

Green Oak Charter Township
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
June 7, 2018

Approved: _____

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Smigliani at 7:03 p.m.

Roll Call: Chuck Fellows
Keith Lee
Sarah Pearsall
Michael Sedlak
Deborah Sellis
Lamberto Smigliani
Michelle Stock

Also Present: Debra McKenzie, Zoning Administrator
Paul Montagno, Carlisle Wortman
Leslie Zawada, CES

Guests: 56+

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

**Motion by Sedlak, second by Stock
To approve the agenda as presented.**

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

MOTION APPROVED

Approval of the May 17, 2018 Regular Meeting Minutes

**Motion by Stock, second by Pearsall
To approve the minutes of May 17, 2018 as presented.**

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

MOTION APPROVED

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

Sally Burgess, resident of Green Tree Trail – She provided a signed petition to the Planning Commissioners. The proposal is that the northern entrance to Ascher Farms Development be eliminated and they just go with the South entrance. They sometimes sit there for 3-5 minutes trying to get out onto Rushton Road. They are worried it will

50 greatly increase the traffic and there is a home that sits there at 9961 Rushton. The guard
51 rail will not protect against a perpendicular accident. Due to the lack of setback it is not
52 possible to put a by pass lane. She has noticed the increase of traffic since Rushton
53 Road has been paved as well. The home at 9961 and the one next door will have to also
54 deal with a lot of headlights. Most subdivisions in this area have 1 entrance/exit. There
55 is precedent in Green Oak Township to have one entrance/exit. They are concerned with
56 the wear and tear on their private road as well. She would ask that they visit the area and
57 witness the traffic in that area since the pictures really don't do it justice.

58

59 **BUSINESS ITEMS**

60

- 61 **1. Site Plan Review SP05-2018 for Wyman Gordon a 1,500 square foot**
62 **building addition. 4716-08-100-015 is located at 7250 Whitmore Lake**
63 **Road, Brighton, MI 48116**

64

65 Mr. Montagno reviewed the Carlisle Wortman memo dated May 30, 2018. He explained
66 they are recommending approval of the amended site plan with the condition that the
67 following items area addressed:

68

- 69 1. Add lot coverage and impervious surface calculations to the project information.
70 2. Provide the approved lighting plan in the site plan.
71 3. Address any outstanding times in the engineering review.

72

73 Ms. Zawada explained the proposed addition is close to the existing water main and is
74 subject to the Livingston County Water Authority review.

75

76 A representative from Wyman Gordan explained he is available to answer questions, he
77 did note they are also adding barrier free restrooms in the building.

78

79 Mr. Montagno noted the lighting plan and impervious surface calculations have been
80 added to the plan.

81

82 **Motion by Fellows, second by Sedlak**
83 **To approve site plan review SP05-2018 as submitted contingent upon**
84 **addressing the issues as noted in the CES memo dated May 21, 2018.**

85

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

88

89 **MOTION APPROVED**

90

91

- 92 **2. Site Plan Review for Asher Farms, SP03-2018 parcel #4716-23-300-010 a**
93 **site condominium with 70 half acre single family residential lots on 52.94**
94 **acres. The parcel is located on the west side of Rushton Road, north of**
95 **10 Mile Road, south of Doane Road, in Section23. The site is zoned R-2**
96 **single family residential, in which the single family residential use is**
97 **permitted at the requested density.**

98

99 Mr. Montagno reviewed the memo from Carlisle Wortman dated May 30, 2018.

100

101 He recommended that all of the following outstanding items be submitted before action is
102 taken on these plans:

103

104 1. Increase the size of 6 lots to meet the minimum lot size requirement.

105 2. Provide ramps and crosswalks on all sides of each intersection on the
106 proposed right-of-way.

107 3. Provide ramps and crosswalk details.

108 4. Provide approval for work within the ROW from LCRC.

109 5. Provide a 10-foot-wide non-motorized pathway along Rushton Road.

