



DEXTER TOWNSHIP

PLANNING COMMISSION

6880 DEXTER-PINCKNEY ROAD
DEXTER, MI 48130
TELEPHONE: 734-426-3767
FAX: 734-426-3833
WWW.DEXTERTOWNSHIP.ORG

STEVEN BURCH
CHAIR
TOM EHMAN
VICE CHAIR & ZBA REP.
TOM LEWIS
SECRETARY
BILL GAJEWSKI
EX-OFFICIO TWP. BRD.
BOB NESTER
VACANT
VACANT
COMMISSIONERS

JANIS MILLER
RECORDING SECRETARY

REGULAR MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, August 28, 2018

Present: Steve Burch, Chair; Tom Ehman, Vice-Chair; Tom Lewis, Secretary; Bill Gajewski; Bob Nester. Absent: None.

Also present: Zach Michels, Director of Planning and Zoning (DPZ); and Janis Miller, Recording Secretary.

1. **Call to Order:** Mr. Burch called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM.
2. **Conflict of Interest:**
 - Mr. Lewis: Regarding Natures Preserve, he has used the same engineering firm, Washtenaw Engineering.
 - Mr. Ehman: He will recuse himself from The Woods of Portage Lake as he is a contiguous landowner.
3. **Approval of Agenda:**

Moved by Mr. Ehman, seconded by Mr. Gajewski, to approve the agenda as presented.
Motion carried 5-0
4. **Public Comment:** (non-agenda items) None.
5. **Action Items:**

Item A:
Public Hearing for (18-PC-188) Natures Preserve

Director of Planning and Zoning report:

- A) August 2017 the Planning Commission approved, with conditions, the open space community for Natures Preserve, and a preliminary site plan.
- B) The preliminary site plan approval is valid for a period of twelve (12) months. If a completed final site plan is not submitted within that time frame then the preliminary approval is void and the applicant has to start over again.
- C) There are conditions that would allow the Planning Commission to extend the preliminary site plan approval.
- D) The engineer who is working on the project has submitted to the DPZ a revised preliminary site plan that addresses many of the questions and concerns that were raised previously. This was not distributed because it is not the previously approved

preliminary site plan that was approved but it does demonstrate a good-faith effort on behalf of the applicant.

Planning Commission questions of DPZ:

Mr. Burch: Any of the conditions in the previously approved preliminary site plan, that have not been adequately addressed, will be addressed prior to our next approval?

DPZ Michels: Paragraph 170 (a) of the draft Resolution states that “all conditions of Resolution (17-PC-182) Natures Preserve and Resolution (17-PC-183) Natures Preserve shall remain in full force and effect.”

Applicant presentation:

Robert Wanty, engineer for the project
No questions from the Commissioners.

Open Public Comment at 7:20 PM.

No public comments.

Closed Public Comment at 7:20 PM.

Planning Commission discussion:

Mr. Nester: Based on the Ordinance, are they permitted one extension? Didn't we change the Ordinance regarding the ability to continue extensions? This would be an extension for one year. **DPZ Michels:** The applicant is planning, in the very short future to submitting the plan, and it is my understanding they do not intend to take the full twelve months.

Mr. Wanty: The intent is to start construction this fall. The reason we asked for an extension is because we had to get approvals.

Mr. Gajewski: The applicant has made a good-faith effort to address prior issues.

DPZ Michele: To address Mr. Nester's question, the Ordinance is silent on the potential length, or number, of extensions that's available for a preliminary site plan.

Motion by Mr. Ehman to approve Resolution (18-PC-188) subject to the following conditions: ¶130 be stricken because it is not congruent with the present ¶140; ¶140 should say the site plan [extension request] was not the result of actions of the applicant, because their initial engineering vendor was unresponsive and applicant finally had to secure an alternate; ¶150 there have been no substantial changes on abutting properties because [Reason 1] there is no evidence to the contrary; ¶160 will be in compliance with the standards [and requirements of the Zoning Ordinance] because [Reason 1] there has been no text changes in the Zoning Ordinance; ¶170 the extension shall be valid through August 21, 2019. Motion second by Mr. Nester.

Discussion:

DPZ Michels: I would like to point out that ¶130 is one of the PC's finding of fact for granting an extension, so it should be addressed. It appears that the reasons in ¶140 could be similar to the reasons in ¶130.

