

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

Monday, June 1, 2026
2009 Township Drive
Commerce Township, Michigan 48390

A. CALL TO ORDER: Chairperson Parel called the meeting to order at 6:59pm.

ROLL CALL: Present:

Brian Parel, Chairperson
Brian Winkler, Vice Chairperson
Joe Loskill, Secretary
George Weber
Brady Phillips
Caitlin Bearer
Mickey McCanham

Also Present:

Dave Campbell, Township Planning Director
Paula Lankford, Senior Planner
Bethany Miller, Associate Planner
Jay James, Building Official
Andy Miller, Assistant Building Official

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairperson Parel – We have one change we are proposing, which is to move our scheduled public hearing up on the docket, and our text amendment down on the docket. So, the first item we will tackle tonight, after some of the administrative items, is Item H.1., the scheduled public hearing for the Wingate Preserve, and I'm guessing some of the folks here would like to have a conversation about that.

MOTION by Loskill, supported by Phillips, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda of June 1, 2026, with a change to swap Items G.1. and H.1.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Winkler, seconded by Loskill, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of May 4, 2026, as written.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES

Brian Winkler – Downtown Development Authority

The May 19th DDA meeting can be summarized as follows:

- Insite Commercial Report: Randy Thomas was absent from the meeting. He was attending, along with Bruce Aikens, the ICSC event in May in Las Vegas. That's the International Council of Shopping Centers. The DDA looks forward to Randy's June update.
- The DDA voted to maintain the current DDA Officers and Committee chairpersons from 2026 to 2027. The current DDA By-Laws remain unchanged.
- The DDA voted to approve a \$50,000 contribution to the LaFontaine/CTP Pathway Connection Project. These funds were already in a DDA account earmarked exclusively for trailway improvements or maintenance. The DDA felt that the connection to LaFontaine site is cohesive with the overall Township plan for pathways connections, and it links Commerce to the West Bloomfield pathway.

Caitlin Bearer – Zoning Board of Appeals

- No update.
- Our regularly scheduled meeting last week was canceled due to lack of petitioners.

Dave Campbell – It does sound like the ZBA will have a petitioner for the July ZBA meeting.

Chairperson Parel – George, I'll go to you. I know, at the end of your update, you wanted to lead us into some of the conversations tonight. But just a quick reminder, we do have to open public discussion for matters that are not on the agenda tonight.

George Weber – Township Board of Trustees

- There have been two Township Board meetings since the last Planning Commission meeting, on May 12th and May 19th.
- The reason we had to have a special meeting on May 19th was to review the process for appointing a new Treasurer. Molly Phillips, who has been our Treasurer for 10 or 12 years, has elected to retire at the end of this month. So, we have been dutifully sending out notifications and trying to get some applicants with the right background, experience and temperament to be our new Treasurer.
- Other items covered at the May 12th meeting:
 - First, we appointed Mark Giromini, who is a Wolverine Lake Council member, and Wolverine Lake Board member. He volunteered to also be on the Commerce Township Parks & Recreation Committee. It's a great opportunity for the two communities, all within Commerce Township, to work more closely together and coordinate and consolidate where appropriate.
 - We awarded a contract for a new water main that will go along Pontiac Trail and Beck Road. I'm sure everybody is aware of the water main breaks that have been affecting many communities around us. We are putting in as many redundancy systems as possible, so if there is a water main break in one location, we can shut it down and loop the water around from a different direction to make sure that as many of our residents as possible have water, and the least amount are affected, prioritizing things like Huron Valley Hospital, the schools, et cetera, as well.
 - We also approved a budget for placing security cameras in our parks. Nobody wanted to do this, but with the level of vandalism that we are unfortunately seeing in our parks, we are going to put up security cameras to hopefully act as a deterrent. There has been a lot of vandalism over the past several years.
 - A majority of Priority Waste has been sold to a private equity firm. Priority did not get off to a great start when they bought GFL, but this new firm is supposedly providing an infusion of \$150 million into the company, with the majority of that going toward equipment and people. So, we are keeping our fingers crossed that we're going to see better performance and less trucks down in the near future. For anybody wanting to know, the contract we have with Priority goes for another 3.5 years I believe. So, we are with them until then, and then we will go out for bids at that time.

- Finally, we authorized the ballot language for the November election where we are going to be putting a pathways millage on the ballot. It's probably one of the most frequent requests through Parks & Recreation; people want more connectivity, more nonmotorized pathways to be able to traverse through the Township and get to sites such as the Michigan Airline Trail, our parks, the schools, the library, et cetera. So, we're going to put that out to the voters. The plan would be that we would bond for this, and complete those projects within 36-48 months, including roughly 14 miles of nonmotorized pathways.
- That's what I have for the Township Board update.
- Since I'm assuming 90% of the people here probably want to talk about the Wingate development at Commerce and Carey, I will address a couple things I noted in some of the social media posts and maybe it will make the public comments a little more focused.
 - There were several comments that they wanted the site to remain agricultural and keep it zoned agricultural. Just so everybody knows, that property has never been zoned agricultural. It has been zoned as single-family residential for well over 50 years.
 - The other thing to keep in mind, as this is zoned residential, developers, just like each of us individually within Commerce, have personal property rights. So, if any of you own a single piece of property within a neighborhood, and it's zoned residential, by right you're allowed to build a residential home there. If you own two lots next to each other, you could build two homes next to each other.
 - So, the Township has no authority to stop the development of a project for which it is lawfully zoned, as long as that development meets the zoning criteria. That's what we will be discussing today. This is the Planning Commission's first bite at the apple, seeing a laid-out plan for the first time. We are excited to hear about it, as you are. We have received a very detailed deck on all of this.
 - With that, I will turn it over to Brian to kick off the festivities.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you, George.

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

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

Todd Winnie, 328 Annison Dr, Commerce Township – You mentioned that video surveillance cameras are going to be added to the parks. What is the infrastructure that you are planning on putting in to allow for those cameras to be able to be transmitted and the information stored in a centralized location? Could you express what you're doing? Is there a bid process?

Weber – So under public comments, we don't tend to go back and forth, but if you want to hang around until after the meeting, I'd be happy to talk to you about the plans.

Todd Winnie – So there's plans, but it hasn't been put out for bid at this point in time?

Weber – It has been put out to bid and we've selected a bidder.

Todd Winnie – You have done that already, thank you very much.

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

F. TABLED ITEMS

None.

>>G. OLD BUSINESS

ITEM G.1. TEXT AMENDMENT DISCUSSION

Moved down on the agenda, and Item H.1. was moved up.

H. SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM H.1. PCZ#26-02 – WINGATE PRESERVE – CONDITIONAL REZONING – PUBLIC HEARING

Conditional Rezoning Petition for 2 parcels totaling approx. 75-acres. Proposed to be conditionally rezoned from R-1A (Large Lot One Family Residential) to R-1D (One Family Residential) on the north side of Commerce Road, east side of Carey Road. PIN#'s: 17-04-300-066 and 17-04-300-068

Dave Campbell – So the properties that we're talking about are the combined 75-ish acres at the northeast corner of East Commerce Road and Carey Road; a 42-acre property right here at the corner, and then next door, a 35-acre property for a combined total of 75. The 42-acre property at the corner has been owned by the petitioner, and the developer who is before you this evening, for the better part of a couple of decades. More recently, they acquired the 33-ish acres next door and are proposing to develop the property and do so through a Conditional Rezoning for a single-family residential development that they are calling Wingate Preserve.

I'm going to pull up the Conditional Rezoning site plan here in a minute, but I wanted to remind the Planning Commission and everybody in the audience of the distinction between a traditional or straight rezoning and a Conditional Rezoning. So, both properties are currently zoned R-1A, which is one of the Township's four single-family zoning districts, R-1A, B, C and D. The key differences between those four zoning districts are the minimum lot sizes. In R-1A zoning, the minimum lot size is 20,000 square feet, so just shy of half an acre, and a minimum road frontage of 100 feet in width. As you go from R-1A to B to C to D, the minimum lot sizes get smaller. What the developer is proposing this evening is to rezone both properties to the R-1D zoning district, so the minimum lot size in R-1D is 7,200 square feet with a minimum lot width of 50 feet.

The distinction between a straight rezoning and a Conditional Rezoning is that with a Conditional Rezoning, it is done via contract. A lot of times you'll hear it called contract zoning, which is effectively the developer and the Township entering into a contract whereby the developer says, give me the zoning I need, and I promise I will build this and only this. And when they say this and only this, what they will be presenting this evening and what we'll show here in a moment is a Conditional Rezoning plan that

shows the general layout of what they're proposing. The number of units being proposed, the layout of the roads, the points of access, and so forth.

For the developer to then proceed, they would have to abide by that Conditional Rezoning plan. So, if the rezoning were to be approved, it would be conditional upon them developing that actual plan. So procedurally, the rezoning, or in this case the Conditional Rezoning, would come first. It has to go before the Planning Commission, which is part of why we're here this evening, and if the Planning Commission is prepared to make a formal recommendation to the Township Board, then the Conditional Rezoning would proceed to the Township Board where the Township Board would have the authority to make a final decision.

So, the Planning Commission this evening does have the option, if they're prepared to do so, to make a formal recommendation to the Township Board. If they choose to do so, it would proceed to the Township Board at a meeting, potentially later in June, or possibly more likely, the Board's July meeting. If the Conditional Rezoning were to be approved, then the developer would have to come back to this Planning Commission with a condominium site plan. That would be a fully developed version of the Conditional Rezoning plan that you're going to see this evening, and when I say fully developed, it would have more of the engineering and landscaping detail. What the developer and the Township don't want to do is go into that level of detail until such time as the decision has been made on the Conditional Rezoning.

As I mentioned, what the developer is proposing is 168 lots on these 75 acres. This is the Conditional Rezoning plan. If this Conditional Rezoning were to be approved, this plan would be an exhibit to the Conditional Rezoning agreement, which as I've said is a contract between the developer and the Township. What's being proposed on this Conditional Rezoning plan is two points of access; one on the northside of East Commerce Road, and one on the east side of Carey Road. As I mentioned, 168 homes, all zoned R-1D.

What needs to be discussed this evening with the Planning Commission, and then later with the Township Board, is the potential for a third point of access to the Bridge Pointe neighborhood to the east. This road here, Bridge Pointe Trail, was purposely stubbed at this property line, and one of the things to be discussed and decided by the Township is whether that stub road would be extended into this neighborhood to provide a third point of access. If the Township doesn't want it to be full vehicular access, another option that we've looked at is whether that could be a pedestrian access, a sidewalk or a pathway, so there's at least nonmotorized connections between the two neighborhoods.

The developer's traffic engineer has done a traffic impact study for this proposed development, and then the Township's traffic engineer has reviewed the findings of the developer's traffic engineer. There are a series of recommendations for road improvements that the traffic engineers would be recommending if this project were to move forward, particularly there would need to be improvements along the access point of Commerce Road. The developer's traffic engineer initially proposed an eastbound passing lane to account for eastbound vehicles making the left turn into the new neighborhood. The Township's traffic engineer feels that the more appropriate approach there would be to have a center left turn lane that would be shared, both by the proposed new neighborhood and the existing residential to the south. There would also be upgrades to the existing signalized intersection of Commerce and Carey Road, particularly a westbound to northbound right turn lane, and with that an upgrade to the existing traffic signal that would include a right turn overlap. What that means is there

would be a right green arrow while the southbound movement along Carey Road has green time, so you could have an overlap between those two.

If I go to the aerial and zoom in on the corner, and anyone who lives out that way is likely familiar, there's something of an illegal cut-through that has been established. Too often, folks will cut through here to try to bypass the traffic signal, and/or we will see where people will park cars and boats and trailers for sale. So, part of what the developer hopes to do as part of this project is to make improvements to that corner to deter any further cut-through, and by deter, it would be landscaping improvements, potentially some landscaping, boulders or curbing, or some other improvements to the roadway itself. Those would all have to be reviewed by the Road Commission. All in an effort to create a traffic improvement to this illegal bypass, and then also an aesthetic improvement. It is notable though that this property has an odd history to it, and its ownership is somewhat unclear. The developer is working toward kind of clearing up the title and the clear path to ownership of that property, so that they can make the improvements that they hope to make on that property.

