

Green Oak Charter Township
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
January 5, 2017

Approved: _____

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Smigliani at 7:05 p.m.

Roll Call: Keith Lee
Sarah Pearsall
Michael Sedlak
Deborah Sellis
Lamberto Smigliani

Absent: Dean Williams

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

Guests: 32+

Mr. Smigliani welcomed new Planning Commissioner Keith Lee.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Smigliani added item E election of officers.

**Motion by Pearsall, second by Lee
To approve the agenda as amended.**

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

MOTION APPROVED

Approval of the November 3, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes

A typographical error was corrected.

**Motion by Pearsall, second by Sellis
To approve the minutes of November 3, 2016 as amended.**

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

MOTION APPROVED

CALL TO THE PUBLIC

50 **Karen, off of 8 Mile** – She is concerned about the new development at 9 Mile and
51 Rushton, she felt that they don't need any more homes in this area. There are currently
52 242 homes for sale in South Lyon alone. Her son is in special education and in preschool
53 they are already dealing with mobile art buses, schools are having to omit libraries to add
54 more space. She has to deal with teachers telling her that they don't have the resources
55 they need because they have too many students with too many special needs to
56 accommodate. Everyone is entitled to those public services. Adding more homes will be
57 adding more people and more congestion into our schools.

58
59 **Amy, lives in Evergreen Pond** – She is still disappointed to see such a high density
60 proposed in this area, it's not the right location, the level of service is not there, especially
61 water and sewer, to have well and septic at this magnitude is big. Then it's left to the
62 neighboring property owners to deal with any issues. She would like to see a guarantee
63 for the surrounding neighbors with wells, if there is a concern with wells drying up in
64 perpetuity. She sees 5' setbacks which means the houses could be 10' apart. There are
65 not any fire hydrants proposed and she is concerned about the fire safety. Two entrances
66 are proposed, she would like to see one on 9 Mile with a left turn lane and one entrance
67 on Rushton. Adding those on Rushton Road will limit the conflict points. She would like
68 to see Rushton Road paved in front of the development. The schools are overcrowded
69 and Pearson Elementary will be at capacity when it opens. Adding the additional homes
70 will put a burden on Brummer Elementary. When she moved here 12 years ago, she
71 came here to see a larger area to live, she pleaded for them to make sure they are taking
72 the right steps with proper infrastructure. She asked that they think about what the
73 residents are saying and think about it before a final decision is made.

74
75 **Sharon Delong, 11300 Post** – They did have a meeting with Mr. Schafer and on a private
76 level it worked out well. Mr. Schafer thought it was a good idea to have an escrow for a
77 few years on the existing wells that are surrounding the community well. At minimum, it
78 will be 275 gallons per minute, there are other homes in the area that are 670 feet away
79 also. She questioned when the escrow would begin. There may be a need to add more
80 homes to protect their wells. She would like to have a guarantee longer than 2 years.
81 There is a 5' foot concrete sidewalk that is leading onto their property from lots 161 and
82 162 and they would like that taken off. There should be some type of guarantee to make
83 sure their water is pure and safe. She questioned what would be covering the
84 equalization tank and if they don't want it covered, it would have a negative impact.

85
86 **Chelsea Carter, 11270 Rushton Road** – Her biggest concern is aesthetics, moved here
87 because of the landscape, owe it to the residents to preserve the landscape. Someone
88 is going to make a lot of money off this. The coyotes are being pushed out. The septic
89 field, she sees it, where will all this traffic go. Where will these kids go to school, how
90 much more room do our current schools have. This is putting too much stress on our
91 community and taking away what made South Lyon. She has seen so many changes
92 and this is one step too far, we don't need another development. Losing Erwin Orchards
93 to another development as well.

94
95 **Karen, 8 Mile** – She questioned why they don't do something for the community? She
96 felt that a community pool or recreation center could be utilized with that size of property.

97
98 **Phil Webb, 11470 Post Lane** – His well is only 68' deep and since it's higher he felt it will

99 go dry faster. He is behind where the retention pond is, he questioned what his guarantee
100 is that it won't be contaminated. He questioned how they are getting away with a house
101 on 1/3 quarter acre. He stated they don't have the infrastructure for this type of
102 development.