Mr. Burch: Mr. Ehman, would you like to amend your motion to replace ¶130 because it is relevant to the motion itself as the applicant has made a good-faith effort, and the reasoning is the same as ¶140, the vendor was not responsive, and forced the applicant, on short notice, to retain a new engineer.

Mr. Ehman: I struggled with that as what it really says is, made a good-faith effort to submit timely, and then ¶140 talks about the delay for a final site plan. I thought one is making an excuse for something else, so let's delete ¶130, letting ¶140 explain what the situation really is.

Mr. Gajewski: I think in ¶130 he did make a good-faith effort, he had sincerity and intention to complete the project in a timely manner. As far as ¶140, the delay submitting a final plan was not the result of the action by the applicant but was due to the unresponsive actions of the previous engineer.

DPZ Michels: To refresh everyone, Section 6.04(C)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance states that this timeline may be extended by the Planning Commission upon finding that all of the following are true: 1) The applicant made a good faith effort to submit a final site plan in a timely manner; 2) The delay was not a result of the actions of the applicant; 3) There were no substantial changes to the abutting properties; and 4) the preliminary plan will be in compliance with all standards and requirements of the Zoning Ordinance at the time of the extension. The key is that it is all of the above, not one or two.

Friendly amendment by Mr. Lewis: Due to the requirements of the Ordinance, we duplicate the answers for ¶130 and ¶140. Mr. Ehman agrees with the change.

Motion carried 5-0.

Mr. Burch restates the motion including the amendment.

Whereas, the Applicant has made a good-faith effort to submit a final site plan in a timely manner [¶130], although we are deleting that paragraph, because it is the same answer as ¶140; ¶140 Whereas, the delay in submitting a final site plan was not a result of the actions of the Applicant because a) the vendor was unresponsive and the outgood had to retain a new vendor, new site engineer on short notice; ¶150 there have been no substantial changes on abutting properties in the previous twelve (12) month period since the approval because a) there is no evidence to the contrary; ¶160 Whereas, the previously approved preliminary site plan will be in compliance with the standards of the, and requirements of the Zoning Ordinance because a) there has been no text changes to the Zoning Ordinance; ¶170 Now, Therefore, be it resolved, the Planning Commission, by a majority vote at a duly noticed, regular meeting, held this 28th day of August, Grants Approval of an extension of a Preliminary Site Plan (18-PC-188), Natures Preserve for property located on the north side of North Territorial between 11966 and 12088 North Territorial, Section 16 of Dexter Township (D-04-16-200-014/015), to the Applicant subject to the conditions listed below: a) All conditions of Resolution (17-PC-182) Natures Preserve and Resolution (17-PC-183) Natures Preserve shall remain in full force and effect; b) The Applicant shall participate in a preapplication meeting with the Township before submitting an application for final site plan approval; c) This extension shall be valid through August 21, 2019; d) This approval shall not be effective until the Applicant has paid, in full, all monies owed to the Township for fees, expenses, and/or other related issues related to the extension of preliminary site plan review; and e) This approval shall not be effective until this Resolution and all its conditions are accepted by the Applicant.

NOTE: Mr. Lewis' amendment was to leave ¶130 in the Resolution, duplicating the reason in ¶130 and ¶140.

Roll Call Vote: Yeas-Burch, Nester, Gajewski, Lewis, Ehman; Nays-none; Absent-none. Motion carried 5-0 Resolution adopted.

Item B:

**Review of completeness and possible setting of public hearing date for (18-PC-189)
TeleSite Wireless**

Director of Planning and Zoning report:

- A) This is different from the other applications tonight as it is not a public hearing, it is for a special land use for a communications tower for mobile cell phones.
- B) This is a review of completeness; where this body reviews the site plan materials that were submitted, and determines whether or not the application is complete, and then sets the public hearing. Public input can be received but it is not required as it is not a public hearing.
- C) TeleSite Wireless is acting on behalf of Verizon for a new communication tower on the south side of Island Lake Road.
- D) Communication towers are special land uses in Agricultural (AG) Districts, which means they have a little higher review than by right uses.
- E) The Planning Commission has an opportunity to put more conditions on them.
- F) The Fire Inspector reviewed the plan and supports the project.
- G) The review letter from the Township Engineer has not been received at the time of this report.
- H) Specific standards for communication towers are outlined in §16.24 of the Zoning Ordinance.
- I) There are some things missing from the site plan but that will not cause difficulty in reviewing it.
- J) The property was approved as part of a land division on May 31, 2018.

