

STERLING HEIGHTS PLANNING COMMISSION
REGULAR MEETING
CITY HALL
January 12, 2017

LOCATION: City Council Chambers, 40555 Utica Road, Sterling Heights, MI
SUBJECT: Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission held
January 12, 2017.

Mr. Reinowski called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Members present at roll call: Geoff Gariepy, Paul Jaboro, Edward Kopp, Stefano Militello, Donald Miller, Jeffrey Norgrove, Leonard Reinowski and Gerald Rowe

Members absent at roll call: Benjamin Ancona - Excused

Also in attendance: Chris McLeod, City Planner
Clark Andrews, City Attorney

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Motion by Mr. Rowe, supported by Mr. Gariepy, to **APPROVE** the Agenda.

Ayes: Rowe, Gariepy, Jaboro, Kopp, Militello, Miller, Norgrove, Reinowski
Nays: None
Absent: Ancona
Motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARING - PPCM-1166 - Setzer Properties, LLC

Requesting approval for a planned unit development which includes the development of an approximately 80,000 square foot industrial building and associated trucking terminal in an M-1 Light Industrial District and M-2 Heavy Industrial District - East side of Mound Road, north of Fourteen Mile Road in Section 33.

Property address: 33600 Mound Road

Mr. Reinowski asked Mr. McLeod for an overview.

Mr. McLeod gave an overview of the site plan stating this proposal is for a truck distribution facility. The Planned Unit Development (PUD) concept plan would allow for an approximate 58,000 sq. ft. trucking terminal, 14,000 sq. ft. maintenance building, and about 8,000 sq. ft. of office space. The intended user would be operating 24 hours a day. He displayed the site plans, explaining the zoning designations of the property. He explained the PUD process.

Mr. Reinowski asked if the Commissioners had any questions for Mr. McLeod.

Mr. Militello stated there was a letter received from Liberty Park.

Mr. McLeod stated the owner of Liberty Park submitted the letter which states as of March 1, 2017 the site will close down regardless of what happens with this application.

Mr. Gariepy asked if the parking area was for trailers, and Mr. McLeod stated yes. He also asked about how far the driveway is from the turnaround on Mound to head south. Mr. McLeod stated approximately about 200 feet. Mr. Gariepy then stated, according to the traffic assessment, the truck traffic does not make the traffic worse than it currently is. Mr. McLeod stated that that was correct. Mr. Gariepy asked if it was possible to state in the motion that this particular turnaround would not be used. Mr. McLeod said it could possibly be put in as a condition.

Mr. Rowe stated in the background material there was mention of environmental issues and asked Mr. McLeod to elaborate. Mr. McLeod stated the City does not know of any specific issues but does know there may be issues there.

Mr. Miller asked if this will be a distribution center for FedEx and if there will be truck wells for the smaller trucks similar with the UPS facility. Mr. McLeod stated from his understanding, it will be for semi-truck to semi-truck commercial distribution, not for semi-truck to smaller truck consumer deliveries.

Mr. Norgrove asked if the applicant mentioned anything about using the tracks in the future to bring in their goods by railroad. Mr. McLeod stated nothing has been mentioned to the City regarding rail usage.

Mr. Reinowski asked if there were any other questions for Mr. McLeod. Being none, he asked for the petitioner to come forward to the podium.

Josh Markham, General Counsel for Setzer Properties, 354 Waller Ave, Suite 200, Lexington, KY 40504, came forward. He stated they are a nationwide trucking company and are not planning to use any railroad system. He also addressed the environmental concerns stating they are in the process of doing a Phase 2 environmental assessment and will be working to correct any issues. He also mentioned the peak hours will be at night and should not affect traffic during business rush hours.

Mr. Reinowski asked if there were any questions from the Commissioners.

Mr. Miller asked Mr. Markham to describe the function of the site.

One of the representatives for Setzer explained the trucks will come in around 7:00-8:00 p.m. each day. The trucks will be unloaded and sorted to other trailers. The loaded trailers will leave in the morning hours to start deliveries and return in the evening.

Mr. Gariepy asked if the shipments include private citizens FedEx packages. The representative stated no, these are strictly pallets for larger companies.

Mr. Gariepy asked for an overview of what type and how many jobs will be created at this facility.

Mr. Bower, another representative for Setzer, came forward and stated about 124 jobs would be created for this location; approximately 40 full time and 44 part-time.

Mr. Norgrove asked about the lighting at the facility during the night hours.