110 6. Provide road names.

111 7. Provide tree removal and mitigation calculations.

112 8. Provide lighting plan for further review.

113 9. Provide neighborhood style street lighting along ROW within the site.

114 10. Obtain a sign permit prior to construction.

115 11. Provide elevations and floorplans for all proposed structures for further
116 review.

117

118 Ms. Zawada referenced the CES Memo dated May 22, 2018. She mentioned that they
119 have not received the soil boring or geo technical report which should be provided as part
120 of the site plan process, along with a preliminary grading plan, and detention basin
121 calculations. She also recommended that no part of a detention basin be within any
122 proposed lots. Forebay sedimentation basin shall be required. They have not received
123 the wetland delineation report and a road cross section on the site plan does not meet
124 the current engineering standards. The site is proposed to be serviced by well and septic,
125 and they recommend the applicant provide documentation from the Health Department
126 that this is feasible for this development. At this point they are not comfortable there is
127 enough information that has been provided for the Planning Commission to take action.

128

129 Mr. Fellows stated for full disclosure the 1.2 acre parcel in the middle of this development
130 is where he lives, so he is surrounded by it.

131

132 Clerk Sedlak questioned if the proposed entrances and site distances have been seen?
133 Ms. Zawada stated she has not seen those yet but she will pass along the resident
134 concerns.

135

136 Mr. Lee questioned if the north entrance was eliminated they would still need to meet the
137 minimum distance for the cul de sacs.

138

139 Clerk Sedlak stated the road issues are a concern, it is difficult to pull out of the fire station.
140 He didn't know if there was an obvious solution but they need to go back to the builder
141 and address these items before they go any further.

142

143 **Motion by Lee, second by Fellows**

144 **To postpone SP03-2018 Ascher Farms parcel #4716-23-300-010.**

145

146 **Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous**

147 **Nays: None**

148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196

MOTION APPROVED

3. Public Hearing for a Planned Unit Development, PUD 02-2018 Mallard Lake, parcels 4716-15-200-005 and 4716-15-200-004. A 98 unit residential iste condominium development, located in section 15 west side of McCabe and Silver Lake Road.

Mr. Montagno reviewed the Carlisle Wortman memo dated May 29, 2018.

He has provided a review of the PUD rezoning request and preliminary site plan that offers the Planning Commission the appropriate information to make a recommendation to the County Planning Commission for approval, with changes or conditions, postponement of action, or denial. A number of issues regarding the proposed PUD have been identified as well as items on which the Planning Commission must make determinations in this review. These have been summarized below. These items should be discussed by the Planning Commission and addressed by the applicant on a subsequent resubmitted for review.

- 1) The Planning Commission must determine whether they will waive the tree inventory requirements based on the criteria in Section 38-363. (d).
- 2) Provide an inventory of landmark trees as well as those within building envelopes.
- 3) Provide verification from the MDEQ for wetland delineation and regulatory status for each wetland identified on the site.
- 4) The Planning Commission must approve, disapprove, or conditionally approve the site investigation report.
- 5) Provide a trailhead near the entrance to the development with bicycle and motor vehicle parking and public space.
- 6) Place a public access easement over the trail system to ensure availability to the public.
- 7) The developer shall be responsible for the development of the non-motorized path along their Silver Lake Road frontage per the requirements of the Township Pathway Ordinance.
- 8) The Planning Commission may require that the open space be maintained in a natural state and be adequately protected as nature preserves.
- 9) The Planning Commission may wish to discuss the proposed stormwater management techniques with the applicant. Mallard Lake PUD May 29, 2018 13
- 10) The applicant shall convey through the PUD agreement and fee title the guarantee of open space which shall in addition, be maintained through the Site Condominium Homeowner’s Association.
- 11) Single ownership shall be documented with the PUD Agreement.
- 12) The Planning Commission should discuss the proposed deviations and determine if they are acceptable.
- 13) A complete list of deviations must be included in the PUD agreement.
- 14) The preservation of open space shall be addressed in the PUD agreement and the condominium documents.
- 15) Provide a preliminary approval letter from the LCRC.
- 16) If found to be acceptable, the road width deviation must be included in the PUD agreement.
- 17) Any agreement for payment in lieu of planting mitigation trees on or off site must be included in the PUD agreement.

