

4:30 P.M. – CALL THE MEETING TO ORDER

Chairperson Werth Called the meeting to order at 4:30 P.M.

I. ROLL CALL

Present: Sandra Werth, Chairperson
Matt Ray, Secretary
Tony Bartolotta, Commissioner
Dave Kramer, Commissioner
Colleen Murphy, Commissioner
Scott Sintkowski, Commissioner

Absent: Steve Reno, Vice Chairperson

Also Present: Jeffrey Polkowski, Superintendent/Planning
Scott Alef, Planner II
Amy Williams, Departmental Aid
Gary Wall, Township Supervisor

Attendance: Approximately 50+ persons in the public

II. APPROVAL OF THE JULY 28, 2020 PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING AGENDA

MOTION BY Bartolotta, SUPPORTED BY Kramer,
RESOLVED TO APPROVE THE JULY 28, 2020 AGENDA as written.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
(6-0)

III. APPROVAL OF THE JUNE 23, 2020 PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES

MOTION BY Kramer, SUPPORTED BY Bartolotta,
RESOLVED TO APPROVE THE JULY 28, 2020 AGENDA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
(6-0)

IV. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

MOTION BY Bartolotta, SUPPORTED BY Kramer,
RESOLVED TO APPROVE THE JULY 28, 2020 CONSENT AGENDA.
MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(6-0)

V. SITE PLANS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. PUBLIC HEARING - Rezoning. 20-01-03, Redwood Living Residential Development (New Hearing)

Location: NE corner of Hatchery Rd and N Williams Lake Rd
Request: Rezone from PL, Public Lands to R-M2, Multiple-Family Residential Zoning District. This is a modification of the original rezoning request.
Parcel I.D. No.: 13-18-100-008
Applicant: Redwood Living c/o Patricia Rakoci

Applicant or representative present: Patricia Rakoci and Emily Englehardt

Mr. Polkowski gave a brief overview.

Ms. Englehardt described the plan to develop the subject property, and fill a niche in the housing community. The plan is for single story attached units for rent that provide a home-like atmosphere. There would be 103 units with sidewalks that would rent for approximately \$1700-\$2100. She further stated that there would be no traffic issues and the homes would be 140' from Richardson Ct.

During the public portion of the meeting, the following spoke in opposition to this request.

Robert Tarchalski of 2343 Evadna stated that the underground aquifers has not been addressed. He has concerns with the water table and wells and the extra sewage that 103 homes in this area might cause problems. Additional concerns with losing greenspace, extra noise from losing the tree buffer and accidents caused by additional traffic flow.

Sandy Polk of 7444 N Shaker submitted a letter, but spoke to ask that the commissioners consider that when the Road Commission took over this land it was for public use, not commercial, and to sell for profit. She feels this will lower land value, increase traffic and not an ideal gateway to Waterford. Feels that tenants don't generally fill out census information.

Greg Bauer of 6950 Hatchery is opposed because the woods now create a buffer for the noise, and also there is the potential of 206 cars for this

development and the majority would be working and create more traffic on an already busy area.

Leslie of 2688 Tackles Dr. White Lake, is opposed and wonders who would pay that amount for rent to be near a busy airport.

Hanna Parker of 7398 Hatchery- opposed due to traffic, speeding, concerns for bikers, wild life, noise barrier and construction noise.

Jacquelynn Brown of 945 Oregon has been a lifetime resident and is concerned with the environmental impact and feels that we should be protecting our public, undeveloped lands.

Paula of 6561 Windiate feels that there are plenty of old buildings that are not being used and would rather see them re zone a commercial property for redevelopment.

Mr. Polkowski offered, for the public benefit, the different uses that could be developed in this zoning without any request for rezoning and public hearing.

Wayne Wood of 2280 Carlos feels that that airport has been a big inconvenience since it was put in and does not feel that this property should also be disrupted.

Sandy Schnake of 7463 N Shaker – would reiterate what has already been said, and add that they like being secluded from the traffic on Williams Lake Road and the wildlife that it shelters.

Jim Barnett of 7126 Hatchery feels that allowing this development would be a disservice to the community, there is too much traffic and this is all about money and the benefit to the Township.