With the R-1A zoning, one of the discussion points with the Planning Commission tonight will be the number of units that are proposed. So, as I mentioned, 168 units are proposed and the developer's logic for seeking the smaller lot sizes is an effort to preserve as much of the greenspace on the property, and particularly around the perimeter of the property, as possible. So, what the developer is showing on this conceptual layout is preserving these pockets of existing greenspace, existing vegetation around the perimeter, and effectively clustering the smaller lots more toward the center of the project so that there is an effort to preserve the existing vegetated area, and to enhance that vegetated area, to create a buffer between existing neighborhoods and the new neighborhoods.

What the developer might contend is to develop the site under the R-1A zoning, in order to get the minimum lot sizes they would need, they'd effectively have to develop the whole of the property and develop lots that go right up to the perimeter lot lines and would not be able to offer this preservation area around the perimeter. So, again, the hope is to cluster the lots more toward the center of the site to preserve, I think they've calculated 30% of the site would be preserved greenspace; 30% is accounting for about 23 acres of the site.

The Township attorney and the developer's attorney have drafted a draft Conditional Rezoning agreement, which the Planning Commission should have in their agenda packets. I think both attorneys are comfortable with the terms of the agreement. Within that agreement are the conditions that the developer is offering for the Conditional Rezoning agreement. As I mentioned, one of the keys is this Conditional Rezoning plan and adhering to this Conditional Rezoning plan, but there are also conditions relative to the traffic improvements, conditions relative to the upgrades to the existing intersection, conditions relative to making a contribution to the Township's sidewalk and pathway fund, in lieu of constructing pathways along the frontages of Commerce and Carey Road since, at least at this time, there aren't any existing sidewalks or pathways that they could connect to along the frontages. The internal roads, which will be public roads, will have sidewalks along both sides, but they would be offering a contribution to this Township's pathway fund in lieu of building a new pathway along the north side of Commerce Road, and/or the east side of Carey Road.

I'll see if the Planning Commission has any questions for me, and then I know that the development team, led by Mr. Kassab, has a presentation that they would like to make on their own behalf. I will mention, too, that the developers, of their own volition, held

two meetings prior to this one at the Township Library and invited the residents of several of the surrounding neighborhoods to those meetings. I believe one of them was in mid-February and the subsequent meeting was in mid-March. That's not something that they are required to do. They did so in an effort to introduce themselves and introduce their projects to the neighbors. Based on a lot of the feedback that they received at the February meeting, they made some changes to their conceptual layout and brought it back to the neighbors at the March meeting. They felt they had a good response with the surrounding neighbors, and they presented a plan that the neighbors, at least at that time, felt was closer to what they would be hoping to see achieved on this property. I'll take a pause there and see if there are any questions for me, whether there are questions on the plan, or on the agreements, or on the procedure itself. Otherwise, I know Mr. Kassab would like to make a presentation on his own behalf.

Chairperson Parel – Excellent, thanks Dave. And to the gentlemen standing in the back, there are plenty of seats up front if you'd like. With that, any questions from the Planning Commission at this point? Hearing none, Mr. Kassab, we welcome you up.

Bearer – Brian, I have one question.

Chairperson Parel – Yes, of course.

Bearer – On the map, can you show us what area is zoned commercial within the map you just had up, just so everyone in the audience can also see that?

Dave Campbell – I can, and thank you for reminding me of that. So, the entirety of the property is currently zoned R-1A. The developer is seeking to conditionally rezone them to R-1D. What is relevant to the discussion this evening, in addition to the current zoning, is also the property's designation on the Township's Future Land Use Map. That's what I'm pulling up here. The Future Land Use Map is probably the most significant portion of the Township's Master Plan. The Township tries to do a Master Plan every 10 years, with a 5-year review. We just went through the review process back in 2022 into 2023, and as part of that, we updated the Future Land Use Map. The difference between the Future Land Use Map and the Zoning Map is that the Future Land Use Map is meant to be a vision, a 20-year vision, for Commerce Township. The Zoning Map is meant to be the law that will implement that vision. That's probably the easiest way to understand the distinction.

So, if we zoom in on this property, or these two properties, what you'll notice is, at the actual corner is this pink rectangle. The pink color represents a Master Plan designation of neighborhood commercial. The intent there, when the Planning Commission created the Master Plan and went through subsequent updates through the years, through the decades, was that there was some logic in having some form of low intensity commercial at this corner. When we say low intensity commercial, the thought was something like a neighborhood market, or a bakery, or maybe a takeout restaurant, or maybe an office or a daycare, something that could provide low intensity service to the north/northwest quadrant of the Township. And so, while the corner is not zoned commercial, it is master planned neighborhood commercial, and the neighborhood commercial designation on the Future Land Use Map is most closely aligned with the B-1 zoning designation, the B-1 local business zoning designation on our Zoning Map. I hope somewhere in there was an answer to your question.

Bearer – It was, thank you.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you. I think it was important to get that out. Mr. Kassab, I think we're ready for you.

Mr. Kassab – I'm Mark Kassab, on behalf of Commerce Carey LLC and Commerce Carey East LLC. Dave Campbell covered a lot of the points I'll be covering, but certainly I will cover them in a little bit more detail. I appreciate the opportunity this evening. We've put together a small deck of about 20 slides or so. I'll talk a little bit about our company background, the property details of course, the master plan of the parcel, the types of homes that we envision on this site, the wetland map, traffic evaluation, density discussion, public benefit that goes along with the Conditional Rezoning, and certainly any questions and answers that the Commission or the residents may have.

A little bit about us; our company has been around for a little over 50 years. I've been with the company myself for 26 years. I'm here with a couple of associates, one that's been with the company for close to about 45 years, in addition to our traffic engineer, Jill Bauer, and also Pat Keast, our civil engineer, is with us. M. Shapiro Real Estate Group has been in this Township, as many of you know, for well over 40 years with some major land holdings that we've developed and we're very proud of. Our partner is MJC Homes. MJC companies is a family-owned business which has also been around for approximately 50 years, based in Southeast Michigan.

Again, some of this will be repetitive, but I apologize. As I put this together, I felt I have to go over it again with you. The properties are located on the northeast corner, approximately 78 acres. Current zoning is R-1A with 20,000 square foot lots. The Master Plan, as Mr. Campbell had stated, is single-family residential with neighborhood commercial at the corner, which would theoretically accommodate roughly 75,000 square feet if the property were to be rezoned to B-1 Commercial. What we're proposing is single-family, which is consistent with the Master Plan on the majority of the parcel, through an R-1D rezoning through a Conditional Rezoning agreement.

This was just covered. This is the Master Plan of the parcel; it's a little difficult to see, and unfortunately, I can't zoom in on this. But the parcel is master planned single-family residential, and the hard corner, inclusive of what we call the orphan parcel. We'll talk a little bit more about that. That orphan parcel, the last chain of title is back in the late 1800s. It's not on your tax roll. It's not owned by anybody. We're going to probably have to file an action for quiet title or get a license from what we believe to be the prior owner's family. But all of that hard corner is master planned commercial.

So again, a little bit more about the future. As certainly the Planning Commission and Township Board is aware, the Master Plan, was recently visited by the community in 2023, approximately 3 years ago. The Future Land Use Map envisions this site for 2 units per acre. By rights on the parcel, and by rights on the current zoning, that's approximately 122 lots. We'll go over what's referred to as the parallel plan. The future use of the commercial through the B-1 zoning; theoretically you can put approximately 75,000 square feet on the hard corner if it was rezoned, certainly through the proper channels through the Township. Combined, and you'll see a parallel plan, we thought it would be important to combine the two if it were rezoned on the hard corner and kept with its current zoning of R-1A; approximately 100 single-family lots in addition to 75,000 square feet of retail combined.

Here's what again is referred to as a parallel plan. If the hard corner were to be rezoned, and if the remainder of the parcel was to be developed based on its current zoning,

what's referred to as zoning by right; basically, come in and ask for permits, submit the proper paper along with that, do the proper traffic studies, something like this could be conceivable. Similarly, you'd have one point of access on Carey here for the residential, one point of access on Commerce and more than likely a point of access for the retail coming probably closer to here and eliminating this one. This is what's referred to as a parallel plan, and again, zoning by right if we just said hey, look, let's just develop it as it's zoned and maximize its current density, approximately 122 lots. This is the boundary line, roughly right here on the north. This is the boundary line to the east. Here's the connection to the east coming in off Commerce Road and coming in off of Carey Road as well.

As I believe Mr. Campbell had stated, we did a pre-app meeting approximately in January. Again, we've owned this parcel for well over 20 years on the parent parcel with the most recent addition probably about two or three years ago, all from the same family. We met with the neighbors at the Township Library on February 11th. As part of our process, we feel it's best to meet with the residents to get some input because you can have a little bit more candid conversations and have some good dialogue with them. As you'll see from our plans that have evolved over the last few months, there's been some changes within our plans. We met again with the residents on March 11th and had a number of discussions with neighbors during this process, via phone calls and emails, all of which I believe were valuable input and have been incorporated within the plan. Further input that I received this afternoon that I'd like to mention as well, that could be or should be incorporated within the plan.

The original plan, this is not the plan that's part of our Conditional Rezoning agreement, and again, just to share with you what I believe good dialogue can achieve with neighbors. We mainly focused on this particular area. There was some question of should we connect to the subdivision to the east, Bridge Pointe. Certainly, from a planning standpoint, one could argue that the stub street was there for future connection and should connect. For public safety purposes, there was a lot of concern of traffic to and from Bridge Pointe into the subject development, and then furthermore, as you can see, these are pretty large lots to the north. To the north is Four Oaks subdivision. There were some comments that they would be backing up to two or three lots behind their one lot. It didn't seem right. There seemed to be a better way to create a plan here. For the most part, everything else stayed the same to the west and to the south.

This is the revised plan and what I want to point out on the revised plan, as Mr. Campbell had stated, this could be a vehicular or non-vehicular access, depending on what the Township, the Planning Commission and the Board would like. This does meet the fire code from an access standpoint. Previously, as you can see, we had minimal access points. So, to get back to here you would need a secondary access point. We eliminated that by reconfiguring the area without losing the open space requirement or the open space that we had proposed.

Furthermore, some important features, and again we'll discuss them further. There's a total of 12 or 14 lots to the north. We have 7 lots that back up to them within this plan. And again, this particular area here can be a future connection, or could also be a non-vehicular connection as well.

Types of homes; that's a question that we're asked often. This is not affordable housing. These aren't Section 8 homes. These are go to your bank or credit union and get a mortgage type of home. It's unfortunate because I remember my first home was about \$150,000, but entry level of new homes today, it's hard to achieve a \$500,000 or \$600,000 price point. We envision these homes in the range starting at \$550,000 up to

\$650,000. This past weekend, I did a small Zillow search to see what's to the east and south, and what's available. These three homes, public information, is what's available today. The homes to the South that are for sale, approximately 20 to 25 year old homes, gorgeous homes, beautiful homes, larger homes, but there certainly is a shortage of supply of homes. Three homes are available, two of which are about 10 days on the market, and one of which is about 20 some odd days on the market, so all under 30 days on the market.

Part of the due diligence that a developer does is understand the environmental, which has come back clean, the wetlands and this is taken through the wetland map. As you can see, there's a regulated body of wetland here. This particular area, believe it or not, back in the days it was used for a watering hole for cattle. It's non-regulated. It's a small little depression. Sometimes it holds water, sometimes it doesn't, but this is the main body of wetland right here that connects to the west from a future wetland connectivity. Maps have been verified with EGLE. We've also had a wetland consultant that confirmed the boundaries of the wetlands within the property.

As we discussed, and these were taken off Google Earth images, this is heading westbound. We're on Commerce Road, here's Carey Road where the vehicles are. You can see the cut-through here. This is the Preserve subdivision to the left here, this is the subject property to the right. This is where Mr. Campbell stated a left turn lane would be installed.

Traffic evaluation; traffic is always a concern. I think it's important we spend a little bit of time on the traffic. As part of the process, we've engaged a traffic engineer who's here with me this evening. If you have any detailed questions, she'd probably be more qualified to answer than I would. A center left turn lane was recommended and suggested, and certainly we would agree with the center left turn lane on Commerce Road.

Signalization improvements; anytime you bring in more homes, bring in more development, you best see what you need to do to the local intersections and certainly some improvements to Commerce and Carey signalization would be required. The south side of East Commerce Road, fronting the Preserve subdivision, will need improving alongside adding that left turn lane. It's all within the right-of-way. We're not going within their land. And install a westbound to northbound right turn lane, as Mr. Campbell stated. So, if you're heading westbound on Commerce, a right turn lane would be installed there.