197 18) Prior to final PUD approval, a PUD agreement regarding this proposed development
198 shall be reviewed and approved by the Township Attorney.
199

200 Ms. Zawada reviewed the CES memo date May 18, 2018. The Township will require the
201 necessary right of way for Silver Lake Road to be dedicated for the proposed road
202 improvements. Currently a pathway along Silver Lake Road is not provided. The cul de
203 sacs do not meet the Livingston County Road Commission requirements there is one that
204 is slightly longer than the requirement and there are two that are shorter than the minimum
205 requirements on the north end. A boulevard entrance may be required at the north end
206 of the project and recommend it is reviewed by the Fire Marshall. Units 41-51 should be
207 served by the proposed pump station instead of grinder pumps. There is a multi-lot
208 retaining wall and they recommend that is eliminated. Geo technical soil report with
209 infiltration data be provided for all proposed stormwater basins.
210

211 **Representing Mallard Lake: Kate Bond, Atwell**
212 **Bill Anderson, Atwell**
213

214 Mr. Anderson stated this project was approved in 2008. They looked at those plans and
215 made some minor improvements. The property is zoned PUD R2. It is a very secluded
216 wooded development with 117 acres of actual open space. There are two points for lake
217 access and 2,000 lf of an 8' wide path along the frontage. They are proposing public
218 sewer with individual wells on Estate sized lots.
219

220 The public benefits that are being proposed are as follows:

- 221 • Public sanitary sewer
 - 222 • Environmental friendly
 - 223 • 117 acres of open space
 - 224 • Land dedication for Silver Lake Road improvements
 - 225 • Provide electrical service to Colman Park
- 226

227 The following are the requested deviations:

- 228 • Private road cross section 27'
 - 229 • Modifications to setbacks
 - 230 Front -30'
 - 231 Side – 10'
 - 232 Rear – 40'
 - 233 • Side entry or recessed garages on select lots only.
- 234

235 Mr. Smigliani opened the public hearing at 8:02 p.m.
236

237 **Larry Marshall, 12099 Pinebrook Ln.** - They live at the southeast part of the pond and
238 have been there for 30 years. His first concern is with detention basin #6 because it will
239 drain directly into the pond as opposed to creating that as a retention basin. This pond
240 has no inlet or outlet so any water that goes into that pond only leaves through
241 evaporation or absorption. The detention basin #6, with the increased run off will raise
242 the water level and increase the flooding on his property, that he gets yearly. He
243 requested a limitation of fertilizer on the residential lots since all of it will end up in that
244 pond, the growth in that pond will increase substantially. He asked that they pay close
245 attention to the development, because he found some sloppy work in the proposal where

246 the proposal kept referring to the pond as Silver Lake throughout the proposal. He
247 suggested including changes to the PUD process and revert back to using a PUD overlay,
248 we are restricted in what they can do to look at the density, if they used an overlay and
249 let the overlay lapse they would have gone back to the original RF zoning.
250

251 **Dan Mansfield, 12057 Pinebrook Ln.** – His property goes underneath the pond and onto
252 the other side. He is disappointed he had to discover this was going on. He found out
253 by his neighbors although he lives on the pond, he didn't know what the process was. He
254 never knew about the 2004 or 2007. He asked that in the future he should have some
255 notification. He said they talk about large lots, these are large lots where he lives, his are
256 5-10 acres and compared the proposed sizes. He is concerned about the life of the pond,
257 it is struggling with the phosphates, the entire east side is almost all lily pads, he chuckled
258 when they talk about fishing piers, the lake is very shallow, he has only seen goldfish in
259 that pond. He moved out here because it's beautiful, there are mature oak trees on the
260 property and those will be removed, it didn't benefit anyone. It benefits the developer and
261 builder. He would like it to stay Green Oak Township and didn't want it to turn into Livonia.
262