Sharon Paladino of 7200 Hatchery said that they fought the expansion of the airport and feels that this does not benefit anyone. It causes more traffic, eliminates the wildlife that they enjoy. There are other properties to re develop.

Jessica Sinden of 2824 Lansdowne said this is a lake community and there are few sidewalks, but many issues with traffic and speeding. To widen the road they would residential land would need to be taken from residents. She is also concerned with safety of the children as there is a bus top near this development.

James Allen of 7306 S Shaker is concerned that the residents who reside in this area are taken care of.

Lori Hubbard of 2795 Ravenglass voiced concerns for wildlife, losing peaceful feel, increase in traffic and crime.

Dave Marshall of 2574 N Williams Lake Rd said to sell Public Land to a private party, the Township should be extremely picky. The rating for Redwood was low when he looked online. The Township should do more research and agree with all issues mentioned.

Lisa Smith 6347 Harriet feels that the apartments seem nice, but feels that this is not the right place for it.

Anthony of 7345 N Shaker is opposed for all of the previously mentioned reasons.

Paula Rowland of 6774 Desmond has four questions. Will they be allowed lake access, what tax revenue would the Township receive, have there been infrastructure studies, and what is the sales price?

James Nunley of 7230 Hatchery lives on the first curve on Hatchery and continually has vehicles go through his yard and has replaced his mailbox several times. There are no bike paths, and traffic is a serious issue. He also has concerns with noise, and would like to know the impact this development would have on the lake.

Walter Plentis of 2336 Carlos asked if a traffic study was done.

Robert Kinsora of 5063 Ridge Top is concerned with traffic.

Sherry Bonnell of 2620 Desmond is also concerned with traffic and lives on a street without a traffic light and sometimes has to wait 5-6 minutes to turn left. This development will only make it worse.

John Harding of 2940 Ravenglass is against the development for all of the same reasons, Waterford does not need any more transient renters, as we gained so many back in 2009-2010 during the recession.

Laura Raupp of 2573 Campbellgate is opposed and has concerns with traffic and how this may affect the drinking water.

Ed Ford 6879 Forestlawn said that as a child he remembers playing on this property and said that kids still do. There are many trails and forts. He is opposed and has concerns with traffic.

Mauren Bates of 2685 Lansdowne has concerns with this development messing with the water and lake quality.

Lori Bonnell of 7054 Hatchery is opposed and concerned with pedestrian safety with traffic. Bus stop in the area and drivers can be impatient. Very congested.

James Kohler of 2709 Lansdowne is opposed to this request as he remembers the changes from when the airport expanded. There was more noise and less woods.

Paula Milgrom of 7126 Hatchery voiced concerns that there are many curves on Hatchery, and that they might want to widen the road in the future. She does not want to have to hire an attorney to fight this and the possibility of having people have their properties taken away for such a project.

Elizabeth Brown of 2870 Airport is opposed and feels that this traffic will affect Airport road as well, and the trucks travel too fast and shake his house now. He feels that another location could be re-built rather than this site.

Carrie Harding of 2940 Ravenglass voiced concerns with traffic at other intersections that do not have a light, and if the schools and busses can handle more kids.

Ann Cramer of 7026 Hatchery is opposed, she walks her two dogs and the traffic now makes it unsafe.

Robert Ammon of 7176 Hatchery is opposed. Says this is all for corporate profit and the developers have no stake in the community.

Maureen Edson of 7084 Hatchery is opposed for all of the reasons previously mentioned and wishes that the Township were to permanently designate this property as green space. Traffic concerns on Hatchery, left turns would be dangerous.

Kathy Schemers of 7000 Hatchery is opposed but wanted to point out that the Township chose to go to a single waste hauler to help eliminate traffic on the

roads, so why would they consider this development and traffic that it will create.

Tom Conkle of 2366 Richardson is opposed for traffic reasons.

Art Paladino of 7200 Hatchery is opposed due to traffic, and voiced a concern that traffic signs have been removed and not replaced on Hatchery.

Nick Skrzypczak of 2802 Riverside rides his bike in this area, and likes residential neighborhoods, not rentals. Less personable.

Diane Funk of 2529 Litchfield- travels this area frequently and asked if they did any research on traffic, and asked that the Township research this before making a decision.