The gravel approach on the orphan parcel on the northeast corner of Commerce and Carey will be removed and would be done to the standards of landscaping that I know many of you are familiar with that we're accustomed to. It's important to note that Commerce Road is an arterial road. What does that mean, right? It's intended to service traffic outside of Commerce Township as well as within Commerce Township. What a traffic engineer refers to is LOS, or level of service. What's the level of service of the road that's currently there? What's the level of service of the road going to be after the proposed development comes in there? So, the level of services are rated from A being the best to E being the worst. The current level of service is rated B and A from AM to PM respectively. Note that 70% of the traffic on Commerce Road comes in from neighboring communities, 70% of the traffic. So, if the Township chose to rezone this to agricultural, and have two houses on the entire property, I hate to say that the traffic can only grow based on the neighboring community's growth. So, it's how we control that traffic within the development and how we control the improvements that we make as part of the development.

This is the orphan parcel as Dave mentioned in this particular area. I'm not sure what this car was doing there, but I'm sure many of the neighbors have seen some of the vehicles, and again the right turn lane would be coming over here for the signalization improvements to the intersection from a light. Again, part of the feedback that we received, quite frankly, I thought maybe a small roundabout would be great here. Residents didn't like that idea, and we agree. We own some property that a roundabout was placed in, and I haven't seen many that work well, but I understand there is a need for them in certain areas. So again, that's part of sitting with the residents, and we chose to sit with the residents twice and field a number of phone calls from them.

Let's talk about density for a minute. We looked at 3 developments and again, you know, when we look at developments, we look at the density, we look at the traffic, we look at the type of homes we're installing, and density is always a critical component, alongside of traffic. We looked at the Preserve, we looked at Bridge Pointe, and we looked at Huron Hills. Our subject property, and again being master planned 2 units per acre, 168 homes on the property on 77.62 acres of gross land results in residential density of roughly 2.16 units per acre. The Preserve property is 107 single-family homes on roughly 39 acres, netting about 2.75 units per acre. Bridge Pointe subdivision is 121 single-family homes on 54 acres, resulting in 2.23 units per acre. Huron Hills subdivision is 134 single-family homes on 44 acres, approximately 3 units per acre.

Our density is less than the three that I just mentioned. As Mr. Campbell had stated, as part of the rezoning with the Conditional Rezoning agreement, it almost locks you into a contract. Why do that? Because theoretically, we can rezone this to R-1B, C or D, call it what you want, sell the property off, and then you're dealing with somebody else on a plan that nobody wanted. So, in my opinion, it's best to lock in a plan that everybody agrees upon with the changes that we all agree upon, and let's talk about what our community benefits or public benefits should be.

I think it's best if I can go to slide 11 so you can envision ... Dave, can you zoom in on the plan so everybody can see some of the details? There we go. So, I have the public benefit slide, and I also have it in front of me. I will put it up again so everyone can see it. Again, the public benefits that will be outlined within the contract would be the acquisition for the use of the hard corner. Again, we don't own that hard corner. The subdivision to the south doesn't own it. The subdivision to the west doesn't own it. It's not on the tax roll. We ran a title search on the property and what our intentions would be is not to increase any sort of density, not to put anything out there outside of landscaping, through a landscape plan that's going to need to come to the Township to get approval. It will not just be a couple of boulders and a tree stump to prevent people from cutting through. It's going to be nice, lush landscaping.

Interconnectivity of sidewalks, to the east to Bridge Pointe, or a road; however, the Planning Commission and the Township Board feels it would be best. We're big on landscaping. I can assure you, in all the reviews in my 26 years with the company, we don't have any landscape comments because we exceed all municipalities comments, including Novi, White Lake, Commerce and Farmington, because it's a standard that we live up to and a standard that we set for ourselves. We would love to keep 30% of the property as open space. What does open space mean? I received a call this evening asking, if this is developed, and 20 years from now somebody wanted to put a ball field here, or an open area where somebody's going to rip out the trees? Within the Conditional Rezoning agreement, we'd like to prevent that from happening. So, what you see here stays in perpetuity, not only for this development, but for the folks to the north, south, east and west, and for the Township on what they're going to be achieving.

So, this is interesting, and again, it's part of why we met with the residents and got the valuable input that we did. If I can have everybody look out the window for a second. From a distance standpoint, there's a home that's about 210 feet from us. Our closest home to the rear of the lots on this is 248 feet. No matter how great we are with landscaping, nothing we can do can preserve the trees that have been there for 30 to 60 years. Most of us won't see it in our lifetime. What's interesting, as I mentioned to Dave, I drive a Tesla and it has Google Earth on it, and I noticed a beautiful home on the other side of the Township building here about 220 feet away, and you can't tell what's on the other side of that. So yes, we could put trees and arbor vitae if it was clear cut, but you're never going to get the natural protection if the site was clear cut. I believe protecting the natural space and its open areas without clear cutting the entire site, and developing properly with the road pattern that we get approved by the Township is the right way to do it.

There are 7 lots that back up to the northern 12 lots. The parallel plan had 26 lots that back up along this entire boundary line right here to the north. I think we would all agree that nobody would want that. There's 140 feet from the rear of the lot lines to the east property line, roughly right here. From a separation standpoint, a minimum of 140 feet. And again, this area here is open for discussion. And it's difficult to see here, but we've increased the setbacks off of Commerce Road so we can install some additional landscaping to minimize the visibility from Commerce Road for those passing by. All natural space to the north and to the east, and within the development will be preserved. We are not impacting any wetlands. We're not looking to mitigate any wetlands.

Sometimes developers come here, as we have in the past, saying look, we want to shave off a quarter acre or a 1/2 acre of wetland. That's not proposed on our development. As part of our Conditional Rezoning agreement, we've agreed that we will not seek any variances. The builder will not seek any variances, nor will any future homeowner seek any variances. What you see is what you get. If somebody wanted to come here and say, I'm installing a pool that's going to be coming out to here and I need a variance, it's part of the Conditional Rezoning agreement that's part of title for everybody's home that's acquired that says they can't.

Traffic improvements on Commerce Road; again, with signalization improvements and assurance that no commercial will ever be on the site.

That's it. I'm happy to answer any questions the Commission or the residents may have.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you for that. I think it may be an appropriate time to go down the line here and check in with the Commissioners to see if anybody has any questions or comments for the developer, and then we'll open the public hearing and give everybody an opportunity to speak. Dave, any opposition to that?

Dave Campbell – No, other than the developer may want an opportunity to address any questions or concerns that come up during the public hearing.

Chairperson Parel – Of course. Caitlin?

Commissioner Comments:

Bearer – Who maintains the greenspace?

Mr. Kassab – So the greenspace would be maintained by the HOA once it's turned over, the developer is out of the development and the homes are sold. Typically, an HOA is formed that consists of the homeowners within the development. The natural preserve typically is not touched. It is kept in its natural state. Short of health, safety, welfare issues, nobody should be going in that natural preserve, meaning they cannot and should not be installing a walking path on the boundary line to the north. If a tree is falling on somebody's house, or going to be falling, certainly they can go in there, notify the HOA to go in there to maintain that tree or cut a portion of that tree down so it doesn't fall on a home, but the open space within the development, as it's referred to within the pocket parks; this particular area would be maintained, all the entrance, the boulevard entrance, the landscape entrance, is maintained through the HOA, which is set through a budget upon development.

Bearer – I was referencing not so much the landscaped portion, but the greenspace and wondering who would have the liability for anything happening within that greenspace, the back portion. So that would still be the HOA.

Mr. Kassab – It would be the HOA. There would be no maintenance to it, but it would be part of the HOA insurance.

Bearer – Out of curiosity, and obviously the public can speak to this too, what was the opposition to the roundabout at that intersection?

Mr. Kassab – That's a good question. Where I live, far away from here, they put in a roundabout and I think it's great because I don't have to sit at a light for a longer time, but roundabouts are not cheap. As many of you know, we thought, and were willing to install a roundabout, but the residents were not in favor of it.

Dave Campbell – If I may, we bounced that off the Road Commission as well. They have looked at this intersection and they've looked at it for the potential of a roundabout. The numbers, the volumes and the crash history are not there on their end to rationalize a roundabout. They also had some concerns about the soils and the wetlands there, and the impacts of that, and then trying to make a roundabout fit on what is a challenging area. So, the Road Commission was not particularly favorable to the concept of it being a roundabout at that intersection, which is somewhat unique to the Road Commission. They're fans of roundabouts, but this was not one of their candidates.

Bearer – That's all for now. I think I'll probably have more questions after the public comments.

Chairperson Parel – Yes, and just to be clear, we can have the opportunity for additional questions or comments after public comments. Brian?

Winkler – I have no questions at this point.

Phillips – I would like to hear the public comments first.

Loskill – I will wait.

Weber – I will wait as well.

McCanham – I'll wait.

Chairperson Parel opened the public hearing.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you. With that, I will formally open the public hearing. I'd just like to talk about some of the rules. We want to limit everybody to two minutes, and we ask that out of respect for time. We ask that everyone start out with their name and address. I know it's difficult to have conversations like this, but there's no need to repeat yourself. If it has been said once, we understand and we will take it into consideration. We are listening. We may or may not have the time to respond, but we will listen to everyone. The most important thing is that we need to be respectful to everybody here. No hooting and hollering. So, I would appreciate that. I will invite our first resident up to speak. Please give us your name and address.

Abby Burgess, Carey Road, Commerce Township – As you may know, myself and others have attended planning meetings for over a year and a half once we learned that there may be the possibility of development on the property at Commerce and Carey. We also reached out to as many neighbors as possible in order for us to have a say about how the property would be developed.

As we have stated before, we would absolutely love for the property to remain undisturbed, and I would love for nothing to be built and to maintain the same peaceful space that I've enjoyed for 28 years. However, I am aware of builder's rights and that the gentleman who purchased the property 20 years ago is well within his rights to develop on the property. I am very grateful that Mr. Kassab took the time to speak with many of us who are concerned about the development and listened to our concerns. One major concern was the loss of the mature tree perimeter and the disruption of sight lines.

Many people have lived in the area for decades and have enjoyed rural views that they do not want disturbed. Mr. Kassab has agreed to consolidate the homes to the center of the property and leave the large buffer of mature trees to help mitigate the homes being built in people's backyards and to ensure that the new homes are not very visible to those who currently surround the property. As nice as the homes may be, myself and many others simply would rather look at trees than homes. So, we do appreciate that the mature tree barrier will be left undisturbed.

We are thankful that what happened to those that live in Lake Sherwood near the Crystal Lake development will not be happening on this property. Additionally, to divert quickly to answer the question about the roundabouts, I live directly next to the intersection at Commerce and Carey, and the only time I'm able to get out of my driveway in the morning is when there is a red light, so a roundabout would make it nearly impossible to exit my driveway unfortunately.

An additional concern is the amount of traffic that will be added to our area. This is a concern that I am aware needs to come before the Oakland County Road Commission as we do not own our roads. However, concerning the issue of too many homes and too much traffic, there are a few things that I would like to ask for on behalf of the residents of Commerce Township. First, we ask that you continue to be advocates for the residents of Commerce Township to the Oakland County Road Commission as our current infrastructure does not meet the need and the traffic problem has become, quite

frankly, unbearable. This in turn ties into the issue of too many homes being built in Commerce, which adds too many cars to our roads. As I said, I am aware that this is an issue for the Road Commission, however, I would like to implore Commerce Township to aid its residents by minimizing the amount of development taking place.

I am aware that if someone owns a property, they are able to develop on it. However, we are asking that if Commerce Township is aware of large parcels of greenspace and land that will be going up for sale within the Township, that Commerce Township purchase the land in order to provide residents with a park, a trail or simply a piece of land that does not have several homes shoved on it.

As a young person who used to be proud to say that I live in a beautiful rural area like Commerce Township, I am concerned that every day I'm going to wake up, look out my window, and see something akin to Novi, Farmington, West Bloomfield and many other places that have lost their rural charm for being overdeveloped. I, for one, would be happy to vote yes on a millage benefitting park land and keeping large parts of the land owned by the Township as opposed to being owned by developers.

Today I am asking that you as a Planning Commission, take into consideration the people that live here and pay taxes because they like the rural aesthetic of Commerce Township. Unfortunately, it is not possible for nothing to be developed on this property and again we are very grateful to Mark for taking our concerns into account and not building houses corner to corner. However, it is not too late to stop over development in Commerce Township. We do not need more homes; we do not need more traffic. We need large greenspaces, native plants, mature trees and for Commerce Township to continue to advocate for its residents that have lived here for decades. Thank you.