263 **Trevor Allen, 12066 Pinebrook Ln.** – He stated there are substantive and procedural
264 issues, there has been inconsistent information on the actual zoning classification. For
265 example, there are signs that are posted on Silver Lake Road that say the property is
266 listed as RF, if you go to the master map that's on the website it indicates its R-2 PUD.
267 The color coding of that is inconsistent with the white residential farming of the
268 surrounding areas. Now that is inconsistent the application made by the proposed
269 planned unit development element to be R2 land. The Commission needs to consider
270 there are statutes on this issue particularly MCL125.3405. When the Commission took
271 this into consideration and officially approved the PUD years ago there are laws within
272 the State of Michigan that there is a certain time they are given to complete the project
273 and that time has lapsed. The actual ordinances within the Township's booklets are
274 inconsistent with the statutes of the State of Michigan. The ordinance indicates that the
275 zoning is to remain consistent with what it previously was. The statute says the zoning
276 has to revert back to what it was previously which was residential farming. With that being
277 said, there are certain additional considerations that need to be made, mainly the
278 surrounding lands, the environmental impact, roadway impacts and the substantive
279 issues that those raise.
280

281 **Jennifer Cunningham, 12015 Pinebrook Ln.** – She showed that the surrounding area
282 going around the proposed development is all zoned residential farming. Her property
283 backs up right to where their walking trail is. Mallard Lake is in such poor condition, she
284 has been there almost 18 years and they used to canoe on that lake, now you can't even
285 get a canoe paddle through there. The nutrients that will be loaded into this lake will kill
286 it, it's not going to be a lake anymore and that's taking away her benefit of the lake.
287 They're proposing to let the public come in, is she supposed to get a fence, where is her
288 privacy? There will be people walking right up to her property line, they want public
289 parking for people just to come in and walk through her back yard. That's taking away her
290 benefit. Also, they are going to clear cut all of these trees. She called the DNR and they
291 said in a clear-cut situation 70% of those trees that are replanted will fail. In the land
292 capacity capability analysis says its difficult to adequately protect ground water resources,
293 they are all on wells, what happens to their water and their resources. These are ¼ acre
294 lots, it is no benefit to the current residents and this will considerably decrease her

295 enjoyment of her property, she sees eagles and hears birds and that will all be gone. Mr.
296 Smigliani explained the Township's tree mitigation process.

297
298 **Janet Marshall** – She has lived here for 30 years and has the same concerns everyone
299 has already said. She is also concerned with the wildlife and questioned if there will be
300 a conservation study. There are all sorts of migratory birds that come every year, she is
301 concerned about the what kind of impact this will have. She is also concerned about the
302 flora. When Mallard Crossing went in that is when the lake started to change, she
303 mentioned the flow of the water changed and how she had to ask several times before a
304 silt fence was put up. The lake has really changed, she didn't know if fertilizer was come
305 in from the development, but whatever they did it didn't work.

306
307 **Michele. 12030 Pinebrook Ln** – She wasn't given any sort of notice and she borders the
308 development. They moved here from Detroit and they moved here for the scenic views.
309 She thinks she will have some sort of storm sewage basin next to her property, is there
310 any sort of danger for her well, she would like a study done and have the results of that
311 study provided to the public. She felt that a traffic impact study should be done. In the
312 application from the developer they said it would be a modest increase and without a
313 study she is trying to understand how they make that claim. When she spoke to the Road
314 Commission they said the average number of trips for a household is 8-10. Using those
315 numbers if they add 98 homes that is almost 1000 cars surrounding her daily. There are
316 a lot of inconsistencies.

