

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

Thursday, November 19, 2020

2009 Township Drive
Commerce Township, Michigan 48390

In accordance with Public Act 228 of 2020, this meeting was held via Zoom, video conferencing technology.

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

ROLL CALL: Present:

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

Also Present:

David Campbell, Planning Director
Jay James, Engineer/Building Official
Paula Lankford, Assistant to the Planning Director
Alex Nelson, Meeting Moderator, Merge Live

B. APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

MOTION by Sovel, supported by Mills, to approve the Zoning Board of Appeals Regular Meeting Agenda for November 19, 2020, as presented.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Sovel, Mills, Rosman, Mistele, McKeever

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES:

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

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Mills, Mistele, Sovel, McKeever, Rosman

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA:

Chairperson Rosman – Is there anyone from the public who would like to say something this evening that does not address the item before us this evening?

Alex Nelson – Public, press *9 if you wish to speak. The caller has raised their hand. Caller, press *6 to unmute, then state your name and address for the record.

Michael Johnson – We’re addressing the variance from Article 33.

Chairperson Rosman – Mr. Johnson, let me stop you right there. We’re going to come to that in a few minutes and I’ll be glad to call on you at that time.

Michael Johnson – I'm so sorry to jump the gun.

Chairperson Rosman – That's okay. Is there anybody else for public discussion that is not on the agenda this evening?

Alex Nelson – We have no other callers waiting.

E. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES IN COMMERCE TOWNSHIP:

Rick Sovel – Township Board & Library

- We just had our swearing in tonight. We have a new Supervisor, Larry Gray.
- This week on Tuesday, we approved our 2021 Budget, something that takes us a 3-month process to go through. It makes for a long meeting, but it's done.
- We have not been together in 6 months. I'm not sure what else to talk about, other than the fact that someone keeps stealing our lights at the bridge.

Chairperson Rosman – And, we have a drive-through window at the Library.

Rick Sovel – We have a drive-through window. You might want to check to see what's going to be open and what's not. Some new decisions will probably be made with the new Supervisor on Monday. Check with the Library and the Richardson Center.

Bill McKeever – Planning Commission

- I have a couple items from our October 5th meeting.
- We recommended approval of a Conditional Rezoning for a new retail lumberyard with outdoor storage located at 4158 Pioneer Drive.
- We also recommended rezoning of a parcel of property, changing the zoning classification for the eastern portion of a split-zoned parcel of land from B-1 Local Business to R-1D One-Family Residential, located at 4435 S. Commerce.
- Unfortunately, I was unable to attend our November meeting due to an unforeseen emergency. I would defer to Mr. Campbell for an update on that meeting.

Dave Campbell –

- There was another Conditional Rezoning at that meeting for the property on the east side of Martin Road that used to be the driving range, across the street from Township Hall. The Planning Commission recommended approval for a Conditional Rezoning so that Pulte Homes can build 103 attached townhomes. These will be owner-occupied. That Conditional Rezoning subsequently went to the Township Board just this week on Tuesday, and the Township Board approved it. The next step now is for Pulte to come back to the Planning Commission with a fully developed site plan, and that would be consistent with the terms of the Conditional Rezoning.
- The Planning Commission also saw a proposal to expand the Marathon Station at 519 W. Commerce Road, in the Commerce Village area. They're at about 1,000 square feet now, and they want to put an addition on the east and south sides to make it closer to 3,000 square feet. The petitioner needed approval of two things. One was Special Land Use because a gas station is considered a Special Land Use in that zoning district. Two, they needed site plan approval.

The Planning Commission granted both approvals, conditional on a number of things. We're working with the petitioner to address all of those conditions.

- The other one was Comcast. They have a facility on N. Commerce Road, across the street from the Methodist Church. Most people don't even know it's there. They want to put an addition onto the existing building on that facility, but because a public utility facility in a residential zoning district is a Special Land Use, they also needed Special Land Use approval along with site plan approval. They got the Special Land Use approval, but the Planning Commission tabled any action on the site plan because they wanted Comcast to do some work on that building to make it better looking and to blend in better with the residential zoning district.
- The Planning Commission saw a concept plan for the old Sally's Bar. That's on the southwest corner of Union Lake Road and Wise Road. The property owner is partnering with a restaurant operator to hopefully revitalize that building. They would use the existing building but also put an addition on it along with a nice patio. They'd bring that whole site back to life. It was a really good looking proposal. It was very cool how they integrated the old barn building with some new architecture and new features. The Planning Commission was very excited to see it and hopefully that is a plan that is going to come to fruition sometime in the near future.