Mr. Kassab – Mr. Chair, if I may. I've been doing this for a long time. Abby has been nothing but professional, on point, and the neighbors are lucky to have her as a neighbor.

Chairperson Parel – We really do appreciate it. Let's keep it to two minutes. Sir, we welcome you up.

Gary Hanger, 2096 Golfcrest Dr., Commerce Township – I'm here representing myself and my wife, Helen Hanger. We are opposed to the proposed rezoning PCZ26-02 as the increased number of houses that would result will cause substantial additional vehicle traffic on our neighborhood streets as the construction traffic and the new residents seek a shorter route between Carey Road and Bogie Lake Road, and will thus cut through our neighborhoods. Our neighborhoods already suffer from too much commuter traffic finding its way under our streets due to the congestion of the primary and secondary streets in the area, widespread availability of GPS and travel apps, and the lack of foresight by Commerce and White Lake Townships when they paved Cooley Lake Road from Duck Lake Road to Carey Road, but failed to continue it through to Bogie Lake Road. It should have been done.

This failure has resulted in substantial amounts of traffic treating our subdivision streets of Golfcrest Drive, Glen Hollow Drive, Turnberry Drive and Mistwood Drive as if they are the paved Cooley Lake Road extension. Much of this traffic fails to abide by the residential speed limits, thus endangering the local residents who use their streets to walk, jog, bike or push strollers. Township supervision is aware of these problems but seem unwilling or unable to help. When a new development was being considered in the Union Lake area of the Township a few years ago, extra efforts were put forth to

address the cut through traffic concerns of the residents of Cascade Avenue, and a solution was arrived at to prevent traffic from entering this neighborhood. We deserve the same consideration. Please retain the current Master Plan zoning until such time that local traffic concerns are remedied. Thank you.

Chairperson Parel – I'm just going to ask really quick if we can avoid clapping. We understand great speeches and we appreciate it. We are all here for the same purpose, so if we can avoid that to prevent keeping us here longer than we need to be, I would really be grateful.

Don Peterson, 2330 Medinah Court, Commerce Township – I'm just down the road from the intersection. I wish I could be as articulate and as compelling as the last two speakers, but I agree with a lot of what they say. I guess my biggest emphasis is that there's no reason to increase the density. The parcel as it is currently zoned can fit in a sufficient number of houses. I understand Mr. Kasab wants to make more money and God bless him, I wish he could make enough money to pass it on. But, because he wants to make more money, that doesn't mean that the residents should suffer from his plan.

We need houses. I love houses. I don't have a problem with houses, but I'd like it to be built consistent with the Master Plan and with, I guess, our forefathers here in Commerce Township. I think everyone would be fine. I know something ... Mr. Campbell, you can tell me if I'm wrong, but I found something where your department came out and said the current zoning is proper and it could be developed with single-family homes. Now we have somebody who comes in and wants to increase a lot more homes and the city itself has said that it's fine the way it is. It's zoned R-1A and it's perfectly fine that way. The property is developable as it sits. We don't have to shoehorn in more lots so that we can shoe in more cars that will then have to shoe into our streets and make them more and more crowded.

I see the streets around here in Commerce, Welch, and they're backed up. And when you come down M-5, and I know it's mostly pass-through traffic to White Lake or whatever, but if we add this, if we have 168 lots, we're going to add 300 cars, and then it's going to be backed up. That's not why we live in Commerce Township. We live here for the peace. We live here for the greenspace, and we live here because we want to keep it the way it is. It's zoned residential, let's build houses. I have no problem with that. What I have a problem with is changing the zoning so that we double the houses and we double the traffic and we doubled the profits. Let's just keep it the way it is and he can find a way to profitably develop it.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you. Next.

Dave Mensch, 1995 Four Oaks, Commerce Township – I live just north of the development there on a couple acres. I noticed there was a lot of ... when we got into the density of the number of houses per acre, they didn't talk about anybody on Four Oaks. We're essentially about 80 acres with 28 homes on it, which is .35 homes per acre. A lot of the numbers we're talking about here are 1/6 of an acre lot. Those are city lots. This is not Detroit. This is not Farmington Hills. I can stick 14 of those on my 2.2 acres. It's outrageous what they're proposing. If you want a simple solution, you just have to look to the east and copy what Bridge Pointe did. They have about the same acreage. Do the same layout and everything will be fine. Use the same entrances

proposed. Put your retention pond in. Put your circle in. R-1A, yes – R-1D, hell no. Thank you.

Mary Ross, 2020 Golfcrest Dr., Commerce Township – I've never done this before but I wanted to make the point of coming here today. It's unfortunate I have to meet my neighbor this way, but nice to meet you. I wanted to also express my concern for the traffic going through Golfcrest Drive, through Lynne Hollow and through Turnberry. I have a 1-1/2 year old child and I'm currently pregnant with another, and as it stands, taking my stroller out to walk my child, it is a danger every day. We cannot stand to have any more traffic cutting through our neighborhood. I have cars zipping past me when I'm pushing my stroller and there are many other parents I see also having the same problem that I am. So that's all I have to say.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you.

Zack Schwartz, 4600 Kara Court, Commerce Township – I echo the sentiment of what makes northwest Commerce so beautiful is that it was zoned R-1A, and you have all these beautiful homes on large lots, all the way up and down Carey, into Cooley. Those are all large lot homes. In fact, the homes that Mr. Kassab showed on Zillow, every single one of those is a half acre. The smallest one I think I saw was .35, which is 16,000 square feet, which is significantly larger than what he's proposing. We talked a lot about the roads and traffic. Also, if you've tried to go to your Kroger, either in Milford or on Union Lake Road, it's maxed out. The lines are long, the food is low. If you go to Meijer, it's the same thing. Our Fire Department, they do a fantastic job, but they're doing more and more work every single year. Adding people obviously adds traffic, adds more work for all these things outside of the roads that are already maxed out, and I just echo the sentiment that it was zoned appropriately for the Master Plan and for the area, and I think the developer absolutely has land rights, and I think their rights should follow the zoning that it currently sits in.

Matt Jackson, 4861 Juniper, Commerce Township – All I have to say is Juniper and everybody knows where that street is. Just to reiterate everything that everybody said about the traffic, the people in this new sub are not going to go down to Duck Lake or Commerce Road. To come up north, they try to cut up Juniper, and you know how horrible Juniper is. We have been back and forth with the Road Commission many times, and there's not a whole lot they can do. They said their hands are tied. It's in terrible shape and I guarantee the people who live in this sub are going to use Juniper Drive to cut through because it's a huge cut through right now. That's why people on Juniper are very concerned.

Dave Campbell – We can probably have two or three people in line.

Diane Nolff, 3262 Lacosta Court, Villas at Beacon Hill, Commerce Township – My concern is the amount of electricity and power and water that you are going to be absorbing with 168 units. We lose our electricity often, and with all these extra houses, what are we doing about upping the power grid? What are we doing about the water situation? My pressure has already decreased as more and more homes are going in. That's my big question. Also, what is the size of each house that you are proposing per lot? The square footage?

Chairperson Parel – Do we have the approximate square footage?

Mr. Kassab – We have an idea. They are going to be ranging from approximately 2,500 to 2,900 square feet.

Diane Nolff – How close together are they?

Mr. Kassab – Depending on the setbacks from the Township Ordinance and R-1D; I don't have the information to determine at this time.

Diane Nolff – So you're having these huge houses right on top of one another. That's a concern.

Sean Henson, Golfcrest Drive, Commerce Township – I'm one of the other members on Golfcrest Drive. I call it the Golfcrest racetrack. If you were looking on your map, the quickest way to get to the high school is going to be cutting through our subdivision. When I worked from home in the last year, probably three years in a row, it's ridiculous. I could time it, and I told the sheriffs, here are the times that you need to come and watch this. It was pretty dramatic, and unfortunately the first three people they pulled over were residents of the subdivision. So, please slow down, being a resident. But realistically, if you looked at the map, we've got to do something with traffic. I think there have been some other communications about signage. We talked about speed bumps, and everything seems to be getting shut down. Again, please look through that with the Road Commission and see what can be done. I think the next thing that's going to happen is someone is going to get hit, and we're going to be right back here talking about it. Thank you.

Kathy Oleski, 5841 Old Sherwood Dr., Sherwood Square subdivision, Commerce Township – My husband and I, and our neighbors, got together and reviewed everything that was on the website that we could get our hands on because we were not actually close enough to be included, but we have the same concern. There is nothing in the traffic study that we could find that talks about what happens on northbound Carey Road. You could see in the images that were shown of Commerce Road how it curves, and if you're traveling from the west, from Milford, because it's a neighboring community, we go there for dinner, you do not have a clear line of sight right now to turn left to go north on Carey Road because of the curve. That was kind of left off of the map and it looked like it was left out of the study because it's a very short line of sight, and it's already a difficult time to make that left turn to go north on Carey Road. So, I'd like to ask that that be considered as well. You know, the neighbor that said that you have to have a red light to get out of house. Well, we're going to have a really hard time turning left there, with the right turn signal the other way, but nothing to help us turn left to go up Carey Road. It's a real problem.

The other area that is a problem is just north of the new exit there where there's an incline on Carey Road. Carey Road has an elevation, it's a natural elevation. We've always had it, and when my kids were growing up in the area, we were concerned because the bus would stop at the top of the hill, and the cars would be traveling north and you can't see that there's a bus stopped at the top of the hill. We had so many near misses that it was really dangerous. And it's really hard for us to even get into our subdivision. So again, that area going northbound on Carey Road, it just looks like it's

been left out of the consideration and we're very concerned about that. So, that's what I wanted to bring to your attention tonight. Thank you.

Mr. Kassab – If I may just add to Ms. Oleski's comment, and maybe our traffic engineer can opine on it. There are the improvements on Commerce and Carey, between the right turn lane and the signalization improvement, that will address that heading eastbound to northbound on Carey, through some engineering terms that I'd probably screw up if I tried.

Ron Knudsen, 5530 Leisel Ct., Commerce Township – I have a couple of concerns. One is, on Commerce and Carey, I don't see any proposed sidewalks. We already have pedestrian traffic issues there. It's very hard to walk down Carey. There's no easy access. I just thought that when they built some of the other communities, there were sidewalks added, but along Carey and Commerce, I see no plan for that. The other thing, I used to work for DTE Energy. We look at master plans when we're developing the grid and so on, and the master plan called for 75 houses. There were 75 acres of buildable lots here. You're doubling that. So again, sewers, water, electric – we're adding to the whole thing, and I'd like to know who is paying for those increases in supporting the grid.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you. And maybe we will pause there for a second, Dave. You mentioned that the developer will be contributing to a sidewalk fund. Is that in lieu of sidewalks on this property?

Dave Campbell – It would ultimately be a decision of the Planning Commission and the Township Board if that's the route you want to go. In discussing this with the petitioner, the logic was that there's not any existing sidewalks or pathways along the north side of Commerce or along the east side of Carey Road that could be connected to. More challenging than that is the east side of Carey Road has the open water wetlands that we can see, so now you're talking about a boardwalk across those wetlands, effectively a Boardwalk that at least at this time would not have anything to connect to. So, oftentimes what the Planning Commission and the Township Board does in these scenarios is rather than have the developer build infrastructure that will not serve any immediate purpose because it doesn't anything to connect to, instead have them make a contribution proportionate to what it would have cost to build it in the Township's pathways fund so that the Township can make improvements in the same vicinity that would serve a better purpose than building sections of sidewalk that, at least this time, wouldn't have anything to connect to.

Chairperson Parel – I think that's relevant. Thank you for asking about the sidewalks.

Victoria Taylor-Sluder, 4630 Cooley Lake Road – Speaking of the sidewalks, I thought I'd mention real quick that I remember not that long ago, I used to be able to run and bike on Cooley Lake Road, but now I can't without taking my life into my hands. When you talk about the traffic impact, I frankly have to say, who cares if you improve an intersection when you turn a road into a highway. I think you can tell that I am adamantly opposed to this just like everyone you've heard from already. I have a letter that I've included in the packet for you already, speaking of many of the same things we've already heard.