317
318 **Jeff, 8390 lives in Mallard Crossing.** – He stated traffic is a concern, there are limited
319 site lines on his street. He is concerned with the lot sizes and the water depth of the lake.
320 He tried to put in a canoe last spring and only got about 3 feet. He stated it is nothing but
321 lily pads. They can't do power boats. He is concerned about the aquafer and having
322 problems with their wells down the road.

323
324 **Carrie, 8435 Mallard Crossing** – She didn't appreciate the applicant speaking on her
325 behalf indicating that many people are happy about the development and many people
326 are happy about the road being paved. She is not. She sits at the end of Mallard Lake
327 every morning and have to dodge cars that are already going 50 mph and there is limited
328 sighting there. It was nice to hear all the buzz words during the presentation, but it does
329 not adequately represent herself or most of the neighbors that are here. When she
330 purchased her home, she moved from Farmington Hills and lived on a 1/3 of an acre.
331 Now she is being told less than that is an executive lot. She moved out here to an
332 executive lot and purchased 7 acres. She was told by the previous owner that there is
333 something magical about this area. it is magical place to live with all of the wildlife. She
334 also wasn't given any notice either for this meeting. This will strongly elevate the noise,
335 she too hears the birds and Green Oak is why she purchased a very expensive home
336 here, there are not many places that still exist like this.

337
338 **Tom John, 11687 Silver Lake Road** – He is concerned with the number of wells that are
339 being drilled, for the 22 years he has been across the street he has had many water
340 issues with the water levels going up and down. He would like to know what 98 more
341 wells would do to that. He has 18 acres and he has never been contacted once about
342 what they are going to do with Silver Lake Road and his property. As a resident he should
343 be informed.

344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392

David, 12030 Pinebrook Ln. – He moved here for privacy. In the southeast corner there is a swamp and that's all trees. They will tear the trees out and eliminate all of their privacy that they just spent a lot of money on. That does concern him along with the overall value of their property and how this development will affect the value of their home. They were told it was not developable behind them.

Alyssa, 8345 Mallard Crossing – They just bought a home there, their road is very private, quiet and peaceful. She is concerned with the lack of conservation of the wildlife, once that gets developed it will all be gone. She is also concerned with the nature trail that will be open to the public, they spent a lot of money on the land to preserve their privacy and she has concerns about it being open to the public.

Collen Paul, 12000 Silver Lake Road – Her biggest concern is that the road has very limited site lines. She is concerned because there are a lot of migratory birds and a lot of wildlife in that area, she questioned what steps would be taken to conserve that. She is also concerned with the wells and the impact the increase of wells would have on the overall environment.

Mr. Smigliani closed the public hearing at 8:33 p.m. due to no one else wishing to make comment.

Mr. Montagno explained the tree mitigation requirement.

Mr. Fellows commented that this is a beautiful area of the Township. He is concerned about the enforceability, this is a question that goes to the Township. When the neighbors have an issue how will those rules be enforced.

Ms. Stock felt it is important to do a tree survey, she didn't support any modification to that. Ms. Sellis commented on the privacy barriers, she wasn't sure if those are existing trees or replacements. Mr. Anderson said those are plantings. Mr. Anderson stated they will put the replacement trees back on the site, if there are gaps or additional areas then they would do that. Sheets 8 and 9 show the preliminary grading plans and they will be a couple hundred feet away, natural preservation, from the neighbors to the east. The walking paths are for residents and people that are visiting the residents of the development. The pathway along the frontage is consistent with what the policy is for the pathway system and it will be larger. The internal pathways will be for the residents of the development. The tree replacement on the north side there is a little more closer clearing to the property and a lot of the tree replacement will be in that area to increase the landscape buffer. Increasing the landscape buffer in the northeast side makes sense.

Mr. Montagno stated the estimate did not include the heritage trees which tend to come with a larger replacement value.

