

**ADA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES OF THE MAY 19, 2011 MEETING**

A meeting of the Ada Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, May 19, 2011 at 7:30 p.m. at the Ada Township Offices, 7330 Thornapple River Dr., Ada, MI.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Meeting was called to order by Korth at 7:30 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Present: Chairperson Korth, Commissioners Lowry, Hoeks, Lunn, Butterfield, and Treasurer Rhoades.
Also present: Planning Director Ferro.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Chairperson Korth requested exchanging Item #4 for Item #2. Motion by Easter, second by Butterfield, to approve the Agenda as amended. Motion passed unanimously.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE APRIL 19, 2011 MEETING

Motion by Lunn, second by Easter, to approve the April 19, 2011 meeting minutes. Motion passed unanimously.

V. PUBLIC HEARING

Revised Preliminary PUD Plan, Addition of Carports to Hilltop Office Building, 4940 Cascade Rd. SE, Parcel No. 41-15-31-359-014, AMDG Architects for Hilltop Building, LLC

Brent Dykstra, AMDG Architects, highlighted the plans for adding open air carport roofs over 7 parking spaces on the site. The carport structure would consist of pre-finished metal with minimal exposure, simply a roof and some poles with an open view underneath. The request is also for a canopy basically connecting the carport to the south entrance of the existing office building. There are 3 parking spaces to the east and 4 to the south that would be covered. There is a fair amount of existing vegetation that has grown up around the area. Dykstra stated they are proposing an additional landscaped peninsula with vegetation to screen the carport from the east. There has been dialogue with the neighbors regarding their concerns in five areas and they have addressed each of those, in regard to runoff, acoustics, visual impact, a bench that has been removed from the design, and also lighting. As a condition of our approval with regard to lighting, Dykstra stated they would be able to work with planning staff for choosing appropriate fixtures. Also, the lighting under the carport would be on the same timers as the light poles in the existing parking area. There will be one less light pole in the parking as it will be replaced by the fixtures underneath the proposed carport. With the more exposed area to the east they are proposing additional juniper plantings.

Commissioner Hoeks asked what the pitch was on the carport. Brent Dykstra responded it is nominally ¼ inch per foot, very low slope.

Commissioner Easter asked if they were still meeting the number of parking slots that would be required for the building if one spot is taken away. Dykstra stated based on the history it is not parked out to capacity and losing one space is not a hardship.

Treasurer Rhoades asked what the driving force was for adding a carport now, and has the use of some other material been considered instead of a metal roof. Dykstra responded it is an amenity that is perceived by the owner to be a benefit. If you look at the design, it is a system that has a factory applied

finish with a 30-year warranty. The slender roof will have the least visual impact on both sides of the lot line.

Korth opened the public hearing on the request.

Doug Landman, 1062 Greenwood Forest, property owner south of the building, explained the things that have been done over the years to try to minimize impact on the neighborhood, and stated they still have ended up with a building that is less than ideal. Now we have a proposal to take away some of the requirements that were put in place by the Planning Commission when the building was originally approved. Unless they make the carport literally invisible and soundproof, non-illuminated and fully porous, there is going to be some impact that structure has on the properties to the south. It won't enable them to better market the building; it won't enhance the owner's revenue strength or the Township's tax base; it won't enhance the aesthetics to benefit the community.

Michael Coles, 1047 Huckleberry Lane, stated he agrees with Doug. He thinks a carport cheapens the property around it, and does not enhance the building or the neighborhood around it.

Korth closed the public hearing

Dykstra responded that they are really attempting to engage in a productive dialogue. He stated he does not believe the views are affected by the carport height. The existing screening has matured and grown up quite a bit, and the foliage on the applicant's property is quite dense and mature to a height of 14-16 feet above the parking lot.

Commissioner Butterfield asked if carports are considered an accessory building. Planning Director Ferro stated they are an accessory to this use, but accessory buildings for commercial property uses are not specifically addressed in the zoning rules.

Butterfield asked if other covered areas had been considered to the west of the building. Dykstra responded they had looked at the layout for the targeted number of spaces and this was the most efficient with the goal of covering the entry and providing the most continuous path to the rear of the building.

Butterfield asked if there is currently fencing between the property and the neighbors to the south. Brent Dykstra responded there is an existing fence across part of the south property line. He stated his understanding is it's doing its job of shielding the lights from the upper level windows of the adjacent homes.

