on concrete pour and everything else, and what's more advantageous for the layout and everything else. Realistically, this time next year starting to move forward with groundbreaking. But the current building, September.

Chairperson Parel – Renovations.

Chris Sciacca – Yes.

Dave Campbell – So he could occupy the existing building, again, with all of the necessary permits, and we will need to look at this fire suppression question. Assuming all necessary permits and occupancy requirements have been met, he could occupy the existing building without any action by the Planning Commission. It's when we start talking about the new buildings and the site plan that would need to go along with that. The Planning Commission will want to review that and take action. That's where we have the discussion about bringing the entire site up into reasonable compliance.

**Commission Comments:**

Chairperson Parel – So, at what point would we talk about converting the last remaining property to B-2 zoning?

Dave Campbell – I think that should go along with site plan.

Chairperson Parel – Is the goal or timeline that he would apply for site plan approval for all of the buildings at once, get approval, in line with the new zoning all at the same time?

Dave Campbell – I would assume so. Now, the property back here, if Mr. Sciacca doesn't see much need for this, then I suppose it could remain zoned single-family. I can't imagine he wants to buy it and not be able to use it, and if what he is going to want to use it for is commercial in nature, then it would need to be rezoned. I can see that rezoning running on the same track as site plan approval, other than site plan would only have to go to the Planning Commission, and the rezoning has to go to both the Planning Commission and the Township Board. We can time things out so it dovetails together.

Chairperson Parel – He is going to put together a timeline for these buildings, and site plan approval comes first, but what if he gets approved for the site plan and decides he doesn't want to build the third building?

Dave Campbell – So, if I understand the question, we might want to look at it as a phased development. Chris, if you think you're going to build the first building, and then

wait a couple years to do the second building, then we want to look at it as a phased development. What we look at there is, if you never get to the third building, we have to ensure that the building you did build and the parking, driveway, circulation, and everything that goes along with it can stand on its own for the next 20 years, and we won't have dead-end sewer pipes and dead-end roads. That's what we look at when we look at phased developments.

Chris Sciacca – Okay.

Dave Campbell – So, if you think it's possible that you're only going to want to do one of those two buildings in the near term, and then the second building might be a couple years off, then we have to think about how to phase it so the site can stand on its own even if the other building never comes to fruition.

Chairperson Parel – Have you purchased the property?

Chris Sciacca – We're still in due diligence.

Phillips – What is the reason for moving out of Wixom?

Chris Sciacca – My lease is going through the roof and my current landlord doesn't really want to fix anything. It has been 10 years.

Weber – And it's a lot closer to White Lake.

Chris Sciacca – It's walking distance to my house, yes.

Phillips – Well, we would welcome you into Commerce Township.

Chris Sciacca – Thank you.

Karim – I don't have any questions, but I think with the sidewalks and the new buildings, the improvements to the façade are definitely going to be acceptable and good for us.

Winkler – I agree with the recommendations that the Planning Department made in the report about what is a reasonable improvement to the site. I might also mention, adding a little bit more landscaping than what is shown on the rendering, maybe along the street and the complement the sidewalk. Other than that, I wish him luck.

Phillips – I think the proposal represents an upgrade to the existing structure and the property in general, and bringing some new technology and business growth into Commerce Township is a good thing.

Loskill – Just a few comments.

- You need to get an architect onboard, because just looking at the uses you're proposing, you're going to have design issues. As soon as you open that thing to the public, you're going to create a whole bunch of issues.
- Make sure he looks at the setbacks to adjacent streets and the screening requirements between commercial and residential areas so you know what you're going to get through there.



- I would like to see a next generation site plan with parking laid out, parking counts and things like that.
- If you do end up buying the piece in the back, you're going to have to look at screening that from the neighbors because I'm sure you're going to want that for parking or something like that, so realize you're going to have to meet screening standards between that piece and the adjacent neighbors.
- All your work is going to have to meet Township design standards for the buildings.

Weber – I do like the project. Couple of questions. As you're rehabbing the existing building to move into, are you going to do any work on the front? The north side, or the storefront side, whether that is siding or something to make that look presentable. I say that because, Dave, correct me if I'm wrong, that's separate from site plan approval which is going to be wholly focused on the two new buildings.

Dave Campbell – I guess yes and no. As he moves into the existing building, Chris or anyone else could occupy that existing building as long as the use that they're proposing is permitted in the B-2 zoning district. The trigger for putting a new face on that building is when he comes in for site plan approval for the new buildings. That is the Planning Commission opportunity to say, "Okay, now let's try to bring the entire site into reasonable compliance." I don't know if this is the basis of your question, Mr. Weber, but Chris would want to be cognizant of what is going to be required for the new buildings as he is making decisions on what, if any, facelift he wants to put on in the near term for the existing building.