103
104 **Charlene, 11946 Post Lane** – She sees the traffic, she has been there 42 years.
105 Rushton Road and 9 Mile will be horrendous as well as Pontiac Trail. No one goes down
106 Pontiac Trail due to the traffic at rush hour. She is quite sure 9 Mile and Pontiac Trail
107 would be more than 8000 cars in a 24-hour period. She is concerned regarding the
108 schools as well. Park Hurst has 400 homes, it is Lyon Township but part of South Lyon
109 Schools, these new developments will be part of our school district. There will be more
110 on 8 Mile going in. They will have to build more schools and more taxes for everyone.
111 She doesn't see the additional trees, the houses are still 5' apart, and there is the pathway
112 which is not paved. She felt the guarantee needed to be more than 2 years to protect
113 their wells. Also, now it's in phases. The mobile home park has phases and it's still going
114 on. She does not want to go down Rushton Road and see a massive Pine Hurst. If they
115 have to have a new sub, have homes that are larger or smaller homes with more land.
116 They need to go back to their roots, this is what they came out here for. There is no age
117 restriction either for the adults.

118
119 **Belinda, 11439 Post Lane** – She appreciated Mr. Schafer having the meeting. She
120 realized property owners have a right to develop their property, she would just like to think
121 about what is put there and look at all the ramifications and work to come to some kind of
122 agreement.

123
124 **Jason, Evergreen Pond** – He commented that the leeching field is right next to resident's
125 wells and in the 70's there was something called blue baby syndrome, where there is
126 enough nitrate leeching into the groundwater, babies drink the water and babies die.
127 From what he's hearing, he doesn't want it. To have City Water and City Sewer might
128 help appease some of the people. Traffic is the way it is.

129
130 **Noted: that Mr. Tobel** submitted a letter and photo's regarding the problems with traffic
131 on Rickett and Winans Lake Road that were distributed to the Planning Commission
132 members before the meeting.

133
134 **BUSINESS ITEMS**

135
136 **1. Legacy Park at Green Oak First Amendment to Planned Unit Development**

137
138 **Representing: Rodney Goble**
139 **David LeClair**

140
141 Mr. Montagno reviewed the Carlisle Wortman memo dated 12/8/16 with the following
142 proposed amendments:

143
144 At this time, it was advised that the Planning Commission carefully review the eligibility
145 criteria and make an informed decision to recommend, recommend with conditions, table
146 or deny the proposed amendments, listed below, to the PUD Agreement.

147

- 148 1. The Planning Commission shall determine if deviations from building square
149 footage, exterior building materials, and designated front parking will be allowed
150 as part of the proposed development phase.
- 151 2. Add language to the PUD Agreement for future traffic impact analysis' and owner
152 responsibility.
- 153 3. Amend agreement to require developer to install a solid surface non-motorized
154 path that follows the perimeter of the PUD in a free form design.
- 155 4. The Planning Commission must evaluate the proposal in terms of the eligibility
156 criteria from Section 38-233 of the Zoning Ordinance to determine if the PUD still
157 meets the eligibility criteria.
- 158 5. The Planning Commission must evaluate the proposal in terms of the eligibility
159 criteria from Section 38-233 of the Zoning Ordinance to determine if the PUD still
160 meets the eligibility criteria.
- 161

162 Mr. Goble explained this would be the first amendment to the PUD. They concur with Mr.
163 Montagno to the tremendous impact identifying traffic and road improvements that were
164 necessary long before they purchased this property. They came to an agreement to
165 mitigate the traffic and help to improve the traffic. They feel it is still a big community
166 benefit to bring 100 acres of recreation to the community.

167

168 Mr. Lee stated traffic is a big issue and questioned how they will drive that resolution. Mr.
169 Smigliani provided some background information regarding traffic improvements. Mr.
170 Montagno stated it's his understanding the larger residential piece has initiated a traffic
171 study which has not been submitted to the Road Commission yet. There are some
172 suggested mitigations, the goal is instead of having Vortex do some improvements, they
173 will work together to try to maximize the benefits of those improvements, and work
174 together to see how can they couple these things together to do the improvements.

175

176 Clerk Sedlak questioned if the items listed in the email from the Road Commission dated
177 11/29/16 have been addressed? Mr. Montagno explained since that email there have
178 been some discussions and additional needs have been identified, the township, Road
179 Commission and developer will need to come up with a reasonable solution. Clerk Sedlak
180 explained that it fails now without any additional traffic, and if they add any additional
181 traffic it will need to be taken to something that has a marked improvement.