Commissioner Lowry asked why the new owner wants the carport, and whether they have discussed a rubberized canvas as opposed to metal. Rubberized could be less noticeable; it could be done in a color that would fit in the area, and you would get minimal noise from it. Dykstra stated it is generally an amenity for working out of the building - shielding of vehicles from the sun in the summer and the snow in the winter. He stated they have not explored a rubberized canvas type of option.

Lowry stated he was concerned with visual impact. With regard to noise, he doesn't feel it would be any different than rain hitting the roof of a car.

Rhoades stated that noise from rain would be more of an issue at night, when there is less ambient noise. He stated he liked the idea of a rubber membrane roof that would produce less noise from rain.

Korth asked if the applicant had considered using a tray-based green roof system on top as it does deaden the noise, creates an aesthetically pleasing view out the building, and can be designed with lining material along the edges to shield the actual structure of the carport. Korth pointed out that a green roof system on

the carports would also reduce runoff. Korth encouraged the applicant to consider a green roof approach, and stated he would support approval with either a green roof or rubber roof.

Easter questioned whether the major objection of fellow Commission members and neighbors was the sound or the look.

Homeowner Doug Landman responded to Easter's comment by stating it's really all of the above depending on where you live in the neighborhood. He stated for him it's more the noise, but for other neighbors it's visual.

Hoeks stated he could not think of any building on Cascade Rd. that has carports. He believes it would be unfortunate if carports proliferated along the Cascade Rd. corridor.

Korth stated he could empathize with the owner's desire to have a parking space protected from the weather. He has some concern that the carports will impact, over time, the quality of the foliage on the adjacent evergreen screening, which needs full sun.

Butterfield stated she would like to be able to visit the site prior to voting on this item.

Lunn stated he would like to have the applicant evaluate the green roof option, and respond as to its feasibility.

Motion made by Butterfield, second by Easter, to postpone action for one month until more information is provided. Motion passed unanimously.

Dykstra stated that in the early development of the carport concept, they considered the possibility of a custom-engineered structure, and a possible green roof, and dismissed the concept based on cost feasibility.

Korth stated two things need to be addressed by the applicant for the next meeting: one is we need to assess visibility from a distance in the neighborhood, as well as possibly scaling back the number of spaces could potentially bring your costs into alignment and accomplish most of your goals.

Lunn suggested being provided with addresses of existing installations of the same carport system that could be viewed by Commission members.

Preliminary PUD Plan/Request for PUD Rezoning, 3,790 Square Foot Dental/Office Building, 4875 Cascade Rd. SE, Parcel No. 41-15-31-302-053, Rockford Construction for Dr. Lathe Miller

Todd Schaal, The Estes Group, presented the revisions that have been made to the original project plans. Schaal stated they have worked on the drainage problem, and have reduced the building size from 4,500 to 4,200 square feet. He stated they have been working closely with Jim Ferro and neighbor Don Kimball. He noted they are leaving the arborvitae on the north property line in place, and have added significant landscaping. Schaal stated they have also contacted Jim Schumar, who owns the adjacent office building to the west, as well regarding the proposed building.

Jim Ferro stated the new building would replace a current residential structure that was converted in the 1980's to office use. This project came in under PUD zoning to seek slight relaxation from normal office standards in a couple of areas: (1) side yard setback from the west lot line of 15 feet instead of the required 25 feet, (2) on the east side 21 feet instead of required 25 feet, and (3) the rear yard setback from 40 feet required to 33 feet. All of the normal office district setbacks combined result in a very small allowable building envelope on that site, thus the reason for asking for relaxation of the standards. The

site design places the parking in the front of the building with the driveway access on Argo Avenue rather than Cascade Road.

Ferro stated he believes minor revisions are needed in a few areas: (1) the parking lot needs an additional 225 square feet of landscaped island space, (2) the landscape plan indicates planting of a tree in a location that appears to be in the road right-of-way; (3) the landscape plan identifies an existing tree to remain that appears to conflict with the proposed parking area, and would therefore need to be removed, and (4) the landscape plan doesn't show the property boundaries.