A representative stated it will be lit for the safety of the drivers as well as the workers.

Mr. Reinowski asked the Commissioners for any other questions. Being none, he asked if there were any public participants wanting to speak.

Steve Balmer, 3118 Garden Ave, Royal Oak, came to the podium. He asked the commission to hold off making a decision until later to see if it could still be used as a sports facility.

Jeff Szulya, 1238 Kensington Ave, Grosse Pointe Park, came to the podium. He asked the commission for more in-depth due diligence regarding the traffic.

Julio Russo, lives about 3 miles north of the property. He is concerned about the increase in truck traffic this business would create. He also mentioned Mound Road needing repair and more truck traffic will make it worse.

Mr. Reinowski asked for any other public participation. Being none, he asked the Commissioners for any other questions.

Mr. Rowe asked the Mr. Markham if the property was owned by his client. Mr. Markham stated they are under contract and in the due diligence phase.

Mr. Gariepy asked the petitioner to clarify when trucks would be coming and going.

Mr. Markham stated there will be trucks out on the roads making deliveries but the heavy traffic into the facility will be at night.

Mr. Norgrove asked the petitioner if the company knows what they will do when Mound Road goes under construction.

Mr. Bower stated the amount of traffic will not be more that what has gone in and out of the property under previous use as a sports facility. All their drivers are employed by FedEx and they will make adjustments when the construction starts.

Mr. Reinowski asked if there were any other questions from Commissioners. Being none, he asked for a motion.

Motion by Mr. Militello, supported by Mr. Miller, in the case of PPCM-1166, 33600 Mound Road, I move to **recommend approval** of the concept plan for the Planned Unit Development to the City Council, based upon the facts and plans presented, subject to the following conditions:

1. That the development and operation of the development shall remain consistent with the scale and nature of the use as described in the proposal, at Public Hearing and reflected on the concept plan;
2. That if the concept plan and Planned Unit Agreement are approved by the City Council, the petitioner shall develop, maintain and operate the development in compliance with all pertinent codes, ordinances and standards of the City of Sterling Heights, County of Macomb and the State of Michigan.
3. That if the concept plan and Planned Unit Agreement are approved by the City Council, appropriate site plan and engineering plans meeting all other requirements of the City of Sterling Heights shall be provided by the developer.
4. That if the concept plan and Planned Unit Agreement are approved by the City Council, the modifications requested as a part of the overall PUD concept plan be approved as they generally meet the intent of the City's Zoning Ordinance and specifically the Planned Unit Development Ordinance.
5. That if the concept plan and Planned Unit Agreement are approved by the City Council, the Planned Unit Development Agreement be developed, signed and recorded by the owner of the property and the City which shall also include appropriate long term maintenance provisions of all areas of the site.
6. That with City Council approval, the overall time frame for the completion of the project be within the time frame specified by Ordinance, with the option of further extending the time frame upon request by the applicant and approval by City Council.
7. That the petitioner work with the City Planner to increase landscaping throughout the site to include additional landscaping along the Mound Road frontage, throughout the parking areas and along the side yards of the site. In particular landscaping sufficient to buffer the keeping of vehicles near the front of the site should be provided.
8. That the additional pedestrian connections be provided as outlined in the Planning Office's staff report.
9. That all fencing that is visible from an abutting public thoroughfare or abutting property be decorative in nature as required by Ordinance and that the fencing

along Mound Road be set back from the right of way to accommodate the required greenbelt plantings.

10. That the site plan review comments provided by the Planning Office be addressed as a part of revised concept plans or as site plan approval is applied for.
11. **That the design and façade materials be upgraded to meet City requirements including the use of brick or other similar materials.**
12. That the applicant work with the Macomb County Department of Roads all other necessary agencies and implementing the traffic improvements suggested within the Traffic Impact Assessment.
13. The recommendation of the Planning Commission shall remain valid and in force only as long as the facts and information presented to the Commission in the public hearing are found to be correct and the conditions upon which this motion is based are forever maintained as presented to the Commission.