182

183 Clerk Sedlak stated that an area wide, comprehensive traffic study is needed to
184 understand the true build out and contribution to the traffic issues from the surrounding
185 developments. It's not good enough to consider just The Legacy or The Vortex, they
186 need a traffic study for the end game. He can see approving the amendment, but he
187 would recommend not approving it if he saw it this way, right now.

188

189 After further review and discussion the Planning Commission was in general agreement
190 with the required standards outlined in Section 38-327 of the Zoning Ordinance.

191

192 Mr. Goble stated the issue is the timing in which how that language would limit the site
193 plan approval process around these future sites. Clerk Sedlak stated he did not see it as
194 an impediment because the coordination is the most important part and that the
195 consideration is there.

196

197 Mr. Montagno suggested there are some gaps, this is still conceptual, make sure it's on
198 the agreement so they know the individual for parcel X knows they are responsible.

199
200 Mr. Goble stated it's appropriate to have an overall global study. Significant cooperation
201 from potential developers and future phases of this PUD is critical and they want to be
202 part of this solution he is just not sure how that will all tie together moving forward.

203
204 Clerk Sedlak stated the Board will look at how it complies with the ordinances and the
205 PUD Agreement and traffic knowing full well they have to make improvements and
206 participate with the County and possibly the State. The biggest thing is the cooperation
207 level of everyone involved.

208
209 Mr. Montagno stated the language is open ended enough that they can move forward
210 and allow them time to come up with an agreement and doesn't have to be based on a
211 full traffic study but based on how everyone will work together. The Road Commission
212 appears to be on board and everyone is committed to making this happen.

213

214 **Motion by Sellis, second by Pearsall**

215 **To adopt Resolution and findings and recommendation of approval for**
216 **Legacy Park PUD amendments Legacy Park at Green Oak 1st Amendment to**
217 **the PUD with language reflecting the following;**

218 **The Planning Commission recommends approval of PUD Amendment for**
219 **Legacy Park to the Township Board with the following conditions:**

- 220 1. **The language for the amended PUD agreement is finalized to the satisfaction**
221 **of the Township Planning and Zoning and Building Department and**
222 **Township Attorney before Board action.**
- 223 2. **The developer(s) for the PUD or individual phases come to an agreement**
224 **with the Township and LCRC and Township Engineers for traffic**
225 **improvements based on an area wide traffic study before going to the Board.**
- 226 3. **Update to the area plan to include hard surface permitted pathways to the**
227 **satisfaction of the Township Trails and Recreation Committee as well as the**
228 **connection to Spicer Road.**

229

230 **Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Unanimous**

231 **Nays: None**

232

233 **MOTION APPROVED**

234

235 **B. Vortex Gymnastics Center (Village Mix Use) Site Plan Approval Brivar**
236 **Construction Company, Commercial/Retail 9 acres**

237

238 **Representing Vortex Gymnastics: David LeClair**

239 **Doug Necci**

240

241 Mr. Montagno explained the plan has been amended and updated a few times. He
242 referenced the Carlisle Wortman memo dated 12/8/16. He explained an updated plan
243 was submitted that addressed all of the previous recommended items. The Planning
244 Commission may still discuss the elevation and make sure those items have gone in the
245 direction they wanted. This site plan has come a long way. They feel comfortable

246 approving based on final administrative review and require process through the Board to
247 update the PUD. Mr. Montagno explained the Township Engineer, Ms. Zawada, felt her
248 items can be addressed administratively with the caveat if something changed with regard
249 to the site layout then she would suggest coming back in front of the Planning
250 Commission.

251
252 Ms. McKenzie explained the applicant submitted revisions to their plans yesterday and
253 those have not been provided to the Planning Commission.

254
255 Mr. LeClair explained the provisions were made before Christmas. The last revisions
256 were adequately addressed regarding the pedestrian circulation sidewalk and
257 landscaping issues.

258
259 Mr. LeClair explained the engineering plans haven't changed since September and they
260 were approved as noted and they can take care of the few things with the final
261 construction plans, he did not foresee anything changing.