Ferro stated an underground storage storm water management system is proposed that he suggests be increased to 300 linear feet of 24 inch pipe to come closer to conformance with our storm water ordinance. The storm water management system has been designed to lessen the storm water impacts from the site compared to current conditions, but it falls short of meeting the design requirements as stated in our storm water ordinance for new development. Ferro stated the maximum release rate has been sized so it doesn't exceed the capacity of an existing 6 inch storm lateral that has never been used rather than sizing it to meet the maximum allowed release rate that's in our ordinance.

Todd Schaal responded the 6 inch pipe is on the corner of this property and the adjacent property of Mr. Kimball's. The Road Commission put in a drain several years ago trying to solve the drainage problems in the area. Schaal stated they have sized the system to the maximum that the existing 6 inch pipe that is there will handle, but he agrees with Ferro's recommendation to increase the pipe size on the property.

Public Comments:

Jim Schumar, 4843 Cascade Road, stated he is excited to have a nice building there, but you need to be careful with allowing variation from the setback requirements.

Board Comments:

Korth asked if this is basically a new building why would we not ask the applicant to meet our zoning requirements for storm water runoff management.

Ferro stated the allowable discharge rate in the ordinance is equivalent to a green site, so the ordinance is intended to insure that when a green site is developed the post development peak discharge rate is no greater than it was prior to development. He noted that in this case, we are not starting with a green site, but with a previously developed site with no storm water management. What is proposed by the applicant reduces the storm water impacts from what they are currently, but it's not getting back to the equivalent of a green site. Ferro stated the storm water ordinance does not specifically address requirements for re-development of previously-developed sites.

Todd Schaal referred to picture #5 showing the stream going into Don Kimball's yard. He stated their development will take care of a lot of the water flowing down from the parking lot, and there is also a lot of water that flows from Mr. Schumar's property as well. Schaal stated they have talked about planting river birches down there along with putting in a lot of landscaping, which will help significantly.

Easter asked if the applicant is working to meet LEED standards. Schaal responded that Rockford Construction has people who are LEED certified, and they want to do all they can so they have that plaque in front for people to see. Regarding the landscaping islands, they would like to put the landscaping outside the parking lot because those spaces are precious.

Rhoades questioned the air-conditioning unit and a buffer being erected to deaden the sound from reaching the neighbors. Schaal stated Don Kimball works in the air-conditioning business, and he

suggested putting them on the west side of the building, and that's the same side as the other building's units are.

Ferro commented on what appears to be an old well head that should be properly sealed. Ferro pointed out this is a relatively small scale project, and on some previous projects of this scale the Planning Commission has combined Preliminary PUD approval and Final PUD approval, so the applicant's remaining step after this would be Township Board approval of the Plan. However, the Commission may not want to combine the approval process if it wishes to review changes made to the plan as called for in conditions of approval. The other question is whether the building elevations as shown in the applicant's submittal are locked in at this point or whether they are subject to change.

Schaal responded that they submitted landscaping plans as well as elevations even though they are not required at this step. The elevations are not locked in stone, but they are close. Along with what Jim is suggesting they are on board with the recommendations, although they are requesting some help with the landscape island in the parking lot. The doctor is now running into a lease expiration and this is giving anxiety, and if we could chat a little bit about the requirements and that type of thing, then go from here to the Board that would be awesome.

Korth suggested there is one spot in the parking lot that is pie shaped and that could be converted to a planted island. He asked what the plans were for the siding material of the building. Schaal responded composite stone and Hardyboard.

Korth asked if the applicant would be willing to make that a condition of approval. Schaal responded absolutely. Schaal also stated they are comfortable with a landscape plan subject to staff approval.

Korth stated that in Item #6 of Jim's conditions of approval: (A) is changing the parking lot landscaping, and (C) involves the storm water system that would meet the ordinance of Ada Township; Item #7 would be that the building would be finished as presented on the plans using cultured stone and Hardie board siding; and #8 would be that the exterior building lighting be of residential quality and nature.