F. OLD BUSINESS:

None.

G. NEW BUSINESS:

ITEM G1: PA20-02 – JOHN LITZAU – PUBLIC HEARING

John Litzau of Commerce MI is requesting a variance from Article 33 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance to exceed the maximum square footage allowed for detached accessory structures to retain a shed that was constructed on the property located at 2441 Greenlawn. Sidwell No.: 17-12-228-003

Chairperson Rosman – Mr. Litzau, are you still there?

John Litzau – I'm still here.

Chairperson Rosman – Okay, good. Are you going to make your own presentation this evening, or do you have somebody representing you?

John Litzau – Nope, I'm just me.

Chairperson Rosman – Okay, go right ahead, sir.

John Litzau – I don't even know how to start. I think everybody's got my letter that I wrote.

Chairperson Rosman – Yes, we all have it, and by the way, I want to share with the public that each one of us has physically been to the property to see what it is that you're asking for.

John Litzau – Okay. The only thing I wasn't able to do was to show you some of the old Google maps that shows that I had an original shed. We've owned the property for 10 years, and there was a better shed in the same spot that there is now, and the only thing is I made it 24 square feet bigger. I mean I don't want to read what everybody has already read. I just wanted to make a few points that there's a house across the street with a garage bigger than mine, it's a 2-story. He's actually directly across the street from me. He has a shed that's bigger than the shed that I replaced my old shed with. I guess the problem that I did was I made the shed bigger. From what I could understand about the rules and regulations is that I had 30 days. The old shed was a metal shed and it had been there for 15 years or whatnot. I bought the property from my sister and as I said, the shed has been there. It was actually a foot from the fence, which was not conforming for sure.

But, this whole thing started when I had some issues with the neighbor. I built the new shed and I did move it. I was told I could build the shed. I didn't have a problem with it. I had a stop ... a non-approved sticker put on the shed, which I have in my hand. I mean I can video it.

Chairperson Rosman – Yes, we see it.

John Litzau – I was told I had to be 3' from the fence, and when I rebuilt it I put it in the same spot. So I did move it 3' from the fence, and I thought that everything was fine. I wouldn't have built the whole thing as well as I built it, but when I was told to stop building it, I did, and then when I was allowed to finish building it, I kind of just put some T1-11 on it and put a roof on it to protect my stuff that's in it and I finished it up. I did move it 3' from the fence and I was told that was going to be fine.

It was on pipes. I had to use a tractor to move it away from the fence. I do think it was a misunderstanding, but evidently it rolled back. It pitches kind of towards the fence. I guess it rolled back 6" and the inspector was not happy that when he came out to measure, it was only 2'6" from the fence. Right after that, I did move it back to 3', which it is now.

After that, then I was told that now I have to tear it down because my garage was too big, but that wasn't how this whole thing started.

Chairperson Rosman – Okay, thank you. Is there anything else you would like to add before I open it up to the public?

John Litzau – No. I think everything that I have in what I wrote is pretty much, I mean there's ... It's an old neighborhood and Commerce Township is very old. I've lived here my entire life and there's many houses, even on the next block over, that have two garages and a shed. I've taken pictures of these and I don't know if you guys even want to see them. I don't want to waste your time.

Chairperson Rosman – No, that's okay. No, we're going to just deal with yours today.

John Litzau – Okay.

Chairperson Rosman – Thank you very much. All right, the gentleman who is handling this for us...

Dave Campbell – Alex is our moderator, Chair Rosman. I know that Building Official, Jay James, looked like he was raising his hand. He needs to unmute himself, but I think he would have some input on the history that got us to this point.

Chairperson Rosman – I'd like to start with the public first. Mr. Johnson, can we start with you first?

Chairperson Rosman opened the public hearing.

Alex Nelson – Caller, *6. The floor is yours.

Michael Johnson, 8039 Barnsbury, Commerce Township – My partner and I moved in here in 2011, 9 years ago. Mr. Litzau is correct, there is a metal shed there. As all of you have been out to the property, you've seen that that has been moved to the south side of the property line now, up closer to the house. We really had some strong feelings here because we have put as much money into this house as we paid for it. We feel that Article 33 supports property values. Mr. Litzau rents out the house and doesn't live in the neighborhood at all. I believe that Article 33 of the Zoning Ordinance is appropriate and we are not in favor of the variance.