Weber – That was my point.

Dave Campbell – Yes, nobody wants to see Chris have to rip off new siding or a new façade to match what the new buildings are going to be a year or two from now.

Chris Sciacca – Got it.

Weber – Should we propose that the disparate R-1D lot be combined with the front lot, and then also B-2? Rather than just doing a rezoning for that lot, it's a rezoning and combine into one lot. We're looking at six parcels in total here, right?

Dave Campbell – Yes, and five are zoned B-2, and the sixth is R-1D. In my mind, it is in everyone's best interest that the properties be combined, and have consistent zoning. Any time you have a project with split zoning, it just turns into a lot of problems for the property owner.

Weber – That's kind of my point, and also to know that there are crazy lawyer fees associated with combining lots through the County, right?

Dave Campbell – Combining properties does not necessarily generate legal fees.

Weber – Maybe it's just the splitting of properties.

Dave Campbell – It's when you split them in a manner that is not consistent with our zoning standards; that's when the lawyers start getting involved.

Weber – Just don't want any surprises. With your existing business and your potential boat dock business, are you looking at any outdoor storage?

Chris Sciacca – No.

Weber – Okay.

Dave Campbell – We talked about that early on in our meetings. We told him outdoor storage is a bad word.

Weber – There's history. How many employees do you have?

Chris Sciacca – I have one.

Weber – So a cantina ...

Chris Sciacca – A cantina for one, for now, until the other two buildings come out.

Weber – And part of the cantina is a question; I don't know. If you have a cantina, is there any Oakland County Health Department criteria, meaning do you have to put in a commercial kitchen for that? If so, it's an ordeal.

Chris Sciacca – Right.

Weber – You'll have to do some homework on that. I think everything else has been talked about.

Chris Sciacca – As far as the current aesthetics of the building, that will be painted. Then we can cross the bridge with making sure that we go to whatever. Let's say we do a building with brick veneer on it, it's going to match. So, it looks better than what it is now.

Weber – That is going to be one of my asks. When you build the new buildings and bring it up to code, that you're going to make the existing building comparable.

Chris Sciacca – Okay, yes. Right.

Chairperson Parel – I'm not sure I can really add anything. I love the idea that we're fixing what I consider an eyesore. I love the idea that you're bringing new business into our community. I'm not sure I can add much to that. Dave, anything else?

Dave Campbell – It's worth mentioning that as this property has been for sale, we've had some other inquiries on it, folks tire-kicking. The uses that they've tire-kicked on are mini-storage. There's always questions about, "Well, can I just fence the whole thing in for outdoor storage for my vehicle repair or landscaping business. Again, we get into those conversations about outdoor storage. So, there's something to be said for Chris's proposal, particularly no outdoor storage, but also a land use that I think is more complementary to the area than maybe a self-storage facility would be.

Chairperson Parel – I agree. Is there anything else we can answer for you?

Chris Sciacca – No, I don't think I have any questions. It's pretty straightforward.

Chairperson Parel – It seems to me that you have the support of the folks up here. If we can help with anything, let us know. We're looking forward to it.

Dave Campbell – Chris, in terms of occupying the existing building, if that is the route you're going, you're going to be working with the Building Department on construction code issues, occupancy issues. It's when the point comes that you're ready to start on the new buildings that you're going to come back to this group with a fully developed site plan, with landscaping, lighting, parking counts and all those things.

Chris Sciacca – Okay, very good. Thank you.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you. We look forward to having you.

### **ITEM 12. CRUMB ROAD TOWNHOMES – CONCEPTUAL REVIEW**

Schafer Development is requesting a conceptual review for a multiple-family townhome development on a 5.3-acre property located on the north side of Crumb Road between Haggerty Road and Meijer Drive. PIN#: 17-25-426-015

Chairperson Parel – This is also a conceptual review and the same rules apply. Dave, would you like to bring us up to speed?

Dave Campbell brought up the aerial of the site on the overhead.

Dave Campbell – Sure. This is a property that the Planning Commission is familiar with, because we have had some tire kickers that have looked at this property through the years. We had a group that was looking to do senior living/assisted living on this property, and we had a group that was looking to do 100 apartments in five 3-story buildings. This property is located on the north side of Crumb Road, just west of Haggerty. This is the Meijer store, the Meijer gas station and all of the other outlots peripheral to the Meijer store.