This action is based on the following findings:

1. That the proposed development of the property in accordance with the proposed concept plan complies with the intent and Ordinance requirements set forth in Section 22.03 of the Zoning Ordinance authorizing planned unit developments. To the extent of any conflict between the proposed PUD development as set forth in the PUD Agreement and the concept plan and other conflicting provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, the provisions of the PUD Agreement and the contents of the concept plan shall control.
2. That the concept plan provides for the reasonable redevelopment of one of the largest continuous tracts of land within the City.
3. That the proposed use is located within the City's primary industrial corridor and is completely surrounded with industrial users, many of which are of a heavy industrial nature.
4. That the site is located on a regional thoroughfare (Mound Road), and is serviced by an eight (8) lane boulevard roadway.
5. The site backs into the existing rail corridor.
6. The site does have environmental issues which limits the use of the site over time.
7. That the landscaping incorporated into the concept plan and associated exhibits is consistent with the newly adopted landscaping standards for commercial and industrial sites.

Mr. Reinowski asked if there was any discussion on the motion.

Mr. Gariepy asked about adding a condition regarding the nearest turn-around on Mound.

Mr. Andrews stated he didn't think the city has the ability to impose that condition because Mound is not a city road.

Mr. Reinowski asked if there was any other discussion on the motion. Being none, he asked for a roll call vote.

Ayes: Militello, Miller, Norgrove, Reinowski, Rowe, Gariepy, Jaboro, Kopp
Nays: None
Absent: Ancona

Motion carried.

PUBLIC HEARING - PZ16-1147 - Frank Karam

Requesting approval of a conditional rezoning from 0-2 (Planned Office) district to RM-3 (Multiple Family and High-Rise) district to allow for the construction of a 57 unit senior independent living facility - between Schoenherr and Hayes Road, south of Hall Road in Section 01.

Property address: 14460 Lakeside Circle

Mr. Reinowski asked Mr. McLeod for an overview.

Mr. McLeod displayed site plans and gave an overview of the proposal. He stated the conditional rezoning is for a 57 unit senior living facility.

Mr. Reinowski asked if there were any questions from the Commissioners for Mr. McLeod.

Mr. Gariepy asked if the requested variance, regarding parking within 25 feet of the building, is specified in the code to protect the building or for aesthetic purposes.

Mr. McLeod stated it is a little of both. In a traditional setting, the greenbelt becomes necessary but looking to the future, the city is trying to intensify the Lakeside area, and to that end, the setbacks may be somewhat reduced.

Mr. Norgrove stated a boardwalk is mentioned in the Master Plan and wanted to know if it is north of this property and asked if the petitioner is aware of this plan.

Mr. McLeod stated the Master Plan shows the bridge in the area of this property to the island, and there have been discussions regarding this with the petitioner.

Mr. Reinowski asked if there were any other questions from Commissioner. Being none, he asked the petitioner to come to the podium.

Tom Ciaramitaro, attorney for the petitioner, 42850 Garfield, Suite 101, Clinton Twp, came forward to the podium. He displayed a revised site plan and described the additional landscaping they plan to put in. He stated they are consistent with other business around Lakeside Circle.

Mr. Reinowski asked for any question from the Commissioners.

Mr. Rowe stated he appreciated the added landscaping to the property.

Mr. Reinowski asked for public participation.

Charles Jefferson came forward to the podium and asked how many senior centers already exist on Lakeside Circle. He also asked what the city is doing to attract younger residents.

Mr. McLeod stated this is not an assisted living facility, which makes it different from the others. He also explained even though the long term goal is to have a vibrant city, you cannot ignore the fact that the city's residents are aging. Within a community, you have to have all demographics accounted for.

Mario Armors, lives in Sterling Heights across the water from the proposed property. He stated he is against proposal. He gave an example of a condo development that was proposed 20 years and was not passed. He asked what this could be converted to in the future if the assisted living wasn't successful. He expressed the proposal is too intense for the area and asked the commission to deny the request. He asked if it could at least be postponed, as the proposal was moved up a week and he would like to be able to talk to neighbors and get a petition together.

Mr. Reinowski asked for any other public participation. Being none, he asked for any questions from the Commissioners.

Mr. Rowe asked the petitioner to give an overview of the size of the units and what other uses might take place besides senior living.

Mr. Ciaramitaro stated it is their intention to have 57 units for seniors. They have no plans to change this for another use.

The petitioner's architect, 720 Ann Arbor Street, Flint, came forward to the podium. He described the one and two bedroom units. He stated it would be difficult to turn this into a condominium development because of the way it will be set up for seniors.

Mr. Ciaramitaro stated there would not be an increase in traffic flow compared to an office building being there.

Mr. Norgrove asked Mr. McLeod how many mailings were sent out and asked how the administration addresses the traffic flow issues.