Motion made by Easter, seconded by Rhoades, to approve the Preliminary and Final PUD Plan, subject to the following conditions:

1. The PUD Plan shall consist of a 3,841 square foot building, with a maximum of 3,001 square feet used for dental office use, as shown on the plan titled "Preliminary Site Plan, 4875 Cascade Rd. SE, Sheets 1, 2 and 3, with a revision date of May 13, 2011, except as revised herein.
2. All public and private utilities serving the site shall be underground.
3. A driveway access permit from the Kent County Road Commission shall be issued, prior to issuance of a building permit.
4. A storm water permit application shall be submitted by the applicant, and a storm water permit shall be issued by the Township, prior to initiation of site improvements.
5. The well located near the southwest corner of the building shall be closed and sealed in accordance with Health Department regulations, prior to demolition of the home on the property.
6. The Plan shall be revised to address the following items:
 - a. Provide required internal parking lot landscaping.
 - b. Address comments in the May 18, 2011 staff report.

- c. revise the storm water management system to comply with the storm water ordinance.
- 7 The exterior materials used on the building shall be cultured stone and cement board siding as indicated on the renderings submitted by the applicant.
- 8. Any building-mounted exterior lighting shall be of a residential quality and character.

Request for Special Use Permit for Type 2 Home Occupation, Fabrication Business in 2,500 Square Feet of Existing Pole Building, 491 McCabe Ave. NE, Parcel No. 14-15-24-300-054, Shannon and Dawn Symes

Shannon Symes stated they are requesting a Type 2 permit for a small business located at their home. Steve from the Zoning Commission came out and we have met all the requirements.

Jim Ferro noted a lot split application had been submitted, and in reviewing the application we became aware there was a business being conducted out of this residential property that involved fabrication and assembly that was never approved for a home occupation by the Township. It is a large property, and there is no visible evidence of the business from the road, there are no outside employees coming to the residence, and they receive an occasional UPS truck visit to deliver raw materials or pick up finished product. There is no outdoor storage; everything is conducted in about 2500 square feet of a pole barn on the property.

Ferro stated there was one comment submitted from Fred Wertz, the land contract holder on the property, who sold the property on a warranty deed and a portion of it was subject to a land contract, and there is now some legal action in regard to the status of the land contract.

Shannon Symes explained the product is all pre-fab. He brings in the material in his truck and cuts it with a chop saw or a table saw. There is no fabrication on the site. Fabrication is really assembly. The left over pre-fab material goes into a waste receptacle which is brought back and is melted down, so we are green because we don't have any of the material on-site. The raw material is fiber reinforced plastic (FRP) purchased at Home Depot. Everything is really assembled at the shop and not fabricated.

Public Comments:

Thomas Dyke, 601 McCabe, stated he came for a fact-finding mission as he had no idea what they were manufacturing.

Shannon Symes responded it is a dog whelping box. He stated they sell these to breeders across the country on a web site. Somebody will buy the box and he will build it and ship it to them. He stated they also sell to universities. The reason they use this material is it's cleaner than wood.

Board Comments:

Butterfield asked if there were any resins or anything of that nature involved. Symes responded it is glass fiber reinforced PVC. There is a little bit of dust but that's confined inside the building and afterwards they vacuum it all up and discard that. They use PVC glue from Home Depot to put it together and then that is discarded. So there's no fabrication and there's no fumes. Everything is stored inside buildings and nothing is stored outside. Symes also stated they are actually getting ready to put their business up for sale and are dealing with a broker. They have been doing this for seven years so if it ever expands it will not expand with us.

Korth stated the gist of the letter received from the neighbor is he has a land contract with the Symes and there is some sort of dispute about the land contract. Korth asked Ferro if he felt it had a bearing on this request. Ferro responded there currently is one parcel here and there's potential for this property to be divided. Based on what is described in Mr. Wertz letter, default on land contract, then only a portion of this parcel is subject to the land contract. The rest of it was already conveyed by warranty deed when the Symes' first acquired the property. The open meadow west of the pole barn would be a separate lot that would be accessed from the private road that is to the west off Bailey Meadows Drive. So potentially there's another neighbor in the future, on another lot that could be created as a consequence of this land contract matter that apparently is the subject of an upcoming hearing.

Symes stated he believes his request complies with the Type 2 home occupation regulations. Symes stated if they knew when they purchased this house that the Type 2 home occupation approval was needed, they would have done so. He stated as soon as he got the letter from Steve he went in within the time frame requested and submitted this application because he wanted to make sure they were in compliance.