262
263 **Motion by Sellis, second by Pearsall**

264 **To approve the Vortex Gymnastics Center Village Mixed Use site plan**
265 **approval Brivar Construction Company commercial/retail 9 acres with the**
266 **following conditions:**

- 267
268 1. **No approval will be binding until the Township Board approves the**
269 **amendments to the PUD, and**
270 2. **The applicant revises and resubmits the site plan for administrative review**
271 **and approval that addresses outstanding items in the planner's reports**
272 **dated 12/8/16, the engineers report dated 12/6/16.**
273 3. **Any modification to the site plans that result in major building**
274 **reconfiguration to plan elements in response to the planners or engineers**
275 **report such as the parking lots, drives, or the building will require the plans**
276 **to be reconsidered by the Planning Commission.**

277
278 **Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Unanimous**
279 **Nays: None**

280
281 **MOTION APPROVED**

282
283 Mr. Smigliani called for a short break at 9:04 p.m. and called the meeting back to order at
284 9:12 p.m.

285
286 **C. Timberview Estates a 128.97 Acre Planned Unit Development & Site Plan**
287 **Review, SP05-2016, Parcel #4716-35-200-004 & 4716-35-200-011 & 4716-35-**
288 **200-018 Southeast Corner of Nine Mile and Rushton Road**

289
290 **Representing Timberview Estates: Bill Anderson**
291 **Kate Bond**
292 **Steve Schafer**

293
294 Mr. Montagno reviewed the Carlisle Wortman memo dated December 29, 2016 and

295 provided the following recommendation:

296

297 The Planning Commission must ultimately make a recommendation to the Township
298 Board of Trustees for approval, approval with changes or conditions, or denial of the PUD.
299 The Planning Commission may want to postpone action until outstanding issues have
300 been addressed.

301

302 A number of items have been addressed per the direction of the initial preliminary site
303 plan review. However, there remain some concerns identified in this review, which have
304 been summarized below. These items should be discussed by the Planning Commission
305 and addressed by the applicant on a subsequent resubmitted for review.

- 306 1. The applicant shall provide documentation indicating approval from the Michigan
307 Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) for any potential disturbance to
308 regulated wetlands on-site has been finalized;
- 309 2. Planning Commission must evaluate the applicant's response to the eight (8)
310 criteria and determine if they meet the intent of a PUD;
- 311 3. The Planning Commission shall determine if the proposed deviations from RE,
312 Rural Estates zoning standards are appropriate for the development;
- 313 4. The Planning Commission shall confirm receipt of said cover letter and determine
314 if the applicant's statements are satisfactory and meet the intent of Section 38-
315 234(8)(f);
- 316 5. Provide additional street lighting;
- 317 6. The portion of the pathway that connects the Green Oak Non-motorized systems
318 shall be paved;
- 319 7. Township Fire Department to review the street radii to ensure sufficiency for
320 emergency apparatus;
- 321 8. The Township engineer and fire Department must evaluate the proposed deviation
322 in road width;
- 323 9. The applicant must explore the possibility of providing an access point on Rushton
324 road;
- 325 10. The applicant will be required to provide access permits from the Livingston County
326 Road Commission.
- 327 11. The Township Engineer and the MDEQ must review and approve all information
328 pertaining to the sanitary sewage system and the storm water plans and designs
329 prior to PUD approval;
- 330 12. The PUD agreement shall have language that clearly identifies that the Township
331 will not have any future obligation to maintain the wastewater treatment facility;
- 332 13. The applicant is responsible for obtaining all applications and permits from,
333 Livingston County Health Department, and all other applicable permits from
334 Federal, State and Local departments;
- 335 14. Update replacement calculations to reflect the requirements of the Zoning
336 Ordinance.
- 337 15. The Township Planning Commission to determine if the applicant's request of an
338 Environmental Trust Fund waiver in the amount of 1,495 trees is appropriate;
- 339 16. Prior to preliminary/PUD approval a PUD agreement regarding this proposed
340 development shall be reviewed and approved by the Township Attorney; and
- 341 17. We defer to the Township Engineer for an assessment of the study

342

343 Clerk Sedlak questioned what the smallest lot size is that has been approved in the past?

344 Ms. McKenzie answered that the smallest zoning district is the lakes area which is 7200'
345 she did not believe there are any this small. Stone Ridge is 12,000' and the average lot
346 size of a mobile home is 50'x100'. Clerk Sedlak stated they are looking at 60'x110' with
347 this proposed site.