The property is about 5.5 acres. As you can see, it's undeveloped. The prospective buyer/developer is Schafer Development, and I assume Spencer Schafer will do the talking on behalf of his dad and his company. Mr. Parel, earlier you alluded to the fact that Spencer is the newest addition to the Township's Downtown Development Authority Board, but tonight he is wearing his developer hat. What Schafer Development is proposing for the site is a residential townhome development, 2-story townhomes. Spencer mentioned, in terms of the market, they would be comparable to the townhomes that Pulte is currently building across the street from Township Hall, the attached 2-story townhomes.

I'll pull up one of the two concept plans that Schafer Development provided for discussion at tonight's meeting. One of the layouts proposes a total of 35 units, and the other a total of 38 units. That unit count might be relevant in terms of how they pursue this development. The property is currently zoned B-3, General Business, which is consistent with everything around it in terms of Meijer, Meijer gas, Jiffy Lube, et cetera. The property is also within the Township's Haggerty Road Corridor, the HRC Overlay. The fact that it's in the HRC is relevant because residential land uses are not usually allowed within our B-3 zoning district. That's usually only for commercial uses. But, the HRC Overlay does allow for residential land uses, including attached multi-family uses

such as townhomes, if the development is developed to the higher and better standards of the HRC Overlay.

The HRC Overlay allows uses not otherwise allowed in the base zoning, but the trade-off is better development standards in terms of architecture, building materials, landscaping, layout and so-forth, with the idea of getting a better project out of the development in return for allowing uses otherwise not allowed in B-3. For the sake of history, that's how the senior living facility across the street came to fruition. This is called Rolling Hills of Commerce, on the south side of Crumb Road. This is an independent senior living facility, and it was a similar situation. The base zoning is B-2, but because it was in the HRC Overlay, they were allowed to do senior living so long as they built it to the standards of the HRC.

The Schafer's wanted an opportunity to introduce the project to the Planning Commission, both the 35 and the 38-unit concept. In terms of layout, they are fairly similar, with one new point of access coming in off of Crumb Road, and a secondary point of access coming off Meijer Drive. Meijer Drive is a private road owned by Meijer, but this property is being sold by Meijer, so it would seem that they would be willing to grant an easement for access for a new driveway out onto the road that they control. The existing detention basin behind the Meijer store was sized to account for all of the development that would eventually come around the perimeter of Meijer. The store was built in the early 90's. These peripheral users have come along in the years since. The Planning Commission will remember that we recently approved a new Chase Bank here at the corner and they are going to start construction any day now. All of that was taken into account when this detention pond was sized back in the 90's. So, whatever develops on this property, the storm water would be routed to that detention pond for Meijer.

We talked with the Schafer's about sidewalks, because we talk with everybody about sidewalks. While Crumb Road is a dead-end road that dead ends into M-5 to the west, we do think that sidewalks through here are important to have. One of the things that the Township has looked into doing, if you look at this cul-de-sac where Crumb Road dead ends into the highway, and this is the ramp of our pedestrian bridge over M-5, the thought is that we could eventually have a sidewalk that runs along either side of Crumb Road and could lead folks to a new sidewalk through here that would then link up with the Michigan Airline Trail in here somewhere. So, when we have been talking to the Schafer's on a preliminary basis about this project, and whether they want to pursue it as a Special Land Use within the HRC, or as a PUD, one of the talking points has been, what could we accomplish with respect to filling in gaps in the sidewalk and hopefully eventually getting a continuous sidewalk on one side of the road or the other, all the way to Crumb Road and to the Michigan Airline Trail. I think that is one of the things the Schafer's want to discuss with you this evening with respect to density. We are still trying to figure out the math of it, but if they get up to a unit count closer to 38, that might push them into where they would need to propose this project as a PUD. As the Planning Commission is well aware, if we get into looking at this as a PUD, then we talk about recognizable public benefits, which are the trade-off for the extra density that comes with a PUD. Those benefits could be offered in the form of sidewalks or contributions to the Township's sidewalk fund.

I know Spencer provided a presentation on this project, and it was in your packet. I'm sure he would love to go through it with all of you, so I will take a pause and see if there are any questions.

Chairperson Parel – Any questions? Otherwise, Mr. Schafer, welcome back.

Spencer Schafer – Thank you for giving us the opportunity to present tonight. I had the privilege of attending my first DDA meeting last month, and it was very informative. I'm really looking forward to Bruce Aikens' presentation next month and hearing about a lot of the happenings at Five & Main now that it seems it is starting to catch some steam. My father and I have looked at this property for a number of years. We know the folks over at Meijer Real Estate Team. We have done some deals and tried to do additional deals with them in the past. We really felt like this was an intriguing opportunity, fully understanding that a lot of this area has been built out over the past half decade or so, starting with Rolling Hills. As Dave mentioned, as a commercial use, they went in doing a senior housing use. I was reading the ordinance earlier and that gives you about 12 units per acre. That is in an area that is zoned commercial and is master planned commercial, but there's this very interesting Haggerty Road Corridor that allows some design flexibility.