Tom Edson (and Maureen) of 7084 Hatchery voiced concerns that drivers ignore speed limit signs now, and is concerned with the safety of residents and children at our bus stops. What is the applicant's long term investment in this area? What if they destroy the land and no one is interested in the apartments.

Barb Mcarthur of 2396 Richardson Ct is concerned with air quality during construction. What if they cannot fill the units, and the trees are already gone.

Mark Monohon of 3517 David K is concerned with traffic and said that we need to look at the master plan for this area.

Amanda Gauthier 2935 Sunderland wants to know why here? It's near an airport and busy road. She said this development had reviews that they were poorly built/insulated. Will people live here long term? Probably not.

Chairperson Werth Closed the public portion of the meeting, however there were a few Comment cards turned in for the record.

Comments cards were read by Mr. Polkowski:

Kathy & Don Schemers, 7000 Hatchery are against apartments at the end of the street because they don't want a transient population to add traffic to Hatchery and Williams lake roads. They don't want to see the green land removed, it will lower property values.

Stephanie Kleine of 2293 Carlos would like to see a traffic study, said the access on Hatchery should be on Williams Lake road only, and speed limits need to be set if rezoned.

Maureen Bates of 2685 Lansdowne says there is already too much traffic on Hatchery. She does not want to see the greenbelt removed as it blocks noise from the airport.

Mary Ginter of 2716 Maplecrest is opposed, there is too much traffic and it will lower property values.

Brett Garrett of 7462 N Shaker does not want this project to happen.

Robert Harner of 7018 Hatchery would like to object because there is too much traffic on Hatchery already, and the road is already in bad shape. Additional traffic will endanger residents. Does not want to see the loss of green space when there are other areas in the Township that are available for re-development.

There were several outburst from the general public, and the chairperson reminded the residents she had closed the public portion of the meeting.

Chairperson Werth clarified several misconceptions, stating that there will be no lake access on the subject parcel and that Tax revenue to the Township cannot be addressed at the meeting without getting information from the Assessing Department.

Chairperson Werth then asked the applicant to address questions brought up during the public portion of the meeting.

Ms. Englehardt advised that there have been numerous environmental, wetland Studies, and they have met with engineering regarding capacity to ensure this is a project that can work.

Sale price of the property to Oakland County Road Commission – Applicant could not answer.

Has there been any research and impact on Williams Lake?

Ian Graham, engineer for Redwood said that all storm water will be treated per water quality volume and meet County requirements. There will be no change

to existing ground water table. All runoff and drainage will go into a detention pond and be treated and released.

Residents spoke out again, to ask if there has been any impact studies done on the lake or for traffic.

Mr. Graham replied stated that here has been no study done, but it has been preliminary investigations. They have not done a traffic study, only preliminary investigations.

Would they be able to encourage a right turn only on Hatchery?

Mr. Graham said that would follow whatever Oakland County requires.

Will there be enhancements on windows and insulation due to the close proximity to the airport?

Ms. Englehardt stated that they do have other communities in close proximity to an airport and they have had no issues. These items have been addressed internally.

Was there the possibility of a safety bypass on the South side of Hatchery?

Ms. Englehardt replied that they do not have an interest in that property.

Chairperson Werth reminded residents that the public hearing was closed.

Board member Bartolotta spoke up to say that he was planning on voting in favor of this rezoning, but after hearing all of the concerns from residents, he has reconsidered, and feels that he has to support the public concerns.

Board member Kramer had the following comments:

First, the developer wants a change of zoning, not the citizens or local government. The Rezoning is presented for purely commercial purposes. Rezoning benefits only the petitioner, not the citizens of Waterford Township. The property was originally deeded to the State on 3/4/1986 by Ida Booth Hampton. Since it abutted Pontiac Lake Recreation, one can assume that she intended it to be park land. Use of properties for apartments violates Ms. Booth's intentions.

The property is/was zoned Public Lands as it was owned by the Pontiac Lake Recreation. (State of MI) Oakland County Road Commission may own the land, but it is part of the park area.

The Road Commission moved the road in 2005-06 west to accommodate the lengthening of the airport runways. This caused wetlands to be filled in and a loss to park lands.

Some residents have made decisions about property purchase based on this property being zoned public land and not being developed.