348
349 Clerk Sedlak questioned why the developer is proposing 27' roadways.

350
351 Mr. Schafer, developer, explained he had an opportunity to meet with the residents in the
352 area and residents of Post Street. They have been very communicative with the residents
353 that expressed concerns and issues. They were able to accomplish 100' with regard to
354 the setback on the infiltration field, and in some places more. They were able to discuss
355 the structures that will be constructed, most people felt there was not a big intrusion and
356 he felt there was good consensus. There were a number of concerns regarding their
357 wells and they are good with giving surety to them, there is a tremendous aquifer but he
358 did understand the concerns. Whatever that surety is, he had no issue to give that to
359 them in the PD Agreement and he had no issue with whatever triggers how long the surety
360 is in place. Also, there was a walkway that was shown on the Delongs lot and his plan
361 would be to remove that and put it in an appropriate area. Lot sizes were changed which
362 reconfigured the open space. They were able to acquire 8 acres which now gives Post
363 Lane and the site to the east more preservation of that woodland. Now they are at 2 lots
364 per acre overall. They have an empty nester component as well as single family. All the
365 single family lots were increased. The senior lots function well. They think the open
366 space work well and there will be great infiltration for the sanitary portion of the site. There
367 will be two access points on 9 Mile and they removed the entrance off of Rushton. This
368 proposal has 75% less density.

369
370 Mr. Anderson explained the well testing was completed and they met with the DEQ on
371 site and received feedback. They are proposing 129 units, 8100 sq. feet, including 111
372 empty nester units on the west side. There will be two boulevard entrances off of 9 Mile.
373 Average lot area was increased and the open space was increased to over 50 acres. A
374 detention basin was eliminated and they added an amenity of either a fountain or wetland
375 feature. There will be a mixture of housing types, public access to nature area, 6,000 lf
376 of hiking/nature trail, sidewalks both sides of the street, 4 pocket parks, and significant
377 perimeter buffers along Nine Mile and Rushton Road.

378
379 Mr. Anderson continued that the waste water treatment area was reduced to 9.85 acres
380 from 18 acres, a 100' perimeter buffer from property line to sand beds is proposed, a
381 25-75' of existing vegetation surrounding treatment plant and beds is proposed and a
382 15' vertical elevation difference from north property line to proposed sand beds. They are
383 following the MDEQ standard procedures for analysis, design and permitting for SBR
384 system.

385
386 Regarding the Traffic Analysis, Mr. Anderson explained the existing conditions indicate
387 warrants necessary at 3 intersections prior to development, turning lanes and
388 signalization at 9 Mile and Rushton, Marshall and Dixboro with existing traffic.

389
390 The community water supply meets all State requirements and the capacity tested well.
391 Drawdown analysis was performed and no negative impact on or off site.

392

393 Clerk Sedlak questioned the 27' road. Mr. Anderson explained the 27' road back to back
394 with a 60' right of way is what's done in Wayne County and Oakland. It provides a
395 narrower safer drive path and slows down traffic and it allows parking on one side only.
396

397 Clerk Sedlak questioned if there are fire hydrants? Mr. Anderson stated yes. Clerk
398 Sedlak questioned what the flow of the draw down was? Mr. Anderson stated it was 250-
399 275 gpm which is a max day with a component of 100,000 gallons of storage and 275
400 gallons per minute. Clerk Sedlak questioned the SBR plant, and asked if there are any
401 excess REU's built into the plant? Mr. Anderson stated no not currently. Clerk Sedlak
402 questioned if the water well was sized to provide water to surrounding areas if they had
403 well problems as a result of your well? Mr. Anderson stated no, but they can have that
404 analysis done and find out what it could support.
405

406 Clerk Sedlak, public access to open space. Mr. Anderson stated yes, that is the public at
407 large and confirmed there are a 4 pocket parks. Clerk Sedlak stated they looked out 5
408 years for the traffic study, what is the proposed build out? Mr. Anderson stated 5 years.
409

410 Clerk Sedlak explained with 240 houses, that's 500 people, he's already limited to polling
411 locations on the east side of the township. He questioned if there is a community center
412 or club house planned? Clerk Sedlak suggested considering a community center/club
413 house large enough to put in a precinct. Mr. Anderson stated that was good feedback
414 but they didn't know if this scale would quite get them there.
415