Mr. Lee stated he had concerns regarding lot sizes. They want a variance for the setbacks and minimum lot size, there is no central water here. It is not even approaching an R-2 zoning so from his standpoint it is not acceptable.

Ms. Sellis stated she has a problem with the issues with the pond condition, that is a

393 valuable consideration. She is not really concerned with the lot sizes due to the open
394 space.

395
396 Mr. Smigliani explained they need to meet the requirements and include no phosphates
397 in the Master Deed. Mr. Anderson stated they support that, but it is difficult to enforce.
398

399 Ms. Pearsall stated she had no issues with the lots. She agreed that the whole area
400 should be done for the tree mitigation. She also questioned the detention pond #6. Ms.
401 Zawada stated she would need to look at the soil borings to see if it can be supported by
402 a retention basin.

403
404 Mr. Fellows stated if this was a standard R2 development what would the density be. Mr.
405 Montagno stated the parallel plan suggested 108 units.
406

407 Clerk Sedlak questioned if the road improvements for Silver Lake were taken into
408 consideration. There should be a correction of the site distances for Silver Lake and he
409 wondered how that would impact their development. He also questioned if the applicant
410 has considered getting water from LCWA or contacting Hidden Lake because that would
411 solve the potential concerns for the wells in the area.
412

413 Mr. Anderson confirmed 23' pavement for the road with parking on one side of the road.
414 Mr. Anderson stated they are proposing 30' for the setback to the sidewalk. Clerk Sedlak
415 asked if the applicant can address via the PUD Agreement and/or the HOA rules those
416 that have the retaining walls on multi lots, that they would be responsible for maintaining
417 those walls with an enforceable clause. Mr. Anderson stated yes.
418

419 Clerk Sedlak stated the power to Colman Park would be a benefit and help alleviate the
420 vandalism. He agreed with a 100% survey of the trees where the land will be disturbed.
421 He agrees with the retention vs. detention. He noted if residents live outside of 300' they
422 would not be notified. He appreciated Mr. Allen's statements. A traffic study is warranted.
423 Ms. Zawada stated a traffic study would be good to discuss with the Road Commission
424 since Silver Lake is scheduled to be paved next year, things will change. Clerk Sedlak
425 stated he is concerned with the site lines on the road. There was brief discussion
426 regarding the number of trips per day expected.
427

428 Ms. Zawada explained a retention basin does not have an outlet it infiltrates into the
429 ground and then there is loss through evaporation. A Detention basin has a restriction
430 that outlets to a natural body of water or a wetland so it is piped to it and is discharged
431 slowly at a regulated rate.
432

433 Mr. Montagno explained if there is more information needed regarding conservation they
434 can ask for studies to be done since it is a PUD.
435

436 Ms. Stock questioned the public access with this property. Mr. Montagno explained the
437 number one finding is recognizable benefits and they have presented ideas as to what
438 those are and it is up to the Planning Commission and Township Board to see if those
439 are recognized. Pathways open to the public was listed as a public benefit. Public benefit
440 is something they have to decide on. Ms. Stock suggested putting their effort to cleaning
441 up the lake and make it nice for the new residents and existing residents as a public

442 benefit.

443

444 Mr. Anderson stated their intent was the reduction of disruption to the property with the
445 reduction of grading to the site. They are willing to do any phosphate restrictions in the
446 master deed regulations. As far as the pathway goes, they will try not to pull the public
447 into the development but keep that more focused along the frontage. They will extend
448 the electrical to Colman Park. Ms. Bond stated they do take the wildlife into consideration,
449 to allow for residential development and the existing wildlife to live together, they make
450 the largest tracks of open space free and undisturbed and contiguous so there are
451 pathways for the wildlife to travel.

452

453 Mr. Lee suggested getting the health of the lake assessed and give them feedback and
454 potential restrictions that might be needed to protect the lake.