Adjacent residents have a right to oppose this development.

Due diligence was employed.

Neighbors and citizens are unhappy, and have been posting on the Waterford Facebook page. Multiple letters have been received opposing the change of zoning.

Presently there is a greenbelt as one travels north and/or south bound on Williams Lake road. This park-like setting is an inviting way to enter into Waterford Township, versus hundreds of apartments.

92% of the land in Waterford is developed.

Apartments are landlord owned properties, not owner occupied. There is not the same pride in ownership, and rental properties increase the chances of problematic maintenance.

The existing green space provides a noise and visual buffer to the adjacent neighborhood.

Citizens continually speak about preservation of existing wild life habitats.

More housing will surely create more traffic problems.

Noise pollution from the airport will always be problematic.

There is no demonstrated need for development of this parcel. Waterford demographics show that there is a large amount of affordable housing in Waterford. As well as houses in the 1600-2000sq.ft. Size. The demographics

also show that most snowbirds live on the lakes. Lakefront homeowners are not likely to sell their homes to live on Williams Lake Road.

MOTION AND VOTE

*MOVED BY Kramer , SUPPORTED BY Murphy; to forward a **unfavorable** recommendation in Case No. 20-01-03 on to the Township Board, to rezone the subject property of this application from PL, Public Lands to R-M2, Multiple Family Residential District based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance approval recommendation guidelines which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.*

Findings:

The requested zoning change is not consistent with the adopted Master Plan as amended.

B. The requested zoning change is not consistent with existing uses and zoning classifications of properties within the general area of the subject zoning lot.

C. The subject zoning lot is physically suitable to provide all dimensional and site requirements for the range of uses permitted under the proposed zoning classification.

D. The trend of development in the general area of the subject zoning lot is not consistent with the requested zoning change.

E. The Township and other public agencies do possess the capacity to provide all utility and public safety services that would be required for the range of land uses permitted under the proposed zoning classification.

F. The requested zoning change and the resulting range of uses permitted under the proposed zoning classification will result in any significant environmental impacts.

G. The proposed zoning amendment will be detrimental to the public interest.

Conditions:

1. Approval and adoption of the Text Amendment PZ 20-03-02 which would permit attached Single-Family developments within the R-M1 and R-M2 zoning districts.

2. Approval or the related Conceptual Site Plan PSP 20-1353.

3. That the rezoning would be restricted to the approved site. Failure to implement the conditional site plan per the standards of the ordinance would invalidate the rezoning and return it to the PL, Public Lands zoning designation.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(6-0)

2. PUBLIC HEARING – Rezoning 18-11-01, Rezone from PL, Public Lands to R-1B Single Family

Location: W Side of Cooley Lake Rd, S of Cass Elizabeth Rd
Request: Rezone from PL, Public Lands to R-1B Single Family
Parcel I.D. No.: 13-28-378-002 & 13-33-126-001
Applicant: Kanti Dhandha

Applicant or representative present: Terrance Garrett (on behalf of Kanti Dhandha)

Mr. Alef gave a brief history. There are 2 parcels, and Over ½ of these parcels is wetland and the owner is trying to develop. The property was formerly zoned residential and was rezoned in 2010 to Public Land for the intent of having a secondary access to a Waterford Park if they wished to purchase it. Due to lack of funding this did not happen.

Mr. Garrett said that Mr. Dhandha had to leave so he was here to present this case on his behalf. The owner has donated the land and profits from development of these parcels will help fund underprivileged children.

During the public portion of this meeting, the following spoke regarding this request.

Jacquelynn Brown of 945 Oregon was concerned that this was a lot of acreage for only two homes. And 92% of Waterford is already developed.

Paula Rowland of 6774 Desmond questioned if there were permits for drainage of wetlands.

Staff advised that only 2 homes could be developed due to the wetlands, and permits for wetlands are handled though EAGLE. (Formerly the DEQ)

MOTION AND VOTE

*MOVED BY Bartolotta, SUPPORTED BY Murphy; to forward a **favorable** recommendation in Case No. 18-11-01 on to the Township Board, to rezone the subject property of this application from PL, Public Lands to R-1B, Single-Family Residential District based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance approval recommendation guidelines which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.*

Findings:

The requested zoning change is consistent with the adopted Master Plan as amended.