We were taking a look at that and we know the Lublin site very well to the south. That was supposed to be developed for some commercial, but that never happened. We reached out to Meijer and we wanted to get a better understanding of what they want to see there. They actually do have some use regulations on that property; certain commercial type uses that they don't want to see that would be in competition with their store and some of the other adjacent developments. So, we approached them with an opportunity for residential and they were intrigued. As you're aware, there was a prior proposal by Harvey Weiss for about 100 multi-family rental units. Harvey developed some of the commercial opportunities in front of Meijer. That proposal did come forward and it was shut down before anything else was done.

We looked at the design districts and specifications of the HRC Overlay and felt that a for-sale townhouse development would be very fitting to offset some of the more intense commercial uses from some of the higher density, attached and lower density residential uses which I know will probably be developed at some point in the future. I know that Shapiro Company does own a lot of those properties. With that, let's go to the next slide.

I know I talked a little about the zoning and such. There is multi-family zoning out to the west, so we think what we're proposing does fit within the confines of the existing development patterns. I'm going to defer to Dave, Paula and the Planning team to really ascertain which route we should go, whether that is a development of RM using the HRC, or if we ultimately do a PUD. There are costs and benefits to both, but I think our design intentions are the same. A couple things I do want to mention; when you do HRC zoning, you're supposed to follow the use standards or the schedule of regulations for setbacks for the B-3 district, even though it is an RM development. So, the RM development actually has more intense side yard setbacks, and front and rear yard setbacks. We want to do this utilizing the standards of RM, so where do we really fit? The HRC says we're supposed to follow B-3. If we do a PUD, we can set the standards as we want.

We want to bring about the most amount of public benefit. There's a substantial number of trees on the perimeter of the property. It would be our intention to try to cluster this as much as possible so we can have some nice buffers from all sides of the property.

Dave, if you can go to the next slide to the overlay of the site plan. We want to do some more intense, restrictive setbacks than would be permitted by right by the ordinance.

The question that we ultimately had was density. I don't want to talk about those because there was some confusion when I initially put this presentation together as to how you calculate the standards of the HRC district, but we're falling somewhere in the 35 to 38-unit range.

One of the things we'd really like to do as part of our development, and we think it will help market our units, is getting that connectivity to the north into the Meijer. The Goodwill parcel was just recently purchased. I don't know if that is going to stay a Goodwill or not, but there is the Chase Bank on the corner. We have had conversations with the owners of the Goodwill property to purchase an easement and construct a sidewalk on their property, and we would like to do something similar on that Meijer parcel where that road is, Meijer Drive. We feel like that would be good development practices in trying to help link up those sidewalks to the condo development to the west. That's something we want to do. How we condition that as part of our approval, we will work with the Planning Department.

If we can go a couple slides back. This is the townhouse development we'd be looking to propose. As I mentioned, it would be a for-sale community. The design and form would be very similar to what is built across the street here from Township Hall, Townes at Merrill Park. I think that's a great product. It has been a very popular product recently. It really gives the opportunity for younger individuals like myself, married couples, people with younger families to get good entry-level housing into the community. Those are the types of folks we would like to bring to this area. With the large commercial presence that surrounds us, more rooftops, more shoppers, we think it's going to be very beneficial.

I've pulled some pictures here. On the right side, that's a representative image for Merrill Park. In the southwest corner, that's actually a development that we put together in Northville Township, across from Cantoro's; it's called Northville Glades. That's a development we did with Pulte. It is a very similar product in nature to Merrill Park. And I included product for another builder we're talking with, MI Homes. I believe that's from another state, but I wanted to give you a taste of the flair and an idea of what these potential townhomes can look like.

This is our plan. I think what we're going to do is predominantly a 3-bedroom townhouse unit. That is very similar in nature to some of the models that do exist at Merrill Park. We were doing some market studies, and we feel we will attract a lot of individuals with younger families, and this will be a fitting product. It has a 2-car garage and the opportunity to park another two cars in the driveway. We understand, with this being a condo development, people have guests and such, so one of the things we want to look at, so we promote the best development possible, is trying to include guest parking spaces.

I have not done an official tree survey, but I have walked the property. The most substantial trees we feel exist are along the western and southern property lines. So, one of the things we look to do here is greater setbacks and trying to cluster the development, trying to produce a vision for a development that we think will be as attractive as possible and preserve some of those natural features onsite.