So, instead of repeating a lot of the things you've already heard, I thought I would mention the natural space is something that I just don't think should be taken so lightly. I thought I would be able to be a little persuasive by mentioning that. I know that arguing on the merits of a natural space just because it's a natural space doesn't really win a lot of votes. People probably don't really care that much that those frogs that are singing over there in a wetland are impacted when you build right next to a wetland. They don't just live in the wetland part of the year, and also for everyone's erudition here, if it's sometimes wet and sometimes dry, that means it's an ephemeral pond and it means it has high ecological value. So, I'd like for you to consider the natural space impact when we continue to just plop buildings and construct, and call a detention pond a wetland. But I'm getting a little bit animated because I feel so passionately about this.

I thought I'd also point out something that others haven't really mentioned and that is that the dark sky that the unlit, non-electrified space contributes to the starry nights for the rest of the neighborhood, the developer states that you took into consideration the preservation of the open space and setbacks for the adjacent homeowners, but we live here 24/7 and light pollution is a growing concern. I think that that should be in consideration here as well.

We don't live in Novi or Canton or Troy because we don't want to have that same kind of generic space. I'm kind of appalled at the thought that that we might end up with a retail space on the corner instead, which we certainly don't need, even if Kroger is running out of space for us. But I thought I would also include in an addendum that I didn't include in the packet that I sent in, if you don't want to consider what you're taking away from the Township for this rezoning, if you approve it, I would like to ask what are you here to do? I mean, you're here to help cultivate and nurture our community through thoughtful and proactive planning.

I know I've seen that in the packet minutes before, that proactive planning is something that you will feel adamantly purposeful about and then developing neighborhoods needs to evolve. Long ago, simply increasing neighborhoods may have been a planner's purpose, but here and now it should change to the next step. It's to enhance what has already been built through careful improvements and encourage the use of R-1A spaces to remain as large lots to maintain the integrity of our surroundings. I think that Carey/Commerce corner would probably be more valuable to the rest of us if it was just a few large lots, maybe a couple of luxury homes that are not just more than a gross of 1/2 acre, hurry up builds. My final comment then is specifically for you, Mr. Weber.

Thank you for letting the Township Commissioners know that the community is taking note of all these proceedings, and we'll remember it. Thank you.

Chuck Bartlett, 1911 Four Oaks, Commerce Township – I appreciate everybody's comments about traffic and not wanting to see this property developed any more densely than it needs to be, but I'm a realist and my understanding is that this guy has the right to put two lots per acre, two homes per acre on that property. What I just saw is that this plan is 2.1 lots per acre when you consider the whole thing. So, from a traffic density standpoint, in terms of the change, and I'm not a big fan of tight lots by any means. I complained about that in some of the meetings. I don't like to see 60x120 lots. But at the end of the day, the impact of this versus going R-1A on that property doesn't change anything about the density of traffic. I'm not trying to downplay the issues with traffic that have been mentioned. Those were all legitimate. But in terms of this property, maybe it's an unpopular view, but I actually like this proposal from the standpoint that, the guy has the right to achieve the density that he's allowed under R-1A, so he's

keeping that in check. When we talk about preserving nature, I live on the northeast border of this proposed development. I can tell you we've got deer, turkey, coyotes, all form of wildlife, and those trees. When I saw the standard one house per half acre, all of that is gone. I don't want to see that. Even the first proposal that they put on the table had a lot of properties along the north. I basically would have had three properties in my backyard, and this was changed. So basically, the developer gets to keep the density of property that he's looking for in terms of the number of homes, but he is respecting the nature of the site, and he also has maximum offset to the neighbors on the north, and to the east, per input from the residents. So, on that basis ... again, I don't want to see this developed, but if they guy is going to put in the number of properties he's going to put in, I like it.

Victoria Loemker, Four Oaks, Commerce Township – Good evening, Commissioners. I'm a new resident on Four Oaks. Just as disclosure, I am a licensed professional civil engineer and I have done engineering review for almost 20 years, so I've seen a lot of plans come across my desk. I am in support of this plan for a couple of reasons. The R-1A zoning as clarified, I think I actually spoke with Mr. Campbell about a month or two ago on that. If this is left R-1A, then basically those lots can be cleared up to the property line. All that nature preserve will be allowed to be taken out.

A couple comments I do have on this plan. My biggest concern actually is the Carey Road entrance. I do believe that it will encourage cut through for traffic wanting to access Carey Road after the development comes in, and to me, this raises a few safety concerns for this proposed development, just cars speeding through there to bypass the Commerce/Carey Road intersection, as well as that increase in traffic cutting through there would ultimately affect the quality of life for the residents that will be living there. The RCOC geometric guidelines actually, to a certain degree, discourage street systems that encourage pass-through traffic. I know in Commerce Township, they do follow the RCOC guidelines for road development.

The other one that I have a concern about is, I do appreciate that Mr. Kassab, the developer, has really tried to preserve the north part of this development, the nature preserve, but I do believe that the Carey Road entrance is going to disconnect the wildlife corridor that's in there, wildlife that is going to that wetlands area to the south. What I recommend possibly doing is keeping the configuration of that entrance off Carey Road, but putting a break-through gate in there for emergency access vehicles only. That way, it still meets the requirement, or the RCOC's recommendation for two entrances. I think it would also discourage some vehicle traffic on Carey Road. I know that almost every day, it seems like there's a dead animal on Carey Road. There's a lot of wildlife that does try to cross there. My hope would be that that would discourage that a little bit.

As far as the connection to the subdivision to the east, I'm wearing my engineering hat here, the TIS report that I read said that there will be minimal traffic going through there, so it doesn't seem at this point, based on the TIS report, and I respect the TIS engineer's report, they are professional, that that would not be an issue. It's also another requirement, per the geometric guidelines of RCOC, that connections be provided to stub streets, public and private. I know it is also the Planning Department's recommendation or preference as, in your packet, they quoted that they always advocate for interconnectivity between neighborhoods for many reasons.

Chairperson Parel – All right, I hate to be the bad guy but-

Victoria Loemker – I know I'm rambling on. I think that is pretty much all I had. I appreciate Mr. Kassab's meeting with the residents. I was not part of those meetings as I'm a new resident to Four Oaks, but in all the plans I've seen in many years, this plan ... it's going to get built. Something's going to get built there. From what I see here, this is a good plan. They really seek to preserve that nature area and that's what we want.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you so much.

Maddie Burgess, Carey Road, Commerce Township – About a year and a half ago when we heard that something was going to happen on this personal land, I was distraught. I've lived here 30 years and I've got to enjoy the nature and the beauty of it, looking out my window, waking up in the morning and just seeing beautiful trees. But when it comes down to it, it's going to be developed, unfortunately. It's too late. There's nothing we can do. It's owned by someone. From what I can see here, when it first was bought, I thought oh, we have to stay in R-1A. That's what it's going to be, it's going to be rural, houses, minimal, trees, it's going to be great. The more we learned, if it is R-1A they could go all the way up to the border and take all the trees down. You're looking at, you know, maybe less houses, but you're looking at your neighbors. We saw what happened in Lake Sherwood. I'd hate for that to happen. I'd hate to be looking at my neighbor's yard after so many years of just looking at trees. So, after looking at this, I mean it breaks my heart to even look at a site plan right now, but this, I honestly think is our best option. I hate to say it but, we get to keep the trees, and we don't have to look at neighbors. Yes, there are a lot of houses, and that also breaks my heart because I hate looking at subdivisions with houses crammed in on top of each other. It's awful to see. It's like what is your quality of life? But, this is the best I think we could ask for. Yes, there's traffic. I live on Carey Road and I listen to the cars gunning up the road at 2:00 in the morning, doing doughnuts under the light, all the time. Is there going to be an accident? I don't know. Good thing I'm not outside. Sometimes I can't even stand outside. I have to cover my ears. It is so loud. But, this I think is the best we could do. We get the trees, we get to keep them. They're not going to get cut down. We get to keep the pond. Everyone is not looking at their neighbors. Yes, there is traffic. And I beg you, please do something about the traffic. Please try to keep some of the greenspace.

Long's Farm, if it ever goes up for sale, please make it a park. Please keep some greenspace. People moved here for the greenspace, for the parks, for the nature. Like they said before, West Bloomfield and all of those places, they used to have it and they just kept building, and now there's nothing left. They have such a deer problem because they can't hunt for the deer. They can't do anything and it's just terrible there. I would hate for that to happen here. So, I beg you, please, if you can buy any of the land around here and make it parks, keep it beautiful. Please, please, please. And if you can do anything about the traffic with the Road Commission, I ask you, please do that too. But I think this is our best option. I hate to say it, but look at that nature we get to keep, and we're not looking at our neighbors. I thank Mr. Kassab for listening to us. I have been to many meetings and there are developers who would not give us the time of day. They say, this is what I'm doing and this is what's happening. Too bad, sorry, you're getting this.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you. We appreciate it. We need to try to keep everyone to two minutes.

Andy Sarkisian, 3398 Tiquewood, Commerce Township – Two things. One is that you've heard a lot of comments about R-1A and the design. When you did the 5-year plan, if you'll recall, our input was, if anything, we would like ... I don't know how you go under A, but maybe an R-1AAA. The Township really needs, particularly for the northwest side of the area, a larger lot size. These should be 1 to 3-acre estates, and it's okay to be \$2 million homes. We want to preserve the semi-rural, not R-1D. For those who say, look what happened in Lake Sherwood, the builder also said the same thing, that they were going to preserve the trees and stuff like that. Fool me once, shame on you, fool me twice, shame on me. They fooled us twice, right Brady? You can see right through. A lot more trees were taken down than what they promised. So, don't believe that approving this will preserve those trees. If anything in the future, think about an R-1AAA with at least 1 or 2-acre lots, and preserving our rural. We have more density housing on Martin Road. Thank you.

Jennifer Beam (also Scott Beam and Hans Beam), 4950 Rayfore Drive, & 2115 E. Commerce Road, Commerce Township – Hi. I'm speaking for two properties. My home on Rayfore is off of Juniper, and more importantly, 2115 E. Commerce is directly across from the Commerce Road entrances. There is a little driveway there to the right of the current neighborhood Preserve entrance. I've been rear-ended and had my car totaled there. When my daughter pulls into there once a week, she has to keep going because she can't turn into the driveway because people coming around the corner, the curve at Carey and Commerce, they are coming around at 50mph and if you try to turn into that driveway, it doesn't work.

We were really hoping for maybe even a signal at this new intersection when we first saw the proposal. So, whatever you can do to make it safe, I feel like this is a good opportunity. Our family has owned this property for almost 200 years. We were here before the Preserve, and before any of you actually. And actually we are probably related to that orphan site, so see me afterwards. So, if we could use this as an opportunity to maybe fix that safety issue at that driveway, we would really appreciate it, my family would.

Looking at this, I've been in the development business in various parts of my life, and the idea of clustering with open space is not new. It's a really good way to get your bang for the buck without disturbing the whole feel for the neighborhood. I think this is a really good plan. I'm sorry everyone, this is my first time seeing it tonight, but it was a really good presentation.

I think sidewalks are a must because people are going to cut through that with their GPS when they're not going to want to go to Carey Road. So, sidewalks for safety; people like me on Juniper, we don't have sidewalks. And you're going to want that eastern opening at least as a bike opening because kids are going to go through there. The Preserve was built next to our property, and the neighborhood kids were cutting through from our property to the Preserve. We had them map it out as to how they would like to cut through our property, because we knew they were going to do it, and we put in a path. It's tough to maintain and it's a liability for us, but kids are going to be coming through there, so make sure that's something intentional.

The Preserve, by the way, those of you who are here who maybe live in the Preserve, there is no border between the Preserve and my family's property. Those houses are backed up right against our property. We have people dumping leaves, mulch, gravel, shrubbery, and all kinds of stuff on our property all the time, and we don't have anything

to say about it. So, I think that border is fantastic. And the fact that you're not clear cutting and grading is just amazing. It's a really good project. Thanks.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you. We appreciate it. Sorry to rush.

Alyssa McGahey, 4904 Greenview Drive, Commerce Township – I live in the Preserves. I just wanted to address my concerns about the safety in exiting and entering our subdivision. Once this subdivision is put into place, I was reviewing the packet of information that was shared for today, and it describes the expectations from the traffic study and what the traffic will look like in five years from now, so in 2031.

And I'm seeing that along northbound Birkdale, southbound Bridge Trail Drive, and trying to take a left out of our subdivision to head north onto Carey, is going to move to an E or F rating in terms of traffic, according to them in their study in five years time if this is built. And exiting and entering the subdivision already, with that 45mph road, is pretty precarious at times, and per your notes about your accidents with your daughter, I am deeply concerned about the additional traffic, plus trying to exit and enter at peak hours and the potential traffic hazards, especially with Carey having that bend in the road like you were describing, and people unfortunately not respecting the 45mph road distinction. So, I just wanted to put that to your attention. Thank you.