Mr. McLeod stated with a senior housing development, typically there are fewer trips per unit. He does not see the increase of traffic as an issue.

Mr. Reinowski asked Mr. McLeod to explain the two mailings Mr. Armors received.

Mr. McLeod stated the first mailing included an inaccurate date. The second mailing had the correct date and was mailed with adequate time.

Mr. Militello stated there was a letter from the petitioner. Mr. McLeod stated the letter is the conditions the applicant proposed and is part of the file.

Mr. Miller asked Mr. McLeod how many three-story buildings currently exist within Lakeside Circle. Mr. McLeod stated there is not a significant number of three story buildings. To the north (by Hall Rd.), there are a couple of multi-level buildings and to the southeast (near Hayes), there are a couple buildings of significant size.

Mr. Reinowski asked for any other questions from Commissioners. Being none, he called for a motion.

Motion by Mr. Gariepy, supported by Mr. Norgrove, that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to City Council to APPROVE case number PZ16-1147, Frank Karam Senior Living Facility, to conditionally rezone the subject property from O-2 Planned Office District to RM-3 Multiple Family Mid and High Rise District, and allow the development of a senior living facility as shown on the proposed revised plans for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development of the property with the proposed senior living facility in accordance with the development plans provides a development compatible with the surrounding zoning and land uses currently found throughout Lakeside Circle.
2. Approving a conditional rezoning agreement for this parcel based upon the proposed conditions contained within the development plans will ensure that the development will be constructed in accordance with a specific mutually agreeable conditional rezoning agreement between the petitioner and City prepared by the City Attorney, which incorporates the conditions offered by petitioner, to the benefit of surrounding property owners and the City;
3. That the applicant agrees to obtain site plan approval for the proposed development on the property within twelve (12) months of the effective date of the ordinance amendment approving the rezoning or map amendment, to obtain a building permit for the proposed development within eighteen (18) months of

such effective date, and to complete development of the proposed development within thirty (30) months of such effective date.

4. That a mutually agreeable conditional rezoning agreement be prepared by the City Attorney delineating the terms and conditions of the proposed rezoning to be executed by the property owner, (and facility operator, if different than the owner), and the City and recorded with the Macomb County Register of Deeds within sixty (60) days of approval of the conditional rezoning.
5. That the applicant work with the Planning Department to resolve any remaining site plan issues as outlined in the Planning Department's staff report.
6. Tree sizes must meet minimum City requirements in terms of size/caliper at the time of planting.
7. That as a photometric plan is developed, decorative lighting fixtures that are in size, scale and character with those within the overall Lakeside development be utilized.
8. That the applicant provides additional landscaping, satisfactory to the City Planner, throughout the site to offset the reduction of greenspace arising from approval of the requested variances.
9. That the use and operation of the facility shall remain consistent with the scale and nature of the use as described in the proposal, at Public Hearing and reflected on the plans.
10. That the petitioner shall develop, maintain and operate the facility in compliance with all pertinent codes, ordinances and standards of the City of Sterling Heights, County of Macomb and the State of Michigan.

Mr. Reinowski asked for any discussion on the motion.

Mr. Rowe asked if the site plan the petitioner was referring to, with the additional landscaping, is an update to the site plan that was given to the Planning Commission.

Mr. McLeod stated it is an update and has not been reviewed by administration and would still have to be in compliance.

Mr. Reinowski asked for any further discussion on the motion. Being none, he asked for a roll call vote.

Ayes: Gariepy, Norgrove, Jaboro, Kopp, Militello, Miller, Reinowski, Rowe

Nays: None

Absent: Ancona

Motion carried.

Mr. McLeod stated they will look into the issue of the public notice and will inform the Commission with their findings. He stated this case is tentatively scheduled to appear before City Council on February 7, 2107.

Mr. Reinowski called for a recess.

Mr. Reinowski called meeting to order.

PUBLIC HEARING - PZ16-1150 - Global Development

Requesting approval of an amendment to a previously approved conditional rezoning (PZ15-1134) to allow for the construction of an 80 unit senior living center within the RM-2 Multiple Family Low Rise District - east side of Mound Road between Poplar and Higgins Ave. in Section 04.

Property address: 44214, 44230, 44242, 44256, 44266, 44282, and 44294 Mound Road

Mr. Reinowski asked Mr. McLeod for an overview.

Mr. McLeod displayed site plans and gave an overview stating this is an amendment to the prior conditional rezoning which was approved for a multiple family development. The revised application is for the development of a two-story, 80 unit senior living facility.