The requested zoning change is consistent with existing uses and zoning classifications of properties within the general area of the subject zoning lot. The subject zoning lot is physically suitable to provide all dimensional and site requirements for the range of uses permitted under the proposed zoning classification.

The trend of development in the general area of the subject zoning lot is consistent with the requested zoning change.

The Township and other public agencies do possess the capacity to provide all utility and public safety services that would be required for the range of land uses permitted under the proposed zoning classification.

The requested zoning change and the resulting range of uses permitted under the proposed zoning classification will not result in any significant environmental impacts.

The proposed zoning amendment will not be detrimental to the public interest.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
(6-0)**

3. PUBLIC HEARING – Special Approval 20-07-01, Marlinton Boat Storage

Location: 3113 Marlinton
Request: Special Use to permit outside storage as a principal use.
Parcel I.D. No.: 13-10-151-001
Applicant: Derek Baker

Applicant or representative present: Derek Baker

Mr. Polkowski gave a brief overview. This property has been under examination for some time. There has been no residential or industrial interest due to the close proximity to the railroad tracks. They are planning on low density storage with exterior fencing and minor cosmetic enhancements and a fire hydrant near the lake.

Mr. Baker said that he is a Waterford resident, and is looking for a place to store boats. He will improve the lot and provide screening. He plans to store about 50-60 boats with future potential of about 130.

Commissioner Bartolotta questioned if there would be a fee for storage and if it would be ground level only.

Mr. Baker confirmed yes and storage would be ground level only.

Commissioner Kramer questioned traffic noise from trailers down a residential street and hours of operation.

Mr. Baker plans to have M-F hours and traffic would be limited.

During the public portion of the meeting, the following spoke against this request.

Mark Monohon of 3517 David K is opposed to this as it is located at the end of a residential street. The roads should be considered.

MOTION AND VOTE

*MOVED BY Ray, SUPPORTED BY Kramer; to **approve with conditions** the request for special approval in this case based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance review criteria and considerations, which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.*

Findings:

A. The proposed use is in accordance with the objectives of the Master Plan and with future land use plans for the area as adopted or maintained by the Planning Commission.

B.1 The proposed use will be compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of building and activity location, scope of activity, character, hours of operation, and compliance with the performance standards required under ARTICLE II, Division 2-2.

B.2 The proposed use will not have an adverse effect on the environment or adjacent properties beyond the normal effects of permitted principal uses in the same zoning district.

B.3 The proposed use will not result in an impairment, pollution, and/or destruction of air, water, natural resources and/or the public trust therein.

C. The proposed use is not located in any Special Approval use service areas identified and adopted by the Planning Commission.

D. The proposed use will not impose an unreasonable burden upon public services and utilities.

E. The proposed use will be in compliance with the regulations of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be located.

Conclusions:

A.1 *The proposed use is of such location, size and character as to be compatible with the orderly development of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be situated.*

A.2 *The proposed use will be compatible with the orderly development or use of adjacent zoning lots.*

A.3 *Pedestrian circulation will not be hindered by the proposed use.*

A.4 *Outdoor operations and display in connection with the proposed use will not burden and/or disrupt uses on adjacent properties.*

A.5 *The natural and surrounding environment will not be negatively impacted by the proposed use.*

B. *The proposed use will be within the capacity limitations of the existing or proposed public services and facilities which serve its proposed location.*

C. *The proposed use will be conducive to fulfilling a gap in the geographic coverage of such services to Township residents.*

Conditions:

All Department comments from this application and related site plan shall be addressed to the satisfaction of department staff.

Hours of Operation shall be limited to be between 7a.m. and 10p.m.

A full screen wall shall be extended along the length of the southern property border between the residential property and the storage areas.

This approval only extends to the current applicant.

The Planning Commission may re-review require additional screening or restrictions at a later date in response to complaints

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(6-0)

4. PUBLIC HEARING – Special Approval 20-07-02, Outside Storage

Location: 2501 Dixie Hwy
Request: Special Use to permit outside storage as an accessory use.
Parcel I.D. No.: 13-13-177-029
Applicant: Greg Mackay

Applicant or representative present: Greg Mackay

Mr. Alef gave a brief summary and advised that the staff would support this request with some clarification.