Next slide. I was actually incorrect. These are the standards and this is how much density would be allowed if you were specifically developing in an RM district. The use standards and the density; it's not very clear in the HRC Overlay, so that's where we want to defer to Planning staff and see what is required. To establish our maximum density, we looked at the PUD. For an attached product that we're looking to do, the maximum allowable density is eight units per acre, so you multiply that by the acreage and that's what we get. We do exceed a lot of the requirements of the PUD. We do have more open space. We do have greater perimeter setbacks that what is required, and regardless of which option we pursue, we'd like to put some sidewalk connections in place because we feel that would be a great benefit to the users of our development, and to Commerce Township at large.

Next slide. Frankly, the main difference between the two plans; on the 38-unit plan, all of those buildings on the north side are developed as 6-plexes. We do maintain similar side yard setbacks. Naturally there is a little bit more encroachment to the west and that is the most substantial difference. As I stated, the open space, I think we are within +/- 2% of each other; they're very similar. Ultimately again, we will have to study those use standards and work with staff to figure out what our density is. It is not going to be our intention to develop above that maximum required as permitted by the code.

Next slide. This shows where those sidewalk connections and linkages would be. One last thing I do want to mention is we know Bennett Lublin who is the owner of the property to the south. He had written a letter of support for our proposed use. We are under contract with Meijer, and we do know the folks who recently purchased the building that Goodwill is in. They were generally in support of our use as well. I do plan to reach out to Jose Mirkin, who is on the DDA, and he actually lives in the condos to the west. We would like to approach those neighbors early on to give them an idea of what we're proposing to see if they have any feedback that we can implement into our development.

Dave Campbell – I think you all received a copy of the letter from Mr. Lublin.

Chairperson Parel – Yes.

Weber – It is the parking lot property.

Spencer Schafer – Yes, I think they're working with the LaFontaine dealership and they're using it as overflow parking right now. The senior living facility got developed, this parcel to the north is getting developed, and hopefully Mr. Lublin's parcel is coming in tow for some future development.

That is the extent of my presentation. I can elaborate on details. I would like to thank the Planning staff for working with us at this early stage. We had a couple of meetings with them as we have been putting this under contract with Meijer. We do have a signed Letter of Intent with Meijer. They did furnish us with a PA. We have gone back with comments. We're hopeful to get this project signed up with Meijer in the next week or two.

**Commission Comments:**

Chairperson Parel – One question. You mentioned that you're looking for an opportunity to bring entry level housing. What kind of price point do you think entry level housing looks like?

Spencer Schafer – I think that's ultimately dependent upon where rates are. Obviously, we're starting to see some downward pressure on rates. I know some of the Townes at Merrill Park are achieving pretty substantial price points; I want to say in the mid to upper 5's. If I did have to guess, things could change in 18-24 months' time, but homes would probably start somewhere in the mid to upper 4's, and potentially lower, depending on what happens with the economy. They're going to be priced very comparably to Townes at Merrill Park.

Chairperson Parel – Okay. I appreciate it. George?

Weber – If memory serves me correctly, the Townes at Merrill Park, we asked them the same question and they thought it would be in the low 4's.

Dave Campbell – What year was that though?

Paula Lankford – Late 2020.

Weber – Probably 2021. I do think it would be a good idea for you to get with Jose and meet with the HOA. They were very active on the previous proposal that came through. As you can imagine, they and the Commission weren't thrilled with the idea of putting 80-100 apartments there. There are already some traffic concerns on Crumb Road. I think reach out to them and say, one, this isn't 100 apartments, and two, it's not going to generate the type of traffic that a retailer might put in there. We did have that discussion with the HOA so it should be somewhat relevant to them.

I'm a little conflicted on the HRC route versus the PUD, and maybe I need to think about it a little more. I do think there is an opportunity to achieve some of what you want to do by coming forward with a proposal that you would take a sidewalk down to the condos close to the cul-de-sac, which then gives all of those residents walking access from their street to Meijer and the other commercial buildings there. Other than that, I support the idea of the lower density versus the apartments that we've seen in the past.

Dave Campbell – With respect to whether we go the PUD route, we have joked with Spencer that it's only one PUD per customer.

Spencer Schafer – My dad was the last customer.

Dave Campbell – Obviously, they've got the Midtown on Haggerty PUD that is still pending, and we're going to see Spencer and Steve, I assume, with the prospective change to a Kroger, from the 187 apartments. A PUD is a heavy lift, so we're trying to figure out if we need to make that lift again or not.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, can you pull up the presentation? George mentioned the proposed sidewalks. The orange sidewalk proposed on the west side, the thought is that it would get all of the folks from those ...