455

456 Mr. Smigliani closed business item C at 9:09 p.m.

457

458 **REPORTS**

459

460 **Chairman** – None

461 **Township Board Representative** – None

462 **ZBA Representative**- None

463 **Planning Consultant** – None

464

465 **Correspondence** – None

466

467 **CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

468

469 **Tony Russo, 9833 Cambridge Court** – He is concerned about the wildlife that goes
470 through that property on Mallard Lake. He is concerned with the property lines of Ascher
471 Farms and Centennial Farms, he questioned what the distance is. Mr. Montagno stated
472 they do abut each other, but then the setbacks buffer. Mr. Smigliani explained most of
473 the time they will also ask for buffers. He thought it would devalue his property.

474

475 **Delphine, 9784 Cambridge Court** – She is concerned for human life. If something
476 happens the fire trucks need immediate access. She is asking for a red light and a 3 way
477 stop at Doane Road and Rushton. She really does worry because that is a potential
478 hazard.

479

480 **Jennifer Cunningham** – Green Oak Township is required in the zoning ordinance to
481 have a site investigation, it's not we're willing to do it or they're offering to do it, there
482 needs to be a wildlife, a traffic, and a site study. She has done her due diligence. They
483 are required to do the study. She is concerned with the traffic once Silver Lake is paved,
484 it will cause more chaos. They are required to do the traffic study, it's got to be done.
485 She questioned why the due diligence wasn't done before they paid to have the roads
486 paved. We don't need more open land for the wildlife, they need the trees. Who will do
487 the study of the heritage trees? Mr. Smigliani explained part of the dialog is that they are
488 submitting to them for review, it's up to the developer to provide them with information.

489

490 There was brief discussion regarding the upcoming process and the definition of open

491 space.
492 Ms. Cunningham stated that she needs a buffer to help control noise.

493
494 **Dan Mansfield, 12057 Pinebrook Lane** – He questioned if the PUD reverted back to RF.
495 Mr. Smigliani stated they are looking into that. He stated they can almost walk on the
496 roots of that pond. This development will impact that, please consider very seriously to
497 do a study of what impact this development will have on the lake. He questioned how
498 does this development benefit the existing residents?
499

500 **Sandra, 12335 Nantucket** - How far are they into the approval for Ascher Farms. As a
501 senior community they finance themselves. Putting a lot of homes in a very small area.
502 They do have concerns about people coming into our property and keeping the seniors
503 safe. She asked that they keep her informed.
504

505 **Wendal Brandt, 12125 Shenandoah Drive** - They do have concerns. They want to work
506 with the Township and the developer to make sure it goes smoothly. He is concerned
507 with the traffic situation. He wants to make sure there is a traffic study. He has aquafer
508 concerns, septic drainage, stormwater drainage, and buffering on the two sides.
509

510 **Larry Marshall, 12099 Pinebrook Ln** – He would like to have access to planners and
511 engineering reports, how will they be informed when resubmittals are in. Mr. Smigliani
512 explained.
513

514 **Sally Burgess** – She contacted Ascher Farms, and she never heard back and then they
515 didn't show up to the meeting, so she questioned the credibility of the developer.
516

517 **Tony Russo** – He questioned if a wall can be put up and how to control the number of
518 units and he is also concerned with the traffic.
519

520 **Larry, 10053 Arlington Circle** – He is concerned about the traffic.
521

522 **Susan, 12015 Andrisan** – She echoed the comments made, quality of life, traffic. She
523 questioned if they do consider the education system and how that will affect the school
524 system. Mr. Smigliani explained we have a shared school system, they don't control how
525 the schools are appropriated. We can't enforce that.
526

527
528 **ADJOURNMENT**
529

530 Mr. Smigliani adjourned the Planning Commission meeting at 9:49 p.m. due to no further
531 business.
532

533 Respectfully Submitted,
534

535 *Kellie Angelosanto*

536
537 Kellie Angelosanto
538 Recording Secretary
539