Korth asked if they have a Special Use permit on 15 acres and they use a land division to sell off part of the land, the Special Use permit doesn't convey to the separate parcel; it remains, does it not, with the parcel with the structure where the work is being done. If we can say it remains with wherever the house and the barn is he doesn't see it having any direct bearing. Even if it conveys back to this neighbor who has a problem, he's already given us his opinion as to what his sentiments are.

Ferro stated yes, but he may only end up with a portion of the property. Korth stated, true, but can we not define a Special Use permit to apply only inside that building.

Symes responded that he does not legally hold title to the property. He did not fill out the land contract correctly, when he subdivided the land he was supposed to have two separate tax ID's. Legally the tax ID is under Shannon and Dawn Symes.

Korth asked Symes if he had any timeline for a settlement in mind that he thinks could happen. Symes responded the parties go to court at the end of the month, but at that point he already has violated some guidelines with the State of Michigan. So, he doesn't know.

Korth stated we can just postpone action and put it back on the agenda when the dust settles a little bit.

Ferro stated he agreed with postponing action. Since the applicant in good faith has submitted the application we wouldn't pursue any enforcement action until this is decided.

Motion by Lunn, second by Lowry, to postpone action until this gets cleared up.

Development Plan for a Proposed Office/Residential Unit Addition of 5,000 Square Feet to an Existing 16,500 Square Foot Building, Special Use Permit Request to Allow Multiple Family Dwelling, Live-Work Unit and Office/Institutional Uses, 660 Ada Dr., Parcel No. 41-15-34-152-009, Integrated Architecture for Thornapple Pines Rental, LLC

Michael Corby, Executive Vice President, Integrated Architecture, stated also present is Jay Rosloniec with Thornapple Pines and Rick Pulaski with Nederveld, the civil engineer on the project.

Corby stated he is glad for the input gotten from previous sessions, and they did receive comments from Jim and we have addressed some of those things. We'd really like to get an approval today to keep moving forward. Corby stated from previous conversations, it appears the most appropriate path was to use the Mix-Use Overlay District and looking at this building as a civic building. He stated they are

looking for a Special Use Permit because with the civic building lot we do need to get special use approval for any uses that are not civic.

Corby presented slides depicting the existing building, comprised of two different building block built at different times. Corby stated they want to bring the windows back to life and open the building up. They want to retain the main entrance to the building on Ada Drive, and they have taken the façade stone and recessed it so the recesses align with the windows above. He stated they want to try to make the front façade people-friendly. They are proposing to replace all the windows in the existing building with windows that match the original style in terms of the panes. The primary entrance to the building will be adjacent to the parking area on the north side of the building. He noted this will be a LEED-certified building. They plan to use a pewter colored metal siding with horizontal reveals in the metal. It's a smooth painted product. The new areas of the building façade will be either glass or the painted pewter color.

Corby stated the big change with the driveway is it will start with at a 2-1/2% grade which will help the safety of the ingress/egress. They are introducing new landscaping into the parking area. They will also be repairing the sidewalk along the Ada Drive frontage and bringing it back to life. Rick Pulaski, civil engineer, has met with the Road Commission staff, regarding their plans to re-pave Ada Drive. Corby noted the Road Commission has reviewed their plan and requiring a deceleration taper for the reconstructed driveway entry.

Corby stated they have tried to address some of the things Jim brought up in his report, and they hope to get approval tonight.

Ferro stated there are two different reviews: (1) is review of the Development Plan under the provisions of the new Form-Based Code that is an optional procedure, and (2) is the Special Use Permit for the office and residential uses on a civic building lot. There are separate sets of standards for each one, and the standards for the Development Plan review include the dimensional as well as the architectural standards.

Ferro stated there is also a third decision point and that is whether to approve departures from any of the standards as described in his memo. Ferro stated he believes the site is well suited to office, residential and mixed-use. Ferro noted he did recommend postponement due to there being a lot of discussion about the departures from the Form-based zoning regulations that are proposed. The Special Use is subject to a public hearing, but the Development Plan is not. The final decisions on both lie with the Planning Commission.

Korth opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. Korth closed the public hearing.

Rhoades asked if the applicant could provide some landscape screening that would screen the site from the home at the corner of Ada Drive and Rix St. He also commented that's it's a little difficult to do much with the building to make it look like a village building, and this may be the best that can be done short of re-facing the whole building.