Weber – So for me, the definition of a PUD, the recognizable public benefit, that little bit of sidewalk there, to me, does not cross the threshold.

Spencer Schafer – We offered an additional donation too. We can talk about that.

Chairperson Parel – I think that's a discussion we've got to have. I just want to make sure we're all on the same page.

Dave Campbell – Another thing to discuss is which side of the road is more appropriate. If we had to pick one side, is it north or south? To get across this pond here is going to be a challenge for whoever wants to take it on.

Weber – I didn't realize that was a pond.

Chairperson Parel – And there is nothing existing?



Dave Campbell – Not across Treyborne or Points of Treyborne; there are no sidewalks across either development. It is worth pointing out that we did have Rolling Hills do a sidewalk across their frontage. I suppose there is logic in either side of the road, assuming at some point we are going to want to pick one.

Spencer Schafer – And we know the Lublin folks, and we have contacts at LaFontaine as well. We could investigate on either side of the street. We did talk with Dave that it may ultimately be more fitting to do it on the south, because there is that wetland area between Treyborne and Points of Treyborne. We're open to considering either option. We understand there's a frontage requirement that we have to do anyway. We want to be fair whether we're doing the work or collecting easements and giving them to the Township. We know the Shapiro folks well who own the property west of LaFontaine. Looking at it from a feasibility and practical application of getting this work done at some point in the future, I think that's a much better route. And then we figure out how to do a crossing across Crumb Road as part of our development. I think that would be huge, but we can analyze that further.

Dave Campbell – I brought up this image from Google Earth. It's a few years old now. It's 2017, and right now you're essentially standing on Crumb Road looking east toward Haggerty Road. I bring this up because there are some pretty substantial trees through here that create a nice tree canopy. When we're talking about sidewalks and which side of the road, I think we want to think about which side would be better in terms of trying to preserve this tree canopy and the natural beauty through this stretch of road.

Weber – I think there are lots of different options. We're all open to any good ideas on how to achieve a significant public benefit if we do go the PUD route.

Loskill – I really have nothing. I'm in favor of it and it makes sense. We need to see a little bit more information before we can really have more specific comments.

Chairperson Parel – I would say the same. Brady?

Phillips – I am also in favor of it. I would much rather see that than another big box store.

Winkler – I have nothing to add to what has already been said.

Karim – I like the project, but I have some comments. What if we flip the sides, upside down, and have the majority of the units could face the other side where there's more trees, instead of facing Meijer. Right now, the majority of those units are facing the other side. In general, I like what you're doing. This is just a proposal.

Spencer Schafer – I think that's a good recommendation. Ultimately, I think we are proposing a 10-foot rear yard setback, and if we do keep the plan in this similar form, we may try to figure out a way to make that bigger. That's important and it is the majority of the units.

Karim – You can plan it.

Dave Campbell – Spencer, was it purposeful that this area was chosen to be the preserved open space area based on the vegetation that is there?

Spencer Schafer – The original tree survey that I have, which I shared with you, I thought the most substantial trees were on that west side. When Meijer provided us with more plans, it was a more formal tree survey for the entire property. I guess they only did a partial tree survey when they put in the road. I'm going to punt on that a little bit and say I'm not 100% sure. But yes, as you look at this aerial, I can definitely tell that northeast or eastern half of the property doesn't have nearly as much vegetation as the west property.

Dave Campbell – The farmhouse was here at one point, if we go far enough back in time. There you go. So, I think part of what Spencer is saying is that there's some pretty substantial older vegetation there that might be worth preserving. When we're talking about flipping, we would want to consider that. Would that then force some of this to have to come out, and those are things we have to weigh.

Spencer Schafer – One thing I'd like to add, and maybe you'll see it as you go forward through the aerials, but Meijer did store a lot of extra material on that vacant eastern portion of the property. I want to say there's anywhere from 8-14 feet of fill. So, I think there's going to be an opportunity to really berm the property and create a couple foot high landscape berm that we can do plantings on top of too.

Karim – You'll still see it from the top

Spencer Schafer – I understand.

Weber – Are there any traffic concerns? You're proposing access onto Meijer Drive, as well as Crumb Road. Is there any concern on people now cutting through the parking lot to get access there? The last thing we want to do is increase people buzzing through a parking lot to get home. If you get stuck at the traffic light at Meijer, they may just turn into the parking lot and cut through to the east access off Meijer Drive.

Dave Campbell – For the folks that live in Treyborne?

Weber – Moreso for the folks that would live here. For 38 or 35 homes, I don't know if it's a big deal, and I know the Fire Marshal would very much like to have double access.