Al Fogoros, 1910 Jason Dr., Commerce Township – I've just got a question for the developer. I'm trying to understand. What went into the decision making in terms of the small lots and smaller homes? Was it a financial decision in terms of it's best for you? Because the plan looks great, but the lots and everything is small and my question has come up a number of times. What about larger lots and larger homes? Is that strictly a financial decision for you that's most beneficial or what?

Mr. Kassab – It's a fair question. It's two-fold. If a developer were to maximize the density, again zoning by right, it's certainly going to maximize the density. We would put in half-acre lots, roughly 122 lots that the parallel showed, but what do we achieve by that? I live behind a subdivision that used to be a farm and it got developed. Being in the business, I said, pick your poison to be very candid. I'd rather not see it. I'd rather have a separation between me and them. Anybody that's going to be buying here is going to be well aware of the lot size, they're going to be well aware of the size of the homes. However, the folks that have been there for 200 years, 100 years, 50 years, I believe in the strong points in this.

To answer your question, density is economics in the development world, and achieving 120 homes, which again is zoning by right, would achieve the maximum density of zoning. We're coming to the Township saying, look, based on the Conditional Rezoning agreement and the benefits that we're willing to offer, the setbacks, the improvements to the intersection, the improvements to the orphan parcel, and improvements to the left turn lane. It's a give and take relationship between the developer and the Township, and by that, you achieve smaller lots, create more open space, get more density, and you're able to do some additional items that, quite frankly, we probably would not be able to do financially if we were developing 120 lots.

Al Fogoros – Well, I'm not arguing with the overall plan you have in terms of spaces. I'm just saying, was it just beneficial for you to have so many more than say higher-end homes and larger spaces, with that same plan, because the plan looks great that way.

Mr. Kassab – That's a fair comment. With that same plan with larger lots, you might achieve, I'll guess, 100 lots. And with those larger lots would come larger homes. With larger homes, I equate that to, you see more Chevy dealerships out there than you do Rolls Royce, and for a reason, because more people can afford a Chevy. What we're looking to bring in is an attainable house in today's marketplace, \$600,000. Again, I'm in the business. I'm a little surprised that it's entry level for a new home today. I've got nieces and nephews that are looking for homes, and it's ridiculous what they have to pay for a home, and a larger lot requires a larger home based on the setbacks, which requires a larger value.

Al Fogoros – So you're catering to someone with less funds?

Mr. Kassab – I wouldn't say less funds. \$600,000 is a considerable amount.

Al Fogoros – Making an investment. So, it's a financial decision really.

Mr. Kassab – Yes. With a larger lot, you might be pushing a \$1 million starting point. Which again, if it were to be developed, absorption on those types of homes is not quick.

Al Fogoros – I'm just saying, you weren't restricted to it. It's your financial decision you have to make as a developer on the size of the homes and size of the lots.

Maureen Izzo, 5023 Juniper Dr., Commerce Township – I wasn't planning on speaking, but I am now. I am the cut through between Commerce and Sleeth, and let me tell you, in the 30 years I've lived there, I cannot believe the traffic. The Road Commission does nothing about it because it's a county road, and I want them to take into consideration. We keep talking about Commerce and Carey. I feel bad for those Golfcrest people because I'm a bus driver and I know that Northern and Lakeland traffic is horrible. But could you take into consideration our street on Juniper? We are a cut through, and everybody is going to take that from Benstein all the way over, when they get off 96.

Clarence Mills, 6000 Turnberry Dr., Commerce Township – I want to speak briefly regarding the cut through. Our street where we live is a cut through for two high schools, Lakeland and Walled Lake Northern. I'm here to tell you, in the morning and in the afternoon, about 2:10, you have a tough time getting out of our driveway onto Turnberry Drive because of the traffic. It's nonstop. The OCSO had their counter out there. I don't know what the numbers are, but they've done counting and it's tremendous. It's tough to get out there. It's a cut-through.

Todd Winnie, 328 Anderson, Commerce Township – I spent a lot of time taking a look at not only what was being proposed here, but truly looking at the 2015 Master Plan for Commerce Township and much of the discussion in the 2015 plan revolved around looking at how the space was going to be developed, how the Planning Commission was going to work with other agencies, specifically the Road Commission and MDOT. And though we've looked at statistical data and information associated with not only the plan, but also with the most recent census, we've seen a significant population increase in each and every count from 1930 to 2020. You know the population increase is

approximately 8,000 plus per year. And in addition to that. We saw significant changes between the 20s, 30s and 50s.

With that being said, the Planning Commission here, it's their responsibility at this point in time to take into consideration the growth of Commerce Township and how the roads will be developed to accommodate all those individuals, whether or not we're talking about 168 houses, 122, or Crystal Lake which recently had well over 200 houses being developed. Now, this might not be specifically pertinent to this particular meeting, as an overall review, what is the Planning Commission doing to accommodate all of these questions that we have about the roads? The roads are the biggest problem that we have here at this point in time.

I'm a 30-year resident. I've been here since 1987 when my brother moved in on Mandon Lake White Lake Township. I've been around to see when this was a cottage community, and it is no longer a cottage community. We have a \$600,000 starting home. This isn't a cottage community. This isn't a \$25,000 house. This is a huge development that is being added to this community, along with Crystal Lake. It should be the responsibility as part of the developers to do a lot more than just add a left turn lane or in some way, shape or form, adjust traffic concerns, the Planning Commission's responsibility is to take a look at this and understand how we are going to grow as a community. If we're looking at the current population trend in which our last statistics said that we are reading somewhere around 43,000 residents and we are going to get to, based on the statistical data of the 2015 Planning Commission, we far exceed that number already.

So, by 2030 we are going to be somewhere in the neighborhood of 50,000+ individuals. Now if we go back to the time that I moved in, in which we had approximately 25,000 individuals, we've doubled our population, yet our roads have not changed. They've been platted since 1928. It was an agricultural area, and it is no longer an agricultural area. We cannot support the number of individuals in this Community with the roads that we currently have. However, I understand you're not the Road Commission. I understand you're not MDOT. But as part of this analysis, in which your planning group put this together, previous individuals and perhaps yourselves, it was mandated that you were to work with the roads to create an environment in which you would work together with developers and the Road Commission to create an environment that would allow for this to be cohesive. Right now, it's untenable. We have roads that are considered specifically by the Road Commission as either principal arteries or minor arteries, and there are very few of them. If you look at the map from your original statistical data and it shows how many roads that we have, there's very few miles of these roads, there are non-continuous roads. There are roads in which we are disjointed. We have roads that end at intersections in which there are 3-way, 4-way intersections. We've all been at Union Lake and Cooley Lake to see the massive pain that it is right there. How about Martin Road? We end Martin Road into Richardson Road. We have another 3-way road intersection. Have you ever been there at 3:00 to 5:00? You'll have to be there from 3:00 to 5:00 because there's no other way to get out of there, and I know you guys move down that-

Chairperson Parel – I hate to cut you off.

Todd Winnie – Thank you for listening. I appreciate it.

Jack Glaab, 5230 Bridge Trail, Commerce Township – Are we still on the Q&A session of this meeting?

Chairperson Parel – I'm not sure there is a Q&A in this meeting, but if you'd like, you can come up and ask a question.

Dave Campbell – Just to answer that question, the intent is, you all provide comments and these folks listen. It's not meant to be a back and forth. That tends to get garbled and it's hard for our Recording Secretary to track that. It's meant to be that you have your two minutes to talk and we listen. Once the public hearing is closed, then that is the Planning Commission's chance to try to address a lot of questions and concerns that were brought up.

Jack Glaab – I would like to get some clarity about the orphan property. How large is it?

Mr. Kassab – While Dave is looking that up, those of you that were at the resident meeting, it's interesting how this orphan parcel came about. Commerce Road T intersected into Carey Road at one point. I'm assuming the Road Commission directed to bend the road and has created this. Dave can go back and show 1963 and 1940. That's what it used to look like. Then it was removed in 1990 or 1980. That's the genesis of the parcel right there.

Dave Campbell – Yes, sometime between 1980 and 90.

Jack Glaab – So the orphan parcel is just that pie-shaped thing?

Mr. Kassab – Just that pie-shaped thing.

Jack Glaab – Okay, now it sounds like a foregone conclusion that you will be the owner of it.

Mr. Kassab – Not necessarily.

Jack Glaab – If not, how does that affect Plan B?

Mr. Kassab – So, you know, can we be the owner? And I don't know if our counsel made it here or not. We would have to file for an action for quiet title because we're an adjacent property owner and that would take some time, and we can own it. Our preference is to get a hold of the family that had owned it, or heirs of the family, and get a licensing agreement to use it, because it really doesn't benefit us from a density standpoint, from a development standpoint. It's from a beautification standpoint. I theoretically can't go on their property and start installing irrigation lines, plants, flowers and retaining walls and so forth. We believe we would have the ability to achieve control of this parcel, through time and money.

Jack Glaab – And if not, basically it stays as is.

Mr. Kassab – Eventually, we will. It's just a matter of time.

Dale Frey, Rayfore Dr., Commerce Township – I live just parallel to Juniper. I'm sitting here thinking that I actually live next to everybody in this room. We all have the same problem. Lots of different problems, but they're all coming out. I've heard it from other people and that's what I've been saying. It all boils down to one thing. There needs to be some growth, but we have to have density control. That's the biggest problem I think that we have, and that includes the housing, it includes the roadways, it includes the trees and all that stuff. And if you look at that mess that you guys have got going, because you approved it, next to Walmart. Now they're going all the way over to Martin Road. The density over there of people and traffic is going to be unbelievable because it already is now. But I'm not going to pick on anybody and I'm not going to repeat it, but most of this boils down to density. You folks are aware and I hope you listen to it and do the best you can to try to control it. We can't go on the roads with kids because there's no sidewalks. The traffic is terrible because people are speeding, they're cutting through subdivisions. They're going to be cutting through Juniper like crazy once they're working at Duck Lake and Sleeth. The only way they're going to get over to the north to Commerce Road where they're proposing the detour is to cut through our sub, and the road is already impassable. It's another part of density and traffic, and you need to look at what's going on throughout the whole Township. That summarizes it for me. Everybody's saying the same thing. I hope you're listening.

Dan Carr, 4862 Juniper Dr., Commerce Township – I'm speaking on behalf of my friends and neighbors that live on Juniper. We just recently moved to Juniper. We were 35 years in Novi, and we moved out here to get away from it all. I think it was three days after we moved in, we got a note from the Oakland County Commission saying that for \$33,000, if we could convince all of our neighbors on Juniper to also kick in \$33,000 apiece, that we could have our road repaved because it was so bad. Of course we voted that down, but we were told that it was a residential street that we have to pay for, we have the liability of, we have to care for it and maintain it, and yet we have no control whatsoever over who goes down that road. So, there's a sign that says, "no trucks", and the truck drivers giggle as they go by. We have stop signs that are merely suggestions, and people fly through there like crazy. And even when the sheriff does come, they have to go through at about 50 miles an hour with no brake depression for the sheriff to actually stop them. If there's anything less than that, and I along with my friend before, we live at one of those stop signs, and so we see it all day long. There's just no enforcement, but yet we're in a position where we're responsible, yet we have no authority over that road. The appeal is just on behalf of my neighbors. I know we're not adjacent to the property, and I know if I were a developer, I would be plowing forward, but the appeal is more to the Planning Commission that something has to be done because that road with this additional traffic is just going to get that much worse as we go forward. Thanks.

Rory Loeding – I technically live in White Lake, but I live just up around the curve at Carey off of Mystic Valley. Most everybody here, when we all leave, we're all going to hit this roundabout, and then we're going to hit the next roundabout, and then we're going to pass the school, then hit the first Commerce intersection, then we'll hit the second and third Commerce intersections, and all of those are heavy traffic points, especially at 4 or 5:00. I wake up at like 4:30am so I can get into work, so I can leave at 3:00 so I could be here by 4:00, so hopefully I miss most of that. I guess if we're going to add, the average household in Michigan has 2 cars, we're potentially going to add 300 cars to

that area. That's going to exacerbate the issue at each of those points, all the way from M-5. That's my concern, ensuring that we can streamline those processes. When the Commerce intersection by the Library went in, or when they started to do the walking path there, I was like cool, they're opening it up and maybe they'll put a roundabout in there so it doesn't backup a mile down the road. Then I went oh, they're just doing a walking path. That's cool, but I was a little disappointed that it wasn't opening up that area to get more traffic through there and out of the area.