Planning Commission questions of DPZ:

No questions of DPZ.

Applicant presentation:

Rob LaBelle, Attorney representing Verizon Wireless, and David Anton, TeleSite Wireless acquisition specialist.

Mr. LaBelle: David Anton locates and acquires sites for the purpose of filling coverage gaps within our zones that we provide telecommunication services. This meeting is for completeness, not a public hearing, so we will not give a full presentation but will answer questions.

Mr. Lewis: Is this location of a cell tower intended to fix some type of a gap in cell phone coverage?

Mr. LaBelle: Yes, it is. Inside the packet you will find propagation maps that present, in a graphic form, the actual measured gaps in coverage, measure actual signal strength that is capable in a particular area. In addition, we receive complaints and information from the regional office in Southfield, which shows lost calls, lost signals, lost data. The more there are of the three things I mentioned, the higher priority the site gets. Each individual tower creates a "cell" around it, each of those cells had to connect with other cells to created a

honeycomb effect. If they are placed too close together, they overlap, and create a zone of destructive interference. If there is a gap between zones, the gap is now permanent as there is no way to place a tower within that gap without creating a massive zone [overlay] of destructive interference. There isn't a lot of leeway as to where you place a tower.

Mr. Lewis: As part of the Ordinance, landscaping and buffer zones are part of the consideration of site plan review. This looks like this is out in the middle of a field. It will be interesting to know what the potential long-range plan for this property might be from the owner. That information might influence the potential waivers relative to the site plan.

Mr. LaBelle: We certainly can provide that. We don't provide for any landscaping on the site plan, because we are going to seek a waiver as the site is in the middle of a field. We have no problem putting landscaping into it if there is a request. We will have Mr. Weber here, if you have any questions of long term plans for the property.

Mr. Gajewski: I call your attention to the special performance standards, which one is communication towers shall be designed and/or painted to minimize their appearance to the greatest extent feasible. How would you address that?

Mr. LaBelle: They use a non-corrosive grey galvanized steel. They use a limited profile monopole.

Mr. Gajewski: Another special performance standard, you can address now or later, is to provide verification that the antenna amount and structure have been reviewed and approved by a professional engineer and that the installation is in compliance with all applicable codes.

Mr. LaBelle: We can provide that. The site plan is actually done by a professional engineer. We have separate engineers that do the tower construction, and separate vendors that provide the steel.

DPZ Michels: That information is processed when the zoning permit is issued.

David Anton, TeleSite Wireless: We order foundation designs, soil calculations, and soil measurements to make sure these towers will be there forever.

Mr. Nester: What is the energy requirement for operating it?

Mr. LaBelle: Not very much. It's not a high voltage tower. Nothing high voltage about the energy that's provided in it. There is a backup generator, as required by Homeland Security, because cell phones have been identified as a first line of defense for emergencies.

Mr. Burch: I got the impression that the commercial service going to this site would be overhead.

Mr. LaBelle: It will be underground.

Mr. Burch: Do you have a number for the milliwatt power that is being transmitted, from the top of the tower?

Mr. LaBelle: We can provide that. It's well within the standards provided by the FCC.

Mr. Nester: The gap that you are intending to fill, are there other associated gaps within Dexter Township?

Mr. Anton: If you look at the propagation map we provided, it shows the existing sites. At this time there is nothing in the near future that we know of. This was a high priority site due to customer complaints.

Mr. Gajewski: Zach, our Zoning Ordinance indicated cell towers have to be how far apart? A congruent one mile, is that congruent with the propagation distance so we don't overlap?

Mr. LaBelle: It is. You can get one and a half to three miles from it depending on topography existing structures, and trees. We're not within one mile of any other tower.

DPZ Michels: I believe when the mile standard was adopted they were concerned about everyone putting up their own tower. When you put up your tower, you allow other carriers to get on to that.

Mr. LaBelle: Your ordinance requires that and so does Federal law. The Federal law actually requires that for us to get a license to broadcast. The ~~FTEFCC~~, Federal ~~Telecommunications Act~~ Communications Commission, requires that all of us play nice with each other. We have to allow all other carriers onto our poles and vice-versa.

Mr. Ehman: My observation is; 1. This is a permitted use subject to some possible conditions, and 2. Cellular activity is growing about as fast as healthcare, at some point these towers are going to decrease the size of their cells because those are going to start getting busy signals, then there are going to have to be more towers.