Spencer Schafer – We've had that conversation, yes.

Dave Campbell – Obviously traffic is worth looking at, and it's always worth looking at in Commerce Township in particular. But it does raise a point of what this property is zoned, which is B-3. Think about all of the potential uses that could be developed on a property zoned B-3, five acres, and what traffic those uses might generate compared to 35-ish townhomes.

Weber – Maybe you just answered my question.

Dave Campbell – Okay, then I won't say anything else.

Weber – Don't sell past the close.

Chairperson Parel – Any other questions or comments, or Mr. Schafer, anything else we can answer for you? I think this was productive.

Spencer Schafer – No, I think this is perfect. It gives us an indication that it seems there is broad, general support for a proposal, so we are going to finalize our agreement with Meijer and work on formalizing more of these details, along with which process we want to proceed with and evaluating public benefit, sidewalks and all of that good stuff. I think this is a great start. We're going to look at taking substantial action this year, and hopefully moving forward with this in the early part of next year.

Dave Campbell – I will mention that when Mr. McKeever called Paula late in the day, and he had car trouble which is why he is not with us this evening, but he did say he has concerns with this project relative to density, which is not inconsistent with what we've heard from Mr. McKeever on projects in the past, in a good way. Spencer, you have what you've heard this evening, but keep in mind there is one member who could not make it, and he does have concerns about going over density on this property.

Spencer Schafer – Yes, and if I could just talk about density briefly. That senior use figure is 12-units per acre. We have three commercial uses surrounding us. We've got an ITC utility corridor just west of us. Ultimately, we have to think about the marketability and what type of residential use best fits here within the confines of those restrictions. So, figuring out the right product and again figuring out how to cluster it to get as much open space and as much preservation of natural features, and opportunity to do more landscape buffers, we think that's super implement.

Dave Campbell – While we have you on the spot, are there any updates with Midtown on Haggerty and Kroger?

Spencer Schafer – Yes, so Kroger's attorney was out the past week and a half on vacation, and I think dealing with a closing for one of their new stores. We did get comments back earlier today for the PA. They supplied the PA, we supplied redlines and they just got us comments back. I have not had a chance to fully review it, but we are moving forward with Kroger. We are very close to inking the deal. We have a meeting with Atwell tomorrow who is going to be the civil engineer for the project. They have prepared a couple of conceptual layouts, but I think we finally have the final tweaks for what will be the concept for our preliminary site plan. I have to imagine over the next 120 days, we will be coming here with a submittal for the Kroger piece and this piece.

Weber discussed the gas station element with Spencer and Steve Schafer.

Dave Campbell – One thing we talked about was updating the traffic study for Midtown on Haggerty to take into account the difference in traffic for a Kroger versus 187 apartments.

Spencer Schafer – We talked about it with Kroger and they said let us analyze the feasibility. I want to wait until they're formally under contract, but I've shared all the materials to date, the approved documents and drawings we had from the County, with the signal at our proposed driveway. They are evaluating it.

Steve Schafer – They were here for that meeting and I think we will probably see a submittal even sooner than 120 days. I'm hoping within 60 days. I'm the eternal optimist.

Spencer Schafer – I'm the realist. Thank you guys for your time.

Chairperson Parel – We appreciate it.

**J: OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION:**

None.

**K: PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Dave Campbell shared the following with the Commissioners.

- Coming up this Friday, August 16<sup>th</sup>, and the Schafer's are aware of this, there is an auction for Oakland County on tax foreclosure properties. There are two significant properties included in that auction which are the two remaining Sleeth Road gravel pits. Mr. Milia and his partners did the western most of the three gravel pits. The two undeveloped gravel pits east of there, which are bisected by the ITC lines, are in tax foreclosure. They're going to auctioned and we should know by the end of the day on Friday who is the successful bidder on those properties. From there, we will figure out what it is they want to do with those.

Weber – We think there is active bidding on both of those properties, right?

Dave Campbell – Yes, we do. We have had conversations with several prospective bidders, some seemingly more serious than others. One guy wanted to do a bunch of self-storage out there and we told him it wasn't zoned for that. Yes, there are some heavy hitters interested in those properties.