Chairperson Rosman – Thank you, Mr. Johnson. I appreciate you coming on this evening. Is there anybody else from the public who would like to address this this evening? Let me just read one more letter into the record, and then we're going to move on to Jay.

This is from Donald W. Munro and he wrote:

My property at 8024 Barnsbury backs up to Mr. Litzau's property. I wish to deny the request for the variance from Article 33. Mr. Litzau does not seem to respect the Commerce Township ordinances currently in place nor boundaries period. In addition to exceeding the maximum square footage allowed for detached accessory structures referring to the shed in question, he is currently encroaching on my property behind my garage by putting up scrap pieces of metal and wood. I believe this "fencing" is encroaching on my property.

In closing, I would like my position of denial to be on record at the meeting on Thursday, November 19th at 7:00pm.

*Sincerely,
Donald W. Munro, III*

There were -0- returns and -1- letter, which was read into the record above.

Chairperson Rosman closed the public hearing as there were no additional questions or comments.

Jay James – I heard the property owner's opinion. I will respectfully disagree with the fact that there was a miscommunication. Our office received a complaint that the property owner was building a shed right on the property line. I did go out and look at it. That was the red tag I left telling him to stop work because he had no permits.

He came in to get a permit, and I was the one that helped him at the counter. We discussed that he already had over 900 square feet of garage and he would not be allowed another detached structure because that would exceed the ordinance. The property owner kind of told me he was redoing the floors in the garage and he needed somewhere to put the stuff temporarily so he could finish the garage floor. I remember my comment saying, "You're going to stuff 900 square feet of garage into a 200 square foot shed? But okay, I can understand maybe you're doing that. If that's the case, fine. I will let you have the shed for 6 months." I believe it was in the fall of last year. I said, "You cannot keep it where it's at. It has to be moved 3' off the property line, which is where our ordinance would allow, and within 6 months, that shed has to come down." I think it was April 1st or something, but as of that date, that shed has to come down. I typed my comments in the computer. He could see them on the screen. We went over them and that was the end of it. Six months later, he did not remove the shed. We sent him a letter. He did not remove the shed. We sent him a ticket. It has gone into the court system, and I believe his last issue at court was that they were allowing him to come seek a variance before the judge made a decision on the property. To me, everything was crystal clear and that shed was not allowed to be there in the first place. I let him keep it for a while, but he knew it had to come down. We were all very clear on that. That's our point-of-view on all of this.

Chairperson Rosman – All right, thank you.

Board Comments:

McKeever – Are there any other variances on this property?

Jay James – Not to my knowledge.

Dave Campbell – Nothing has been applied for, Mr. McKeever. This is the sole variance that is being sought tonight.

McKeever – The existing garage seems to not have enough backyard setback. How is that possible?

Dave Campbell – The existing garage was built in 1992, based on Building Department records. It is an existing, legally nonconforming garage, based on its size, and potentially based on, as you mentioned, the setbacks to the property lines. We have to assume that it was compliant based on the standards of 1992 and it's allowed to continue to exist.

McKeever – Okay. The original shed that has been moved to the south side of the property, right behind the house, that square footage of storage space or accessory structure is not figured into this variance?

Dave Campbell – The second shed I think is news to all of us. The second shed is not the basis of this variance. It would also be in excess of the allowable accessory structure square footage. The second shed potentially is going to go through its own process.

McKeever – I mean-

John Litzau – The second shed's coming down.

Chairperson Rosman – Alex, would you please mute the applicant? I've closed the public portion. It's time just for the Board members now.

McKeever – Unfortunately, I don't see where this meets the criteria. I don't see where this piece of property suffers a hardship that requires him to have an additional 200 square feet of storage. Just because you have stuff doesn't necessarily mean that your property is creating a hardship. The amount of items that you are trying to store is a self-created issue.

Chairperson Rosman – Okay, thank you for pointing that out. The one thing I did not do at the beginning of the meeting was to read all of the requirements in order to receive a variance, and with everybody's permission, I am going to do it now.

In order to receive a dimensional variance approval, the applicant must satisfy all of the following:

- 1. You cannot use your property in the same manner that others in the zoning district can use their property.*
- 2. The variance requested is the least variance that will put the applicant on equal footing with others in the same zoning district.*
- 3. The variance needed is because of some unique feature of the applicant's land that doesn't apply to other land in the zoning district.*
- 4. The problem is not created by the applicant or their predecessors.*
- 5. Granting the variance will not cause significant adverse impacts.*
- 6. The practical difficulty and hardship sought to be cured by the variance request is not just a minor inconvenience or a desire for higher financial return.*

Those are the six things that we have to look at. Is there anything else you'd like to add?