Mr. Burch: Normally, at this point, we would open this to public comment, although for an application for a Preliminary Site Plan, public comment is not really relevant at this time as we're making no decision other than the application is complete and ready for us to set the public hearing in which the public can voice their concerns. However, in this case I am going to change the rules just a little bit in that anyone in the public has a question regarding the site plan placement of the tower, they can ask the applicant, I will permit it.

DPZ Michels: If you do have questions, address them to the chair and the chair will ask them of the applicant so we don't have cross-talk.

Opened Public Comment at 7:45 PM.

Barbara Stahl, 10166 Island Lake Road, Dexter, MI

Her concerns were the size of the property (3 ½ acres); how tall the towers (197 feet); will the farmhouse be torn down (the son will determine that as he will continue farming); will there be any other structures on this site (within the fenced-in compound will be cabinets to hold the mechanicals and a back-up generator); will the Verizon tower interfere with her AT&T (no, as each carrier transmits on a different broadband signal); and will the tower cause lightning strikes (no, the tower is grounded).

Sam Gonzales, 2791 N. Dancer Road, Dexter, MI

The Planning Commission will be signing some waivers for missing information?

(premature, don't know what waivers they will be asking for.) **DPZ Michels:** The biggest missing info is the landscaping plan with our Zoning Ordinance allowing and the Planning Commission to grant a waiver for landscaping.

Mr. Gonzales: How will they minimize the impact on the surrounding area? (part of the Standards of Review performance requirements.) Will there be a light on top of the tower? (lighting will conform to the Federal Aviation Administration rules, in this case no light because it is under 200 feet.) The Dexter Township Zoning Ordinance allow for increasing the height for colocation? (if anyone wanted to extend the height of the tower, they would have to come before the Planning Commission, justifying the request.) Noise from the generator? (only during monthly testing and when power is interrupted.) From this initial review, are you leaning to this being complete? **Mr. Burch:** As of this moment, I am quite comfortable with us proceeding forward with the application.

Robert Arbour, 2849 N. Dancer Road, Lima Township
He takes offence that the landscaping is somewhat optional. Does it make a noise on a wet day? (no.) This is changing zoning to create commercial property. Have alternative sites been investigated?

Bill Peltcz, 8985 Island Lake Road, Dexter, MI
Are they going to run fiber optic to the tower? (That will be determined by the utility company.)

Close Public Comment at 8:09 PM.

Planning Commission Review:

DPZ Michels: We did receive a packet of materials from a citizen that will be include in the staff report for the public hearing. If this body feels it is complete for public hearing, it should set the public hearing for the next meeting date, September 25th. If there are any additional materials this body wants to have on the site plan, they should direct the applicant to do it now. I heard discussion about including the propagation maps, appearance info so that it would comply with the appearance standards, and noise details for the generator.

Mr. Lewis: Can we also have the collapse or fall zone details included?

Mr. LaBell: We are leasing a three-acre parcel. The overall parcel ~~is~~ is a hundred acres.

Motion by Mr. Ehman that the Planning Commission find the application for Special Land Use complete. The date to hear it to be decided by the applicant. (If possible at that hearing, if they get the Special Land Use, they may wish to present a Preliminary Site plan and a Final Site Plan). Motion second by Mr. Gajewski.

Mr. Burch summarizes the motion:

It has been moved and supported that we find the preliminary complete and that we allow the applicants to determine when they wish to come before the Planning Commission, for the Public Hearing, with the caveat in there that they will have to notify Mr. Michels sufficient time that he can notice that Public Hearing. We're putting it back to the applicant how much they wish to present, up to and including a Final Site Plan.

Motion carried 5-0.

Mr. LaBell: Just to give you notice right now Zach, we would like to be on the September 25th hearing. We will do a preliminary and final site plan approval.

Item C:

Public Hearing for (18-PC-191) The Woods of Portage Lake

Mr. Ehman recuses himself.