Victoria Taylor-Sluder – You didn't say you can do seconds, but I have one more question real quick. Nobody has mentioned anything about the water. Where are the 168 homes getting their water for household use?

Dave Campbell – They would be connecting to municipal water, Great Lakes Water Authority. It would not be wells or septic. It would be sanitary sewer and municipal water.

Tim Hedlund, 4984 Greenview Dr., Commerce Township – I guess this is probably more of a question for Dave. When the water main was run down there, what size water main was put in coming down Commerce Road that will be feeding this new development?

Jay James – It's a 16-inch ductile iron pipe.

Tim Hedlund – Okay. Then where is the tapping point that's going in on this? Where are you guys tapping that water main?

Dave Campbell – Are we answering questions?

Chairperson Parel – Sure.

Dave Campbell – I don't know if that has been established yet.

Mr. Kassab – We actually have our civil engineer here, Dave, to comment on that.

Chairperson Parel – I don't know if we want to dive into those details right now. It's getting a little micro.

Tim Hedlund – All right. No problem. Thank you.

Pat Keast, Civil Engineer, SKE Group, 39205 Country Club Dr., Farmington Hills – We're the engineers on the project. As Jay pointed out, it would be tapping the 16-inch on Commerce Road, and then running it at the entrance location, into the site and around, and looping it back to both Carey Road and also to the subdivision to the east where there's a stub there, which is needed, and we provide the necessary easements to do that.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you. Anyone else? Going once. Okay, that was great. I just want to say personally, thank you for all the comments.

Dave Campbell – Mr. Chair, I'm sorry to interrupt. I do want to mention too for the record that we did receive 9 letters/emails. Some of these comments are from folks that I know we've heard from tonight as well. You've all been provided a copy of these, and I have provided copies to Ms. Watson, our Recording Secretary, so she will record these into the minutes as comments included in the public comments. Of the 9, I think they're all, in one form or another, opposition to the project for a lot of the same concerns we are hearing, primarily traffic, but also impacts on environmental features.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, that's important and I appreciate it. And I do appreciate everybody coming out tonight and speaking. Thank you for being courteous.

Correspondence received for the public hearing included the following 9 letters/emails:

1. Victoria Taylor-Sluder, 4630 Cooley Lake Road, Commerce Township. (Also spoke during public comment) Adamantly opposed to the proposal, especially with regard to preserving natural space and wildlife, preserving open space for the neighbors, and issues with traffic.
2. Kevin & Tina Gray, no address provided, 35-year residents of Commerce Township. Opposed to the proposal due to density, traffic, and lack of road improvements.
3. Mohinder Kashyap, 6147 Carey Road, Commerce Township. His vote is no on the proposal.
4. Loraine & Timothy Potochick, 4943 Cooley Lake Ct, Commerce Township. Feels the current zoning should remain as R-1A for property values and proper fit in the community.
5. Robert Linnan, 4860 Cooley Lake Ct., Commerce Township. Opposed to the rezoning due to traffic increases.
6. Alex Roberts, 2381 Glenwood Ct, Commerce Township. Against the rezoning due to density.
7. Suzanne Hughes, 60-year resident, no address provided. The roads were meant for people to get to their summer cottages and are not designed for the traffic in Commerce, creating dangerous conditions and delays.
8. Kathy & Mark Oleski, Treasurer & Past President of Old Sherwood Square Condo Association, 5841 Old Sherwood Drive, Commerce Township. (Kathy spoke during public comment.) Serious concerns with safety issues, traffic, and limited sight lines on Carey Road.
9. Susan Neiryneck, 4986 Juniper Dr., Commerce Township, 38-year resident. Road is crumbling partially due to all the traffic; RCOC counted 2,000 cars each morning and again in the afternoon. What are the plans to address traffic?

Chairperson Parel closed the public hearing.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, I think now may be a good time; a few of the Commissioners had asked to have a conversation with the developer after we heard public comments. I'll start with Caitlin.

Commission Comments:

Bearer – A question about the second entrance off Carey Road. Is it an option for that to be a crash-through gate?

Dave Campbell – While there are different opinions and we've had some very healthy discussion, both the Township Board and the Fire Department are looking to move away from having emergency gates as an option for emergency access. The primary reason is that those gates too often become the spot where the snowplow drivers will pile up the snow, or someone will park a car or a camper there for days or weeks at a time. Or that's where the kids set up the basketball hoop, or whatever it might be. And when there is an emergency and there is a need for that emergency access when the emergency responders get there, it's impeded. So, the position of the Township and the Fire Department has been, for points of access that are required per the International Fire Code, those need to be full access connections, not gated access.

Bearer – Okay, then according to the distance of the property, is it far enough that there could be two points of access on Commerce Road?

Dave Campbell – We would have to look at that. There are separation requirements from the Road Commission relative to points of access to each other, but also to existing intersections and in this case, an existing signalized intersection. The Road Commission will always want to maximize that separation from any new point of access from an existing intersection, particularly a signalized intersection. So, it's something that could potentially be evaluated. We certainly want to get our traffic engineer and the developer's traffic engineer involved in that analysis, and certainly the Road Commission's insights as well. What the developer has done here, and which is what the Road Commission will typically seek is with the Commerce Road access aligning with Greenview. The Road Commission always wants to see roads align. If you offset, then you create conflict points.

The other thing that the developer tried to do was push the Carey Road access as far north as he could to maximize that spacing from the traffic signal, and also to minimize any impacts on those wetlands that are right there along the east side of Carey Road.

Bearer – Understood. Just as a general statement, I'm sure all of us Commissioners are struggling with the balance between a proposal that is a lower density proposal that we can't control as far as greenspace goes, along with an increase in greenspace, but an increase in density. I'm personally struggling with it. I don't really have any questions at this point. I'd love to hear what my other Commissioners have to say, and I might have questions based on that, but it might become a little more clear for me.

Winkler – Brian, I've been on the Planning Commission for almost 20 years, and I've been a Commerce Township resident for 31 years. When projects like this come up, and rezonings like this come up, I come back to the hard reality of zoning, which is, if the developer who owns this property decides to develop it based upon the current R-1A zoning, he can clear cut the property, from property line to property line. And, if he submits a site plan that meets all the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, we at the Planning Commission have to approve it by law. So, here we have a developer that has come in with what I think is an innovative way to develop this property. There are certainly more residences, but with a lot more greenspace. And the difference in traffic between it being R-1A, completely clear cut, large lot residential, at 120 lots, or this proposal at 168 lots, the difference in traffic is going to be minimal. There will be a difference, but maybe 15%. The hard reality is that if this developer, or some other developer who buys this property, wants to develop the property with the current zoning,

if they meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, we cannot deny it. So, it's either this, or a clear-cut property with no greenspace. I hate to be blunt, but that's the reality of the situation. I hope people understand that.

Unidentified Resident – But the roads won't support it.

Phillips – Okay, I guess I'm dissenting a little bit from that perspective. I think the current zoning is consistent with the Master Plan. I think the property is viable for development as an R-1A. It's disappointing to assume that every time it's R-1A, it will be clear cut. I'd like to see a developer come in that actually values greenspace and wants to develop an R-1A and preserve the greenspace and trees. I really don't see any compelling benefit that justifies rezoning from the lowest density residential to the highest density. And I think the serious concern I have is on setting the precedent that any developer could come in for R-1A and make the same argument. I'm going to give you more greenspace, but I want more density, more homes, and want to make it financially viable. And I think if we do that, we're going to see this over and over and over again, and we're going to lose our rural residential charm, and lose the R-1A attributes of our community.

Loskill – I have a question. You've put down the number 122 sites, but I'm not sure how you're getting that. Is that a net, minus the wetlands and other things? If you take 75 acres, multiply that out divided by 20,000, you get 163 sites.

Dave Campbell – They did submit a parallel plan, and you're correct, that by the time you put in roads you're going to lose some of your usable area. A fair estimate is probably 25% once you take into account roads, detention ponds and so forth. With respect to the wetlands, on the parallel plan, they did show the wetlands being filled and utilized as buildable lots. I think one area of the existing wetlands was shown to be an area for detention, which is often what the developers will do. They will use the existing low spot on the development as their detention area. But that's where the 122 comes from is the parallel plan.

Loskill – Okay. I'm not in favor of more developments this size, but in looking at the plan they've proposed, I think it's about as good as we can get. I would support in the future that we change our Zoning Ordinance to make things a little bit more developer oriented as far as lower density to start with, and then by doing things that would promote better sight lines and development practices, we increase the density that way. I think right now, we allow too much density offhand and there's no room for negotiations. As we're sitting here, it's either we get 160 homes on a clear-cut site, or we get 160 homes on a well thought out site. It's a tough situation. We're stuck between a rock and a hard place in making these decisions.

Dave Campbell – I will respond to that to say, it is a Conditional Rezoning. So, the developer can volunteer conditions and it's up to this Planning Commission and the Township Board to accept those conditions. The intent is for those conditions to be proportionate to that which they are seeking, the impacts caused by the rezoning that they're seeking. In that sense, there is a certain amount of negotiations. The developer is volunteering, and that's a key word, volunteering conditions.

Weber – Maybe I'll start with the public service announcement. So, there was a lot of discussion on keeping the Township more of a bed and breakfast community feel, that the Township Board should acquire land or should buy these lands, et cetera. And I'll just tell you that that the Township owns 160 parcels right now. If you include Proud Lake, 37% of Commerce Township cannot be built upon. So, the Township owns it, or it's a state park and we made the decision not to divest ourselves of any of the property that we presently own, I think with maybe a residential lot or two that's thrown in there. My view is that we prioritize existing residents ahead of potential residents.

I'm okay with trading off some density at the building of smaller lots within a community like this to preserve more greenspace. It has been mentioned, people that are coming in, they know what they're buying, and they can choose to buy a larger house on a smaller lot, or not. That's their choice at the time. What I struggle with is the moving from 122 to 168. To me, that's too far of a jump. I'm willing to trade off some density. The logical question is, what is the number? And I don't have that right now. Mark, I think what you and your firm have done has been outstanding. And the most outstanding part has been communicating with the residents. We need the input to try to turn a tough situation into an outcome that meets consensus. The definition of consensus is, you might not get what you want, but you can live with it. I see that here, but at the same time, 168 is too big of a number for me. So, is it moving from R-1A to R-1D? Possibly the right answer is R-1A to R-1C, with something that is consistent with the design you have.

We've seen it so many times. What we think is an adequate buffer is not an adequate buffer. It looks great in the summertime, and it's a completely different story in the winter when the leaves are gone. So, I commend you wholeheartedly with the intent of the design, but I've fallen on my sword more than once when taking a position on housing density. Going from 122 to 168 is too much in my mind. In the alternate proposal, there was the discussion on the commercial site in the southwest corner. In the Master Plan, we were intentional in our language when we described a neighborhood commercial, and literally I think we used the comparison of a small market, not one building with several tenants in it, and nothing near the size of 75,000 square feet. I know when we talked earlier, when Dave did a little bit of analysis for us, that corner roughly comes into four to five acres. So, I don't see something there, but at the same time, I guess I'm saying, I am not opposed to having some kind of a neighborhood market in that corner. I don't think it's going to add to the traffic. This market or coffee shop is not going to be a destination. It would be something that helps build community for the residents in that area and I'm not opposed to that, if it gets to the point where we're looking at a different design in the future. To sum it up, I love the plan, but the density is too great for me.

McCanham – George stole everything I wanted to say. My problem is that I hate traffic out here and I hate the density. Like it was said earlier, we are stuck with certain responsibilities legally; if it's zoned a certain way you've got to go a certain way. People have that right. The thing that hit me in the face was if you were to put this subdivision down as a tabletop, it's beautiful, but then if you plug it into the community, it looks a lot different. My problem is simply 122 to 168. I don't think there's a good enough reason. I'm not looking at the profit. I'm here to represent the community, and I can't see going from 122 to 168 just like that.

Chairperson Parel – I'm not sure I have much to add, other than I think my fellow Commissioners made some really good points. I commend the developer for not only

the meetings with a lot of the residents, several meetings and correspondence, and putting together a plan that I think does look great, to Mickey's point. I love the buffering on the north and east ends. I think you did a heck of a job to try to bring us something that makes the best out of not the greatest situation.