Mr. Reinowski asked if the Commissioners had any questions for Mr. McLeod.

Mr. Gariepy asked if the petitioner provided any information regarding lighting for the site. Mr. McLeod stated the petitioner did not provide a photometric plan yet. If the site moves forward, they would need to provide a photometric plan meeting the cities requirements.

Mr. Reinowski asked for any other questions from the Commissioners. Being none, he asked the petitioner to come forward to the podium.

Phil Ruggeri, representing the petitioner, came forward to the podium. He explained this senior housing development will be assisted living. There will be minimal traffic consisting of staff and visiting family. There will be complete greenbelt on the east side of the property, and only entering and exiting from Mound Road. He displayed renderings of the building.

Mr. Reinowski asked for any questions from the Commissioners.

Mr. Miller asked Mr. Ruggeri how many units were proposed previously compared to this senior living multi-family development.

Mr. Ruggeri stated the apartment complex had 56 units dispersed in three buildings. The senior complex has 80 units but they are smaller and all in one building.

Mr. Gariepy asked about the lighting in the back (east) area which abuts the residents. Mr. Ruggeri stated there would probably be minimal light in the back, most of the lighting will be in the front where there is parking.

Mr. Reinowski asked for public participation.

Charles Jefferson came forward to the podium. He stated he hopes this project gets done because the last couple proposals didn't.

Diane Deperella came forward to the podium, she is representing her mother Frances Madalinski who lives on Poplar. Her mother's house is the first house abutting the proposed senior complex. She wanted to know what will be put along the boundary and how far will it go.

Therella Adar of Sterling Heights stated this is a better proposal than in the past but wants to know why it can't be downsized a bit. She also feels there should be a wall along the property.

Julio Russo stated he has properties across the street on Poplar and has lived in the area for 61 years. He is for the project and hopes it is expedited. He voiced concern regarding the notices that get sent out to residents. He also asked about the deceleration lanes on Mound.

Mr. Reinowski asked for any other public participation. Being none, he closed public participation.

Mr. Andrews addressed the distribution of notices. He explained the state law under the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act, which applies throughout the State of Michigan, specifies what the notice requirements are for Planning and Zoning. It says that a municipality has to give notice to anyone whose property is within 300 feet from the

perimeter of the property. The City of Sterling Heights complies with that, also publishes in the city newspaper, and gives notice by putting on the city's website. He stated the city makes a good effort to give notice to residents.

Mr. Gariepy asked about the age requirement for this facility.

Mr. Ruggeri stated there is no specific age requirement. This is assisted living for any person who would need 24 hour care regardless of his age.

Mr. Kopp asked Mr. Ruggeri to address what will be put along the boundary abutting Mrs. Madalinski's property.

Mr. Ruggeri stated that they will have a natural effect on the property, there will be trees and berms for screening.

Mr. Miller stated the deceleration lane would be determined by the states road commission; the Planning Commission doesn't have authority to make decisions regarding it.

Motion by Mr. Rowe, supported by Mr. Gariepy, that the Planning Commission forward a recommendation to City Council to **APPROVE** the request of Global Development -- Comfort Care Senior Living, case number PZ16-1150, to amend the previously approved conditional rezoning for the subject property from C-1 (Local Convenience Business District) to RM-2 (Multiple Family Low Rise District) to permit development of the property with an 80 unit, single building senior living facility in place of a 56 unit, 3 building, multiple family residential development as previously proposed, in accordance with the proposed revised plans for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development of the property with the proposed senior living facility in accordance with the revised development plans provides a more advantageous and compatible development of the property with adjacent uses than the multiple family development previously allowed;
2. Amending the conditional rezoning agreement for this property based upon the proposed conditions contained within the revised development plans will ensure that the development will be constructed in accordance with a specific mutually agreeable amendment to the conditional rezoning agreement between the petitioner and City prepared by the City Attorney, which incorporates the conditions offered by petitioner, to the benefit of surrounding property owners and the City;
3. That the applicant agrees to obtain site plan approval for the proposed development on the property within twelve (12) months of the effective date of the ordinance amendment approving the rezoning or map amendment, to obtain a building permit for the proposed development within eighteen (18) months of such effective date, and to complete development of the proposed development within thirty (30) months of such effective date.
4. That a mutually agreeable amendment to the conditional rezoning agreement be prepared by the City Attorney delineating the terms and conditions of the proposed rezoning to be executed by the property owner, (and facility operator, if different than the owner), and the City and recorded with the Macomb County Register of Deeds within sixty (60) days of approval of the amendment to the conditional rezoning.
5. That the applicant work with the Planning Department to resolve any remaining site plan issues as outlined in the Planning Department's Staff Report.
6. That the evergreen plantings along the eastern property line be of such size and number to meet the requirements of the City's moderate screening requirements, including the amount of landscaping provided along the road frontages and eastern property line.