McKeever – A question; it was pointed out that Mr. Litzau rents this property?

Chairperson Rosman – Yes, he is the owner and it is a rental, so he is not the occupant of the building.

McKeever – Okay, and I'm not in favor. I don't feel it meets the criteria.

Chairperson Rosman – All right, thank you, Bill. I'm going to turn now to Bob Mistele.

Mistele – I pretty much agree with Bill. I really don't see how the criteria of this property meets the criteria. There may even be other options for him to maybe put an attached shed, something to the property, but I don't see that it meets the criteria for a variance.

Chairperson Rosman – I'm not sure what you mean by attached shed. Do you mean attach it to the house?

Mistele – Yes. My neighbor actually has one and it's kind of neat.

Chairperson Rosman – Well, he'd have to check with Jay if that's allowed. Is there anything else that you would like to add?

Mistele – That's all.

Chairperson Rosman – Okay, I'm going to move on to Rick please.

Sovel – Alex, you may have to unmute him. What is in the back of the property? There is like a cement slab. What's happening with that cement slab and what's the plan for that?

John Litzau – Are you talking to me?

Sovel – Yes.

John Litzau – That's on the neighbor's property.

Sovel – That is the neighbor's property, okay.

John Litzau – He's rebuilding, we're all rebuilding. My plans were to tear down the house and I've got pictures of what I wanted to build. I don't know if you care about any of this. I don't know what you can see. I can't do this over the-

Chairperson Rosman – We're just dealing with this property, exactly what you're asking for tonight – not the future. We're just dealing with this.

John Litzau – Okay.

Sovel – If it's not owned by you, where is the need for all this extra storage then?

John Litzau – What do you mean, if what's not owned by me?

Sovel – If you're not living in it, I'm sorry. I know you own it. If you're not living in it, where is the need?

John Litzau – My buddy's living in the house right now. I'm still in the process. I stopped all my building projects when I got the Zoning Board. I've been working mostly on the garage. I got it all insulated and drywalled, and my plan was to epoxy the floors. When I talked to Jay about putting the stuff I needed to put ... The shed's full. The garage is full. My house burned down in Phoenix and I brought everything back to Michigan. I'm just in the process of trying to figure out what I've got to get rid of and what I can keep. The garage was going to be my woodworking tools, and the only reason I want a shed is, it's for my lawn equipment. I have a very long driveway. I have my lawnmowers, my weedwhackers, all my gas equipment, my snowplow, my snow blower. That's what everybody has a shed for. So it's a practical hardship is what I'm seeking, because I can't put all that into the garage even and park a vehicle in there. I mean everything's probably going to change in the next two years when I get the house done, but I mean everybody in that whole area has multiple garages, multiple sheds. Even Mike Johnson that called in, he has-

Chairperson Rosman – Okay, we're going to just stay with your property. We're just going to stay focused on this-

Sovel – Yes, we can't compare other properties. Just because someone has something doesn't mean you're entitled to that. We only have to stick to your property.

Chairperson Rosman – Rick, is there anything else that you would like to-

John Litzau – Well-

Chairperson Rosman – No, we're going back to Rick Sovel right now.

Sovel – No, I think I'm good for now.

Chairperson Rosman – Okay, thank you. Clarence Mills?

Mills – My concern is, when I looked at Jay's timeline here, it has gone well over a year that he was put on notice, when this shed was started. He was advised that the shed would have to be removed, which to me gives ample time to figure out what you're going to do with the stuff. I don't feel favorable with granting any type of a variance for this shed.

Chairperson Rosman – Okay, thank you. All right, now it's my turn. Well sir, I visited your property and I understand it's a rental, but it looks just awful in the backyard. The front doesn't look so great, but there is so much stuff all over. I know it's a choice that you have, and/or your renter, but you do have another option which at this point you have not chosen to do, and that is to rent storage space. I do, I know a million people that rent storage space to put things in that they don't know what they want to do with, or their boats, or this or that. You have that option. It is not fair to all the Commerce Township residents who live around you to see all that stuff all over. It does not belong all over the place. You have the 900+ square foot garage, and the fact that you've loaded it with things from your home in Phoenix is a personal choice, not a choice that everybody in the neighborhood made, but it's full and everything goes all over the place. There's more than one shed there. There are two sheds. The bottom line is that you are taking advantage of what is allowed in Commerce Township.