That said, I am on the fence as far as my vote goes. I'm not sure I see a need to go up to the 168. I understand that you have the right to do the 122. I understand that somewhere in the middle potentially lies a compromise. I don't know if I can suggest that. I understand what the worst case scenario could be, which could be some commercial, lower density, less trees and I hate the idea of that. For me, the 168 number really stands out. We've talked about density and traffic. I don't believe that the difference between 122 and 168 is an incredible amount of traffic, and I look at that trade off with the buffering, the retention of the trees. That's tough for me. You've heard our comments.

Mr. Kassab – If I may, we've been here for two hours and 20 minutes. Thank you all for your patience. One of the most positive things that have come out of this is the neighborhood input, not only from the resident meetings we've had, but furthermore this evening, and I'd like to continue that. I'd like to continue to get their input to make a better plan. Certainly, out of 26 or so residents that have spoken, I'm going to venture to guess that 2/3 of them had a challenge with traffic. Certainly, when you add one more house, it's going to create more cars on the road. I get that. I'd like to go back and take a look at the plan on what we can do to possibly reduce the density and to reduce the impact of traffic. The folks that live on Juniper, I've seen it. I don't want to admit that I've cut through it, but I've seen it. It's one of those things where, unfortunately, the Road Commission is last to catch up, in my opinion, even where I live in Macomb. Once the developers get in and build their subdivisions, Road Commission comes and widens the roads. It almost seems like it's too little, too late. Nonetheless, we have a duty to this Township and a duty to the residents to come up with a plan that I believe works for everybody. I'd love for the next meeting that we would have to have folks in support because we've made the plan better. At that point, I'd like to make a request to table this matter for further consideration.

Chairperson Parel – I was hoping you'd say that. I really do appreciate that and I'm sure the other Commissioners agree. I think that's the right path. Anything else?

Weber – We have to make a motion to table.

Dave Campbell – Yes, you would. There would have to be a formal motion.

MOTION by Weber, supported by Loskill, to table item PCZ#26-02.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Chairperson Parel – Dave, anything else to add?

Dave Campbell – Maybe just to repeat myself. If and when this Planning Commission gets to a position where they are ready to take action, at this stage of the process, that action would be in the form of a formal recommendation to the Township Board. So, if and when the Planning Commission does so, then what would happen following that would be a final decision by the Township Board. The Planning Department will

continue to take all the phone calls and emails from folks who are going to want to know what the next steps are and what the schedule looks like. I'm quite confident I'll be talking to Mr. Kassab tomorrow to talk through what that schedule might be.

Weber – I've got a comment while we have a mostly full house still. For those of you that don't know, there are 8 bills that are being voted on imminently in the House that would take the discussion we just had out of local government hands. The House of the State of Michigan is looking at changing the law so that we could not zone anything greater than a lot of 2,000 square feet. I did not misspeak, nor a dwelling less than 600 square feet. They believe that there is a shortage of housing. I think most of us would agree with that, and housing is somewhat unaffordable. I think most of us would agree with that as well. But, in my words, they're trying to do brain surgery with a shotgun and not a scalpel. So, now is the time for you to contact your State representatives and let them know what you think about that.

There was a meeting last week where I gave two of our representatives' credit, Noah Arbit and Rosemary Bayer. So, one of our House representatives and one of our Senate representatives actually reached out and wanted to have a round table of community leaders. Unfortunately, there were two of us from Commerce that attended the meeting, and the only other community that chose to attend was somebody from Orchard Lake. We had a very good discussion on that. We let them know what the pitfalls were and what they would be doing to destroy established communities with something like that. But I want you to know what that could do, meaning not just to a development that Mr. Kassab is looking at, but literally the lot next door to you could have 3 duplexes and two campers in the back. Literally, that's what this legislation would allow. So, please contact your State representatives, both the House and the Senate, and let them know what you think about that.

Unidentified Resident – Does that bill have a name?

Weber – It is the Housing Readiness Package, which includes House bills 5529 through 5532, and 5581 through 5585. Some of those make a lot of sense. They're very logical. There's no issue with some of them, but in totality, the most egregious portions would destroy a community like Commerce Township, and everyone else in northwestern Oakland County.

Mr. Kassab – Coming from a developer, I agree with you. I think it's overreaching.

Dave Campbell – It sounds like we're moving on to the next agenda item. I don't know if it makes sense to take a 5-minute recess for those who are not interested in lakefront accessory structures to head out.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you everyone for participating. We really do appreciate it.

[Break from 9:27pm to 9:32pm]

G. OLD BUSINESS

ITEM G.1. TEXT AMENDMENT DISCUSSION

Discussion on waterfront accessory structures.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, could you bring us up to speed?

Dave Campbell – Actually I'm going to ask Jay to bring you up to speed, other than to say that we've had some preliminary discussions on what Jay's proposing relative to amendments to the Zoning Ordinance for lakeside or waterfront accessory structures. We're to the point now where Jay and his team have developed some prospective language. If the Planning Commission feels that this language is appropriate, something we want to move forward with, then two things need to happen next. One, we would want to have the attorney create this language in its amending ordinance form. And two, we would need to have a public hearing with this Planning Commission. Then, if the Planning Commission were to make a formal recommendation, it would go to the Township Board with the potential for adoption. Jay, correct me if I'm wrong. I think the Township Board wanted to see this before a public hearing. I think they wanted it as an item on their July discussion meeting agenda.

Jay James – Yes, at their discussion meeting they'd like to see it, get a first blush at it and maybe give a little input prior to it coming back for the public hearing.

Dave Campbell – So, if that sequences out, then seemingly we would potentially be having a public hearing on this at the Planning Commission in August.

Jay James – So, with that, after our last meeting a couple months ago, I came away from that meeting with some input from you guys as far as some setbacks and heights, eave heights and square footages. So, I amended this document. Really there were five changes that I noted that you wanted to see. The first was the side yard setback. Initially I had listed it as 4 feet, which our current zoning for detached accessory structures can be as close as three feet, but that's in rear yards. I had left it at 4 previously, and from discussion with you guys, and I actually agree with this one, we bumped it up to 10 feet. I think that does two things. One, it reduces the viewshed impairment for neighbors by bringing it more into your own property, and therefore, it's impeding your view more. But more importantly I believe, the 10 foot prohibits or would reduce ... Typically when you have an accessory structure that close to the property line, 3 or 4 feet, that 3 or 4 feet gets used as a junk collector. People throw their ladders back there, they throw their wheelbarrows back there, the grass doesn't get cut, et cetera. I think by widening up to 10 feet, it's still going to be a maintainable portion of their yard and hopefully we won't see all that stuff being stored behind it.

The other one was when we were speaking about the height of the structure. Previously we had the maximum height at 14 feet. I have reduced that down to 10 feet, which includes the peak height and chimney height. This will stop the structures from being an 8-foot wall with a very steep roof that would raise it up higher than any of us would like to see. The other one was the eave height; we went from 10-feet down to 8-feet. Again, it provides the same thing and helps the overall height to be reduced. The square footage, I had initially listed it at 300 square feet. But based on our discussion, I think we're talking like 15x15 would be the Max that we would want to see. That allows you to store your lake toys and your lake accessories, but it doesn't allow you to necessarily

have room to work on your motorcycles, et cetera. I'm sure you could still keep lawn mowers, et cetera, in there. Hopefully we won't have anyone using it for anything outside of storing their materials.

Then we added in the exterior materials to make them more compatible with the primary residence, so that we don't have any nice brick houses with a tin Home Depot shed. We hope it will be something compatible and similar to those in the neighborhood. With that, I will take any questions or comments you have on this revision.

Chairperson Parel – Yes, we've been through a few different iterations of this. Mickey?

McCanham – I'm good.

Weber – You rang all the bells. I have no changes and I think it's good as is.

Loskill – No comments.

Phillips – I approve.

Winkler – No comments. You sure put a lot of work into that.

Chairperson Parel – Jay did put a lot of work into this.

Bearer – No comments.

Chairperson Parel – From my perspective, I'm not a lake guy. I get the perspective on this. I understand why we have to put rules in place, even in an area where it seems like rules are rarely followed. I don't know enough about it, but I guess I just caution, and I hope this doesn't open up Pandora's Box and everybody starts coming to you with...

Jay James – Unfortunately, I think Pandora's Box has already been opened, and this is a way to reign in it a little bit. Remember, this is just the Township's Ordinance. If individual HOAs want to restrict it and not allow them, they can still do that.

Chairperson Parel – I understand. I think this is the best solution. I know you put a lot of work into it. We appreciate it. Dave, what is the next step?

Dave Campbell – The next step for the Planning Commission would be to hold the public hearing and make a formal recommendation. What Jay and I are agreeing upon is that the Township Board wanted to see this before a public hearing, and that would be at their July quarterly meeting which is July 28th.

Chairperson Parel – Is there anything you need from us prior to that, other than what we've heard this evening?

Dave Campbell – I think the Township Board would be interested to hear that the Planning Commission sounds mostly agreeable and didn't have any changes to Jay's proposed language.

Chairperson Parel – Okay, I think you have that.

Jay James – Since you didn't ask me for an update at the beginning of the meeting, I would like to introduce all of you to Andy Miller. He is my new Assistant Building Official here. So, you may be seeing him from time to time. If I do happen to miss a meeting, if there is something on the agenda, Andy will probably be here, and he will be well aware of the situation. If you are in the Township Hall, please feel free to stop by and talk to Andy.

Chairperson Parel – Andy, pleasure to meet you. And Jay, sorry I missed you at the beginning.

Jay James – I know this isn't a public hearing, but I do know there were some people that came here specifically tonight to hear this. I don't know if you'd want to get anyone's comments.

Chairperson Parel – Do you have any comments?

Andy Sarkisian, 3398 Tiquewood, Commerce Township – Sure. I want to thank Jay for all his work on this stuff. And quite frankly, since I am departing, for the entire Board and Larry who's not with us, Jay and Dave and everyone, for all their years of support for all my silly questions and comments. On this topic, I sympathize with Jay. He's got people doing things and it's hard to tell what's going on in people's backyards. I do think you will get a lot of comments in the public hearing and George, you may want to let your friends know on the Township Board because there are going to be neighbors who don't want something of that size that's as close even as 10-feet to the lot line. That will have an impact on their view and the closer it can be to center of the resident's property line, and maybe a certain distance from the water. There's no shortage of outside kitchens that have roofs and things of that nature that are being developed in these relatively expensive homes. It will probably be a more crowded room than this is my guess, when this comes up, assuming all the lakefront people know.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you, sir. Best of luck to you in Florida.

Andy Sarkisian – Thank you.

I. NEW BUSINESS

None.

J: OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION:

None.

K: PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: MONDAY, JULY 6, 2026, AT 7:00PM.

Dave Campbell – We usually like to give you a heads up on what we think we're going to see at our next meeting, which is July 6th:

- Bogie Lake Residential – This is the project with 46 homes, located between Westlake Senior Living Campus and the northern most entrance to Walled Lake Northern High School. That Conditional Rezoning was approved by the Township Board at their April meeting. The next step for the developer would be to come back to this Planning Commission with the condominium site plan and master deed.
- We continue to work with the owner of Commerce Lake Market who wants to knock down his existing store, build a newer, bigger and better store, but also add a fuel canopy. He would need to rezone his properties to be able to do so.
- We are probably going to talk more about data centers at the July meeting and some potential language, probably in a similar format to what Jay proposed, some informal language that, if the Planning Commission feels is appropriate, then we will work with the Township Attorney on formatting it into ordinance language that maybe the Planning Commission would see at the August meeting. By then, we will be getting toward the end of our 6-month moratorium on data centers, so we will probably be asking the Township Board to extend that moratorium by 2 or 3 months just to give us enough time to get through the process.
- We may be seeing a concept plan. I know the developer has a meeting scheduled with the neighbors and they want to wait to present the concept to the neighbors first. They don't want rumors leaking out prior to that meeting, which is scheduled for June 8th.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, remind me again, when is the annual celebration in the Village?

Beth Miller – June 13th.

Weber – Yes, in 10 days.

Winkler – Do they need more volunteers?

Weber – I would think the answer would be yes, and I would recommend that anybody who wants to be part of it to contact Emily England, who is Director of Parks and Recreation.

L: ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Loskill, supported by Phillips, to adjourn the meeting at 9:47pm.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Joe Loskill, Secretary