- Mr. Weber, you mentioned the intersection study that the Township is working on with OHM Advisors. One of the intersections we're looking at is the corner of Richardson and Union Lake Road, the corner where the Chaldean Catholic Church hopes to build a nice, big church sometime in the foreseeable future. There is some coordination between the traffic consultant that is looking at that intersection on the Township's behalf, but also the consultant looking at it relative to what the Church wants to do. One of the things the Church is now considering is moving their new driveway that they would propose onto the east side of Union Lake Road, moving it further north than originally planned, to have it line up with the residential road on the west side of Union Lake Road which is Woodspur. That would create a 4-way intersection with a new traffic signal. That signal, because it would be mostly for church traffic, would be an actuated signal. It would probably be flashing yellow or maybe green 99% of the time, but then on Sunday morning or any other big church events, it would be a fully active signal. That's being evaluated and looked at.
- At the September Planning Commission meeting, you might see a familiar face, Bradley Thomasma, who approached the Planning Commission a couple months ago along with Randy Thomas, looking at the southwest corner of Welch and Pontiac Trail. Currently, there is a house there that through the years has been used as an adult foster care home. The intent would be to remove the existing house and develop it with a commercial use on that corner. When they came in front of you with the concept, there were concerns with traffic, the amount of activity and parking, and also the drive-through. They wanted to be able to have a drive-through tenant in that building. They also wanted to have a second story on the building with office uses above, and that is where it got into concerns

about over-burdening the property with traffic and parking, et cetera. Mr. Thomasma is likely to bring a revised concept in front of you at the September meeting to have further discussion.

- Hopefully you've all seen the activity at the Five & Main site. Continental properties, who is the residential developer, is moving a lot of dirt and has a lot of pipes staged to get that project going. Their hope is to get their sanitary sewer installed by the end of this year. That was always the big hurdle with that project, putting in a sewer that goes 30 feet deep. They're telling us they hope to be moving folks into their first apartment buildings by this time next year, if not closer to early summer next year.
- LaFontaine's name came up a couple times tonight. I think you've seen the progress at what we are not going to call the Dick Morris site anymore. They have put enough money and effort into that site that we will call it the LaFontaine site at 2199 Haggerty. If you'll recall, that was going to be a pre-owned dealership, and also the service center for the Hyundai Genesis dealership that they're going to build further up the street. Based on very recent conversations, it sounds like now they might have a new car operator who would want to occupy that facility. While they tell me I can't tell you the brand name, it is a higher end brand who will want to put their branding on the building.

Weber – That's interesting because in their original concept, they had a relatively small service department at the two boutique stores because service was all going to be taking place at their used car facility. If they're now going to turn that into a standalone franchise ... There were a few things we talked about that we didn't want. We did not want to see a bunch of used cars out in front along Haggerty Road, in front of Hyundai and Genesis. And, we had discussions on traffic, the service drive, and the garage doors facing forward. So, if that's not going to be their primary service facility, if it is a standalone new car franchise, or a different franchise, I would want to rethink how that all fits together.

Dave Campbell – Keep in mind, from a zoning standpoint, that property can be pre-owned or new car sales, the 2199 Haggerty Road site. The way it has been described to us is that they would continue the service facility, because in that building, the lifts are still there. They're going to reuse those service bays, the hydraulic lifts and whatever else is inside the building. So it's going to continue to operate as the service center, but a portion of the showroom will be the new car brand.

Weber – It's not that big of a showroom.

Dave Campbell – I thought it was good news.

Weber – I'll be curious to see how it's all going to fit. A new car franchise is going to have very specific requirements for square footage, and generally any new car franchise is going to have big heartburn if you're sharing a showroom for high-end new vehicles with used vehicles.

Dave Campbell – Understood.

Weber – I'll reserve judgment until we see what the plan is, but it will be interesting.

Dave Campbell – Speaking of LaFontaine, we had a preconstruction meeting with their team on the Hyundai Genesis site. They are looking to break ground any day now. You will notice if you've been to Walmart, it has been a mess over there as Walmart has been repaving their entire parking lot, but part of what they did was to take out the wall that separates the Walmart property from the LaFontaine property, because we will have continuation of the frontage road.

Chairperson Parel – Have we heard from the Rabban family who owns Annie's Party Store?

Dave Campbell – It has been a while. Their architect, Marsha, usually checks in with us, but it has been a few months.

Weber – A reminder, I will not be here for the September meeting. Any update on the marina?

Dave Campbell – He has been reminded that he has a September 1<sup>st</sup> deadline. Today is August 12<sup>th</sup> and the day is over. Being realistic, there's no way he can do what he needs to do between now and September 1<sup>st</sup>, so there's going to be issues. His plans are approved, and he has his RCOC permit. I think he has everything approved on paper. I can't think of anything being held up on the Township's end, or on the end of any other public agencies. The ball is in his court.

**NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2024 AT 7:00pm.**

**L: ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION** by Weber, supported by Loskill, to adjourn the meeting at 8:30pm.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

---

Joe Loskill, Secretary