Director of Planning and Zoning report:

- A) Mr. Watson is acting applicant on behalf of The woods o Portage Lake Homeowner's Association.
- B) The request is to amend a previously approved site plan.
- C) The applicant wishes to purchase property adjacent to his, owed by the Yacht Club, through Mr. Tom Ehman, to make it easier to locate a garage.
- D) This is complex as it's a site condominium and adjacent property is meets and bounds, so you actually have to amend the condominium, amend the master deed, amend the site plan, his request is to amend the final site plan.
- E) We have received amended condo documents, which the Township Attorney has not reviewed and it should be a condition of approval.
- F) The proposed amendment is a major change requiring review and approval by the Planning Commission.
- G) The Planning Commission can approve major changes to approved site plans upon finding that all of the following are true: 1) Such changes will not adversely affect the initial basis for granting approval; 2) Such changes will not adversely affect the overall project in light of the intent and purpose of such development, as set forth in this article; and 3) Such changes shall not result in the reduction of open space, as required herein.
- H) The Fire Inspector has stated that it's not necessary for him t review the plans, and the Township Engineer review letter has not been received at this time.
- I) In the staff report is a draft Resolution and a multi-page amendment.
- J) To make this more complex, the property intended to be purchased, and added, is in a different Zoning District. When the Township adopts the new Zoning Ordinance they can amend that area or the applicant can require it added now. Although it won't affect the size of the structure to be built, it's generally bad practice to have property in multiple zoning districts.

Planning Commission questions of DPZ:

Mr. Nester: With the absence of Mr. Ehman, will it require a unanimous vote?

DPZ Michels: Yes. With seven seats on the Planning Commission a vote requires a majority of those seven, even if some are absent.

Mr. Lewis: Zach, you mentioned a Township Engineer's letter has not been received?

DPZ Michels: Correct. They were essentially reviewing just for the legal description. That may be a condition of approval, that we get confirmation that it closes out.

Mr. Lewis: It's not currently part of the draft Resolution?

DPZ Michels: Correct. I was presuming we'd get that.

Mr. Gajewski: This would simply be a boundary line adjustment to Lot 5. They're just adding a skinny strip of land which is about twenty-five (25) foot wide and tapers to about eighty (80) foot in the rear. There's really no change in site plan, except for that miniscule boundary line adjustment. And there's really no change in open space. So, if this was a meets and bounds deal, we wouldn't be here.

DPZ Michels: Correct. If all the properties involved were meets and bounds it could be handled administratively. Because it is a site condominium it increases the degree of difficulty.

Applicant presentation:

Kevin Watson, 8690 Dexter Pinckney Road, Pinckney, MI

Mr. Burch: Would I be correct in assuming that the new line is where the grass stops?

Mr. Watson: The first tree from the wetlands, it goes through the center of that tree. The next littler tree, just on the outside of it. And the big Oak in the front, it goes through the middle of it. I will finish the landscaping once I get the garage built.

Open Public Comment at 8:23 PM.

Carmen Crawford, 8745 Grove, Pinckney, MI

She lives on the road directly next door to his property and would like to know if the acquisition of the new property and new garage will affect their road and the turnaround.

DPZ Michels: The turnaround is not within the area that is proposed to be added to the lot. It will be closer to the line than it is now but the turnaround will remain outside of this property.

Richard Dryer, 8725 Grove, Pinckney, MI

Right now, there is a lot of equipment on the property and he would like to know if all the equipment will be stored in the garage. He would also like to know how big a structure is being built.

Mr. Watson: Roughly a thousand (1,000) square feet.

DPZ Michels: In the Dexter Township Zoning Ordinance, the size of accessory buildings can be limited by two things; 1) Overall lot coverage or roof area, and 2) the accessory building lot coverage. If you're less than two and a half (2 ½) acres, which this will be, your maximum lot coverage, with overhangs and everything, is a thousand (1,000) square feet. The size of your accessory building is based solely on the size of the property, no matter what Zoning District its in.

Mr. Dryer: Is this structure large enough to house the equipment that is currently on the property?

Mr. Watson: It will house my boat, cars, RV, and personal stuff. The commercial equipment you see is just there to do the work.

Close Public Comment at 8:28 PM.

Planning Commission Review:

All questions have been answered.

Motion by Mr. Lewis concerning Resolution (18-PC-191) The Woods of Portage Lake, ¶60 be stricken [as the information has not been received], ¶110 that the following public input be recorded, ¶120 WHEREAS, the proposed major changes or amendments to the approved amended site plan, (14-PC-155) The Woods of Portage Lake, will not adversely affect the initial basis for granting approval because: a) it is a small addition to the applicant's parcel, b) no known affect to surrounding parcels or the site condominium; ¶130 WHEREAS, the proposed major changes or amendments to the approved amended site plan, (14-PC-155) The Woods of Portage Lake, will not adversely affect the overall project in light of the intent and purpose of such developments as set forth in Article 6 of the Zoning Ordinance, because: a) it is a small area added to the applicants lot, and b) it is supported by the property owners at The Woods of Portage Lake; ¶140 WHEREAS, the proposed major changes or amendments to