Now, as a homeowner, you said you owned in Phoenix, you own in Florida, you own in Commerce, perhaps you own other places. You know that communities have regulations and you also know you don't always love all the regulations. But, if you choose to live somewhere, or to own property, you are in essence saying, yes, I will follow the regulations. For that reason and that reason alone, I'm going to make the motion that we deny for the following reasons.

MOTION by Rosman, seconded by Mills, to deny Item PA20-02, John Litzau, the request by John Litzau of Commerce MI for a variance from Article 33 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance to exceed the maximum square footage allowed for detached accessory structures to retain a shed that was constructed on the property located at 2441 Greenlawn. Sidwell No.: 17-12-228-003

Based on the applicant's presentation and the comments I have heard, I do not believe that the applicant has met all of the criteria of Section 41.09 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance and therefore I move to deny the request for a variance from Article 33 of the Township Ordinance for the property at Sidwell No.: 17-12-228-003.

Denial is for the following reasons:

1. This property can be used in the same manner as others in the zoning district use their property without a proposed variance.
2. There is no unique feature of the applicant's land that does not apply to other land in the zoning district.
3. The problem is self-created by the applicant or his predecessors.
4. Granting the variance will cause significant adverse impacts.
5. The practical difficulty and hardship being sought to be cured is merely an inconvenience, not a necessity.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Rosman, Mills, Sovel, Mistele, McKeever

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Chairperson Rosman – The request has been denied, Mr. Litzau. Jay will meet you anytime you wish in the next week or so at the Township. Make an appointment with him and he will work with you on what needs to be done so that you can comply. I strongly urge you, sir, to use storage facilities to put your things in so you can compact what you have, and the renter that you have, he can clean up too because there's stuff all over the place.

ITEM G2: 2021 ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEETING SCHEDULE

MOTION by Rosman, seconded by Mistele, to approve the 2021 Zoning Board of Appeals Meeting Schedule as presented.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Rosman, Mistele, Mills, Sovel, McKeever

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM G3: ELECTION OF OFFICERS

MOTION by McKeever, seconded by Sovel, to continue with the same officers, with Rusty Rosman as Chairperson, Clarence Mills as Vice Chairperson, and Robert Mistele as Secretary of the Zoning Board of Appeals.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: McKeever, Sovel, Mills, Mistele, Rosman

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

H. OTHER MATTERS:

None.

I. CORRESPONDENCE:

None.

J. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT:

- I don't necessarily have a formal report. It has been so long since we've all been together. I feel like if I tried to go through everything that has happened since the report I gave in May, we'd be here a long time.

- Maybe the biggest item at the Township right now is that we have new Township Supervisor who was sworn in this evening, Mr. Larry Gray. He officially takes office tomorrow, although Township Hall is closed on Fridays. So, for all intents and purposes, his first day is going to be on Monday. We're all looking forward to working with Larry.
- At the same time we all wanted to thank and appreciate the four years with outgoing Supervisor Scott. We had a nice little get together for him last week. We had to keep it COVID compliant so it was a low-key affair, but we let Mr. Scott know how much we appreciated his work.
- There are a whole lot of projects in the pipeline and projects under construction. I don't know if anyone has any specific questions for me about where things stand or where things are headed.

Mills – I've got a couple questions. When we had the last meeting, there were a couple people that had stepped down. I was wondering if you have any replacements.

Dave Campbell – We've got two new faces on the Planning Commission. The folks that stepped down were Tom Jones, who was on the Planning Commission for 22 years, and then Russ Schinzing because his real job was to the point where he could not put the time into the Planning Commission that he knew it deserved. We've replaced them with two Planning Commissioners that we're excited about. One is Chelsea Rebeck who is an attorney, and she has been doing a great job so far. The other is a good friend and colleague of Brian Winkler, Sam Karim. Sam has recently retired from the University of Michigan Health System. He was one of their head architects helping them build all the different Michigan medical buildings that you see going up at their main campus in Ann Arbor, and then all the satellite buildings that you see going up. Sam brings a very strong background in planning and architecture. Chelsea brings a background in law. Chelsea also has young kids so she brings the family perspective to the Planning Commission, which I think is a good thing.

Chairperson Rosman – That's wonderful.