Mr. Mackay agrees that his original plans were lacking. He is a Waterford resident and established his family owned masonry company in 1994 and it has grown over the years. The subject property has been vacant for about 1 year.

Commissioner Ray asked if this would be a permanent new location.

Commissioner Bartolotta said that he welcomes a family business that wants to invest in Waterford Township.

During the public portion of the meeting, the following spoke regarding this request.

Diana Funk of 2529 Litchfield wanted to know what types of trucks and equipment would be stored here.

Mr. Mackay replied that they do have dump trucks (3yd and one 12yd and pick-up trucks) but all access and traffic flow will be off Williams Drive.

Jacquelynn Brown of 945 Oregon said it is nice to see support for family business.

Mark Monohon of 3517 David K supports and said it is great to see new occupancy in a vacant property. He would encourage the company to improve the look with a masonry display.

MOTION AND VOTE

*MOVED BY Kramer, SUPPORTED BY Bartolotta; to **approve with conditions** the request for special approval in this case based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance review criteria and considerations, which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.*

Findings:

A. The proposed use is in accordance with the objectives of the Master Plan and with future land use plans for the area as adopted or maintained by the Planning Commission.

B.1 The proposed use will be compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of building and activity location, scope of activity, character, hours of operation, and compliance with the performance standards required under ARTICLE II, Division 2-2.

B.2 The proposed use will not have an adverse effect on the environment or adjacent properties beyond the normal effects of permitted principal uses in the same zoning district.

B.3 The proposed use will not result in an impairment, pollution, and/or destruction of air, water, natural resources and/or the public trust therein.

C. The proposed use is not located in any Special Approval use service areas identified and adopted by the Planning Commission.

D. The proposed use will not impose an unreasonable burden upon public services and utilities.

E. The proposed use will be in compliance with the regulations of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be located.

Conclusions:

A.1 The proposed use is of such location, size and character as to be compatible with the orderly development of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be situated.

A.2 The proposed use will be compatible with the orderly development or use of adjacent zoning lots.

A.3 Pedestrian circulation will not be hindered by the proposed use.

A.4 Outdoor operations and display in connection with the proposed use will not burden and/or disrupt uses on adjacent properties.

A.5 The natural and surrounding environment will not be negatively impacted by the proposed use.

B. The proposed use will be within the capacity limitations of the existing or proposed public services and facilities which serve its proposed location.

C. The proposed use will be conducive to fulfilling a gap in the geographic coverage of such services to Township residents.

Conditions:

The conditions of this approval, which have considered the Planning Commission's ability to impose reasonable restrictions to ensure compliance with the performance standards established in the Zoning Ordinance, are as follows:

A final site plan shall be submitted for review and all department comments from this application and related site plan shall be addressed to the satisfaction of department staff.

A landscaping and parking plan must be provided.

This approval only extends to the current applicant and use.

The Planning Commission may re-review the approval at a later date should concerns arise and incorporate additional restrictions.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(6-0)

VI. DISCUSSION

1. PUBLIC COMMENT – Five-Year Master Plan Update

Mr. Polkowski advised the commissioners that due to Michigan Planning and Enabling Act, the Master Plan should be re-evaluated every five years. There are a few minor changes to be made due to an increase in population, 4 elementary schools closed, and the adoption of the Summit Place Mall overlay zone. This will be taken to the Township Board of Trustees and then back to the Planning Commission for official adoption.

MOTION AND VOTE

MOVED BY Ray, SUPPORTED BY Murphy to submit the proposed Update Amendment to the Master Plan as presented at this meeting to the Township Board for review, comment, and to approval of distribution for review and comment by the entities specified in the Michigan Planning Enabling Act. Request that the Township Board approve the distribution at one of its August 2020 regular meetings.

Schedule a public hearing on the Update Amendment for the Commission's regular meeting on November 24, 2020, and include notice of that hearing to the entities when they are provided with the Update Amendment for review and comment.

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY
(6-0)***

VII. ALL ELSE

VIII. ADJOURN

CHAIRPERSON WERTH ADJOURNED THE MEETING AT 7:13P.M.