416 Mr. Lee questioned the waste water treatment area is 10 acres and he wondered if that
417 was part of the 50 acres of open space. Mr. Anderson stated no. He also explained the
418 tanks are 42" in height and are located about 200-300 feet away and they will be
419 screened.
420

421 Mr. Lee questioned the 5' setbacks, it seems like they are going to minimal setbacks and
422 way beyond what has been done in the past, he had a problem with that. It seems like
423 they start down the path and then multiple compromises have to be made, it still changes
424 the whole flavor of what they are looking for in the single family residence areas.
425

426 Mr. Anderson stated 10' is what is required for standard and they are comfortable with it
427 on this urban scale. To do side entry garages they would be looking at an 85-90' lot. Mr.
428 Lee stated when they look at the Mater Plan they want to maintain the country feel of
429 Green Oak and he is saying urban which is dramatically different. Mr. Anderson stated
430 the master plan for this site is multi-family, which is a zero setback. They did a realistic
431 plan for multi-family and it was 1000 units. This plan dramatically lowers the density.
432

433 Ms. Sellis questioned the contamination from the septic fields. Mr. Anderson stated there
434 are very specific setbacks from a community from wells. They will meet all of those
435 horizontal dimensions and parameters. It's public health, there is nothing more important,
436 and all of the defined parameters will be reviewed and designed and approved by the
437 State.
438

439 Mr. Smigliani questioned the sidewalk that the resident was concerned with. Ms. Bond
440 explained there is no sidewalk in that area.
441

442 Mr. Smigliani questioned the tree issue. Mr. Anderson stated the 2.5- 3” caliper trees are
443 standard. This is a wooded site, they put as much landscaping in as they can and putting
444 more into wooded areas is not the answer either. Ms. Bond stated the 2.5-3” is standard
445 and she is comfortable moving forward with that.

446
447 Clerk Sedlak felt that the lot sizes was the trend coming up. Ms. Sellis stated she’s not
448 loving it but it’s ok to have a subdivision look different and they do have a responsibility
449 as to what the infrastructure can handle.

450
451 Ms. Pearsall stated she doesn’t like the road width, however the density when you get
452 open space as well is a better solution than having homes sprawled out all over the place.

453
454 Clerk Sedlak questioned how far the west entrance is from the intersection? Mr.
455 Anderson stated 800’.

456
457 Mr. Montagno explained they do want to see correspondence from outside agencies
458 specifically from the Road Commission and the MDEQ.

459
460 Ms. Bond explained the MDEQ is keyed into this project wetlands, species on site, and
461 the discharge permit that will need to be done. She had an onsite meeting and the next
462 step is submittal of those permits, they are monitoring the project and they are happy with
463 how it’s proceeding forward, they are keeping them abreast with what’s going on with the
464 MDEQ and she is fully aware and they are holding hands on this project. Mr. Montagno
465 stated they would need that correspondence. Ms. Bond stated she may be able to get a
466 level of correspondence from their files and submit it. Mr. Smigliani stated they needed to
467 make sure there was some concurrence by the MDEQ.

468
469 Mr. Smigliani noted that for 30-40% of this property there is not a lot of change with the
470 natural features. He would rather see a tighter density and less disturbance on the natural
471 landscape. He thought in comparison to apartments, this is much more viable.

472
473 **Motion by Smigliani, second by Pearsall**
474 **To postpone Timberview Estates.**

475
476 **Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous**
477 **Nays: None**

478
479 **MOTION APPROVED**

480
481 The Chair called for adjournment due to the by-laws. The remainder of the agenda was
482 not addressed.

483
484 **D. Regular Scheduled Planning Commission meeting dates for 2017**

485
486 **E. Election of Officers**

487
488 **REPORTS**

489
490 **Chairman – None**

491 **Township Board Representative** – None

492 **ZBA Representative**- None

493 **Planning Consultant** – None

494

495 **Correspondence** – None

496

497 **CALL TO THE PUBLIC** - None

498

499 **ADJOURNMENT**

500

501 **Motion by Sedlak, second by Pearsall**

502 **To adjourn the meeting at 10:50 p.m. due to the By-Laws.**

503

504 **Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous**

505 **Nays: None**

506

507 **MOTION APPROVED**

508

509 Respectfully Submitted,

510

511 *Kellie Angelosanto*

512

513 Kellie Angelosanto

514 Recording Secretary

515