7. That the use and operation of the facility shall remain consistent with the scale and nature of the use as described in the proposal, at Public Hearing and reflected on the plans.
8. That the petitioner shall develop, maintain and operate the facility in compliance with all pertinent codes, ordinances and standards of the City of Sterling Heights, County of Macomb and the State of Michigan.

Mr. Reinowski asked for any discussion on the motion. Being none, he called for a roll call vote.

Ayes: Rowe, Gariepy, Jaboro, Kopp, Militello, Miller, Norgrove, Reinowski

Nays: None

Absent: Ancona

Motion Carried.

Mr. McLeod stated this will be on the February 7, 2017 City Council agenda.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Charles Jefferson, of Sterling Heights, expressed concern over something written by one of the Commissioners on social media.

Mr. Reinowski stated that it would be appropriate for him to go to city administration to make any complaints.

D.J. Koontz, lives on Sterritt in Sterling Heights, stated he is opposed to a hotel in the location (regarding PZ16-1145 M-59 Properties, LLC).

Mr. Reinowski asked if there were any other public comments. Being none, he closed citizen participation.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion by Mr. Militello, supported by Mr. Gariepy, to **APPROVE** the minutes of December 8, 2016.

Ayes: Militello, Gariepy, Miller, Norgrove, Reinowski, Rowe, Kopp

Nays: None

Absent: Ancona

Abstained: Jaboro

Motion Carried.

CORRESPONDENCE

Michigan Association of Planners
Transportation Bonanza 8 by MDOT

OLD BUSINESS

PZ16-1145 - M-59 Properties, LLC

Request for a Conditional Rezoning from C-1 (Local Convenience Business) district, P-1 (Vehicular Parking) district and R-80 (One Family Residential) district to C-3 (General Business) district - South side of Hall Road between M-53 and Sterritt St.

Property addresses: 11106 and 11124 Hall Road, 44871, 44773 and 44891 Sterritt St.

Mr. McLeod stated the applicant requested an indefinite postponement. The applicant is looking to substantially revise the plan and do not know what that time frame may be. When and if the application comes through again, they will re-advertise for the public hearing.

Motion by Mr. Militello, supported by Mr. Rowe, in the case of PZ16-1145 - M-59 Properties, LLC, 11106 and 11124 Hall Road, 44871, 44773 and 44891 Sterritt St., I move to **POSTPONE** indefinitely.

Mr. Gariepy (to clarify for the resident attending) asked Mr. McLeod if the whole application will change and will there be a hotel to be concerned about.

Mr. McLeod stated there is no way of knowing what the new plan will be until the application is submitted.

Mr. Rowe asked if Mr. Koontz could come back to the podium.

Mr. Koontz stated he would suggest to make cases like this (a postponement) known at the beginning of the meeting.

Mr. Norgrove asked Mr. Andrews if it would be possible to move the old business to the top of the agenda.

Mr. Andrews explained if there is a case to be postponed, it is appropriate during the approval of the agenda for a commissioner to request that a particular case be moved to the beginning of the agenda.

Ayes: Militello, Rowe, Miller, Norgrove, Reinowski, Gariepy, Jaboro, Kopp
Nays: None
Absent: Ancona
Motion Carried.

NEW BUSINESS

Election of Officers

Motion by Mr. Militello, supported by Mr. Rowe, to **POSTPONE** Election of Officers to the next meeting since not all Commissioners are present.

Ayes: Militello, Rowe, Miller, Norgrove, Reinowski, Gariepy, Jaboro, Kopp
Nays: None
Absent: Ancona
Motion Carried.

MOTION TO ADJOURN

Motion by Mr. Jaboro, supported by Mr. Militello, to **ADJOURN**.

Ayes: Jaboro, Militello, Kopp, Miller, Norgrove, Reinowski, Rowe, Gariepy
Nays: None
Absent: Ancona
Motion Carried.

The meeting adjourned at 9:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Stefano Militello, Secretary
Planning Commission