Mills – I've got one more question. That issue on Crumb Road, Zainabia Center.

Dave Campbell – Zainabia Center; Crumb Road is a road that was severed by M-5, so there's the west leg off Welch, and there's the east leg that comes off of Haggerty. We're talking about the west leg of Crumb Road, and on the south side of that is the Zainabia Center which is a religious facility. It has been there since the 90's at least. Paula, was it longer than that?

Paula Lankford – 80's.

Dave Campbell – They wanted to build a gymnasium. Because the property is zoned single-family, and because they're a place of religious worship in a single-family zoning district, they needed Special Land Use approval in order to build their new gymnasium. They got that approval from the Planning Commission, and site plan approval to go along with it. We haven't heard from their engineer lately. I assume they're still working on their design construction engineering plans to get those in front of our Building

Department and our Township Engineer to get approved. I would guess their hope is to get those all approved through the winter so they can start construction in the spring.

Mills – One more quick item, Loon Lake Road and Benstein, what are they building over there?

Dave Campbell – I assume we're talking about the southwest corner?

Mills – Yes.

Dave Campbell – That is a single-family site condominium. I think the number is 23 single-family homes. They're calling that Windwheel Estates. The builder/developer is Joe Schulist. Joe has done a few other projects in Commerce Township. This is his latest one. There was a time where Joe thought he might flip that to another builder/developer, but apparently he is going to do it himself. I know they've done some clearing over there. I don't know if they've actually started on the road. The road is interesting because it's actually going to connect to the existing stub road in the neighborhood to the south, the Foxcroft neighborhood. Their road currently stubs at the property line, but will now be extended and will weave through Windwheel Estates and empty out onto Loon Lake Road.

Mills – Thank you.

Chairperson Rosman – I have two questions; Zerbo's and could you update us on Barrington?

Dave Campbell – Zerbo's has been moving along slowly but surely for a long time, as long as I've worked for Commerce Township which is coming up on 5 years. They have told us that they hope to be open this holiday season. I don't know if COVID puts a pause on that. COVID is going to put a pause on a lot of things, but at one time their intent was to be open for the holidays. Zerbo's is going to be a health food store, spa, restaurant, a whole healthy living thing. I have not heard yet whether they still think they're going to be open in the next couple months or not. It looks complete from the outside, and I haven't been inside yet, but I've been told it looks beautiful on the inside.

Chairperson Rosman – Good, and Barrington?

Dave Campbell – Barrington is coming along. If you haven't had a chance to drive through there, it really is impressive what they've gotten done just over the last couple months. The landscaping is going in, the sod, the flagpoles, the light posts. It's really starting to come together. They are going to have a soft opening in the next couple weeks. They hope to have their first residents moving in before the end of the year. They hope to have that project completely built out, I'm told, by this time next year. In talking to the developer, they're really happy with the interest they're getting. They're excited with how that project is going to turn out. It was a long time getting there. That was a challenging project. It's right next to a wetland. They had a heck of a time putting in the sewer and keeping the water out of the trench, but they're finally to the point where they're planting trees and flowers.

Chairperson Rosman – That’s wonderful. Anything new across the street?

Dave Campbell – We’re talking about the Aikens project. I have been in contact. I think it’s no longer a secret that the residential partner that Mr. Aikens wants to work with is Mr. Galbraith and Mr. Shapiro, the same developers doing the Barrington project. Mr. Aikens project is approved to have up to 300 residential units, and it was always his intent to partner with a residential developer to handle that part. We feel good about that because they’re a known entity and they’ve done several projects in Commerce Township. They’ve always been a good group to work with.

As far as where that project stands, what I'm being told is that they want to get back in front of the Planning Commission and Township Board in early 2021 with hopes of finally breaking ground in late spring/early summer of 2021.

Chairperson Rosman – I hope so too.

Dave Campbell – That’s another one where COVID throws a monkey wrench into the whole thing. That was going to be a place with a bunch of restaurants and gathering spots, a movie theater, and all of those things are kind of big question marks in the world that we live in.

Chairperson Rosman – Sure is. Thank you.

K. ADJOURNMENT:

- Chairperson Rosman – We will visit the bylaws at the next meeting.
- **NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: JANUARY 28, 2021 (potentially electronic only)**

MOTION by Mills, supported by Mistele, to adjourn the meeting at 7:42pm.

ROLL CALL VOTE

AYES: Mills, Mistele, McKeever, Sovel, Rosman

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Robert Mistele, Secretary