Ferro stated one thing that was not mentioned in the applicant's presentation and in his own comments was the driveway connection access to Mars Street. Ferro stated he believes it should be retained as an alternate means of getting in or out of the site for occupants. Corby stated they are fine with retaining the connection.

Lowry asked about the purpose of the deceleration taper, and its relationship to the speed limit. Ferro stated it was to allow vehicles to slow down and ease out of the travel lane before turning into the driveway. There is no change in speed limit proposed.

Butterfield stated the building plan is elegant and understated. She asked whether the access to the site would be gated. Corby replied the site would not have restricted access.

Butterfield also asked if the road could be narrowed to calm traffic along the Ada Drive frontage. Corby stated that the road starts to taper and narrow just down the hill from the building. The Road Commission's only solution proposed was the taper.

Butterfield asked whether there was any phasing of the proposal involved, and whether there were any components that would be added later. Corby replied it would all be constructed at once, and would not be phased.

Easter agreed it is an elegant and beautiful building but questioned whether it fit into the village and what has been created on the other side of the train trestle. She also added that the current building is an eyesore, so she is excited to see something done with it that is very nice, but her conundrum is she has a hard time imagining it in the village. She stated that she goes back and forth, in that it doesn't seem like something that fits in Ada, but given what the applicant has to work with, it's a nice addition, and she looks forward to seeing it.

Hoeks commented he doesn't like the façade on Ada Drive, and would think you could make it look far less institutional. Corby commented that they are not proposing any change to the Ada Drive façade. Hoeks added that he was suggesting that perhaps they could change it.

Korth stated he does not see a single material change from what was presented previously. He noted this stretch of road is the entrance to the historic Village of Ada; it's the quiet entrance to our community. Korth stated if we are to consider a proposal that is so diametrically in violation of the codes that he has just spent the last 3 years developing, he can't imagine voting for it. Korth stated if the owner is serious about the form, the square footage the applicant is after, which he supports, it needs to go out to a group of architects for a way to do this building correctly. To take this intensely modern form and canvas a building that was poorly done when it was originally built, is adding a travesty upon a travesty. Korth stated he loved the concept of the form but hates the packaging.

Corby commented they have taken a lot of steps that have been sensitive to that building. He stated they are trying to keep what's there, and trying to sensitively place what they are adding in positions that are less obvious. He added they are very sensitive to this community and this building.

Lowry stated maybe the applicant could go back and look at 1900 designs when it was built to see what could be incorporated. Corby stated they could deal with the detailing of the additions in a way that maybe is absolutely compliant. The thing that is a little difficult in the approach the Commission is suggesting is to say we're going to cover up and re-do the original gymnasium building.

Korth stated we have a set of codes that talk about the scale, type, shape, size of windows, we have a code that talks about what materials should be used on the outside of a structure. In his mind that's what he wants to see being applied here. Korth stated we developed those standards so structures being built around this village continue to keep a repetitive historic feel and theme to the core of this village.

Motion by Hoeks, second by Lowry, to postpone action for one month.

Korth stated what we do with this building establishes where Ada goes for the next 50 years.

Corby requested individual time for additional dialogue with Korth. If the Commission is happy with the ideas and basic tenets of the ideas, how can we get some conditional approval where we can work with you and you can help represent maybe how we can be more compliant.

Ferro suggested a special meeting between now and next month's meeting.

Motion by Hoeks, second by Lowry, to withdraw the original motion to postpone for one month.

Ferro stated the Commission could consider acting on the special use permit request, to address the proposed uses, and address the development plan approval separately.

Motion by Rhoades, second by Easter, to approve the Special Use permit authorizing residential, live-work unit and office/institutional use at 660 Ada Dr. Motion passed unanimously.

Motion by Lunn, second by Lowry, to postpone approval of the Development Plan for one month.

Motion passed unanimously.

VI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None.

VII. NEW BUSINESS

None.

VIII. STAFF/COMMITTEE/COMMISSION MEMBER REPORTS

Discussion of Planning Commission Priorities for 2011

Korth stated these were in the packets and would suggest tomorrow afternoon talking about that for a few minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Bernie Veldkamp, 5580 Hall St., welcomed Mr. Hoeks back to the Commission.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Lowry, second by Easter, to adjourn the meeting at 11:10 p.m. Motion passed unanimously.

Respectfully Submitted,

Susan Burton, Township Clerk

SB/dr