the approved amended site plan, (14-PC-155) The Woods of Portage Lake, shall not result in the reduction of open space area because: a) the proposed change does not involve the open space area; ¶150 NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, the Planning Commission, by a majority vote at a duly noticed, regular meeting, held this 28th day of August [2018], GRANTS APPROVAL of the Amendment of a Final Site Plan (18-PC-191) The Woods of Portage Lake, (and continues), all of the recommended conditions as submitted by the Director of Planning and Zoning, with one addition concerning the approval of the Township Engineer's legal description, (DPZ phrased: b) approval shall not be effective until the legal description has been approved by the Township Engineer), concerning c) I would like to propose that we strike from "within one (1) year of this approval" and not require that the applicant submit a zoning map amendment and allow that to be done by the new Zoning Ordinance; (DPZ: so strike all of condition c?) I'm going to ask your guidance on that, it seems that leaving the beginning of this "if the area being added to Lot 5 should be rezoned by the Township by adoption of the new Zoning Map".

Mr. Nester: Isn't that a requirement that needs to be rezoned, that parcel of land?

DPZ Michels: Nope. It's a very good practice because otherwise it creates a lot of confusion, and weirdness, and horrible things in the future. It has a potential for that. It's not required.

Mr. Nester: Will his property boundary be defined under two separate zones?

DPZ Michels: There will be a peculiarity that does happen frequently when you have properties that aren't combined. We know about it and we can address it. This body itself could initiate that rezoning process because we've got the legal description and could act as a petitioner.

Mr. Lewis: So, his entire parcel would be under one zoning?"

DPZ Michels: Correct.

Mr. Lewis: My purpose is to make it the Township's responsibility to answer the zoning issue. It seems the applicants already jumped through a sufficient number of hoops and obstacles. I'd like to offer a reprieve from that particular item.

Mr. Burch: Mr. Michels, would it be within the purview of the Planning Commission to, pending the receipt of the legal description from the Township Engineer, OHM, that we, at that time initiate the zoning change?

DPZ Michels: Yep. You could either monumentize it in here or perhaps it fits better as BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission will initiate a zoning map amendment once it has approved the legal description.

Mr. Lewis: I would be in agreement with that.

DPZ Michels: BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Planning Commission will initiate a zoning map amendment once the legal description has been approved.

Mr. Burch: Yes.

DPZ Michels: That would also include a striking of "c", because that basically takes care of it.

Mr. Lewis: Yep.

Motion second by Mr. Nester.

Roll Call Vote: Yeas-Gajewski, Lewis, Nester, Burch; Nays-none; Absent-none; Abstain-Mr. Ehman. Motion carried 4-0 Resolution adopted.

Staff reports and all other supporting documents regarding the above agenda items can be obtained at the Township hall during normal business hours. Additionally, these documents are available on the Townships website: www.dextertownship.org and can be viewed on new.livestream.com/dextertownship.org.

6. Approval of Planning Commission Minutes:

Moved by Mr. Ehman, seconded by Mr. Nester, to approve the meeting minutes of June 26, 2018, as presented. Motion carried 5-0.

7. Election of Officers: No action

8. Township Board of Trustees Update:

Bill Gajewski, Township Board Representative gave a report on the July 17th and August 21st regular Township Board Meetings.

9. Concerns of Commission Members, Director of Planning and Zoning, Supervisor, and Recording Secretary:

Mr. Burch: Tomorrow Mr. Rider, Mr. Drolett, and myself will be interviewing candidates for the open positions on the Planning Commission.

Mr. Ehman: Hamburg Township is updating their Master Plan and sent out a questionnaire. I'm asking the Commissioners to look at it (on the Hamburg Township website) and evaluate if the questions are helpful and if this is the process used to drive a Master Plan. My second concern is why #3: The Woods of Portage Lake is on the agenda, as I feel this could have been handled administratively.

10. Review of Bylaws: No action.

11. Public Comment: None.

12. Future Agenda Items: September 25, 2018

- A) Surface water and wetlands subcommittee report
- B) Common Use Ordinance

13. Adjournment: Mr. Burch declared meeting adjourned at 9:03 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Lewis, Secretary

Janis Miller, Recording Secretary