

**MINUTES  
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS  
PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING/REGULAR MEETING  
FARMINGTON HILLS CITY HALL – COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
April 21, 2016, 7:30 P.M.**

Chair Topper called the Planning Commission meeting to order at 7:30 p.m. on April 21, 2015.

Commissioners Present: Blizman, Fleischhacker, Mantey (7:33 p.m.), McRae, Orr, Schwartz, Stimson, Topper

Commissioners Absent: Rae-O'Donnell

Others Present: Staff Planner Stec, City Engineer Darnall, City Attorney Schultz, Planning Consultant Arroyo

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Staff Planner Stec explained that Agenda Item 4.A. Rezoning Request 1-2-2016 had been withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

**MOTION by McRae, support by Blizman, to approve the agenda as amended, with Agenda Item 4.A. Rezoning Request 1-2-2016 withdrawn.**

**Motion carried 8-0.**

**PUBLIC HEARING:**

**A. REZONING REQUEST 1-2-2016**

LOCATION:	27835 Shiawassee Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-36-254-001
PROPOSAL:	Rezone parcel currently zoned RA-4, One Family Residential District to RC-3, Multiple Family Residential District or SP-1, Special Purpose District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Recommendation to City Council
APPLICANT:	Jacob Bacall
OWNER:	Archdiocese of Detroit

This application was withdrawn by the applicant.

**B. SUBDIVISION OPEN SPACE PLAN 1, 2016**

LOCATION:	North of Eight Mile Rd. between Halsted Rd. and Goldsmith St.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-32-301-005 & 014
PROPOSAL:	Subdivision open space site condominium plan containing seventeen (17) detached single family homes in RA-1, One Family Residential District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Tentative approval of Preliminary Plan
APPLICANT:	Paul Elkow
OWNER:	Gary H. and Pearl Burton, Linda K. Grisham

As Applicant Elkow was not yet present, Commissioner Blizman made the following motion:

**MOTION by Blizman, support by Schwartz, to table agenda item 1.B. Subdivision Open Space Plan 1, 2016, until after 5.A. Site and Landscape Plan 55-3-2016.**

**Motion carried 8-0.**

**REGULAR MEETING**

**A. SITE AND LANDSCAPE PLAN 55-3-2016**

LOCATION:	21017 Middlebelt Rd.
PARCEL I.D.:	22-23-35-478-001, 012
PROPOSAL:	Addition to existing building (The Manor of Farmington Hills) in SP-1, Special Purpose District
ACTION REQUESTED:	Approval of Site and Landscape Plan
APPLICANT:	Farmington Hills Senior Leasing
OWNER:	Farmington Hills Senior Leasing

Utilizing overhead slides, and referring to his review letter of April 18, 2016, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the background for this application, which was for approval of final site plan, landscape plan and tree removal permit in order to construct a 31,353 square foot addition to an existing skilled nursing and rehabilitation facility (Manor of Farmington Hills).

Planning Consultant Arroyo explained that the Planning Commission had previously seen and approved an application for this property by this applicant. The applicant had since modified the plans and changed the configuration of the building. The revised plan had been resubmitted as a new application.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said that this was an existing facility that was proposed to be expanded, and described its location and the surrounding zoning and uses.

One of the main changes was that the site plan now showed an ingress/egress drive along Eldred Street at the property's northeast corner and an egress only drive at the southeast corner of the site. The existing site had existing two-way access drives on Eldred and Middlebelt Road. There were also changes to the design and configuration of the building.

Planning Consultant Arroyo said the applicants were proposing an 18,690 square foot building addition to the west of the building. The proposed 48,260 square foot building would house 116 beds in a skilled care and rehabilitation residential facility. The building was getting larger but actual capacity was only increasing by 14 beds as rooms and facilities were being enlarged to keep in line with current market conditions and to modernize the facility.

A cupola being proposed along the east side of the building would extend 8 feet above the 25-foot height maximum. The cupola met the requirements of Section 34-3.26.3.B and could be approved, subject to the review of the Planning Commission.

Regarding parking, while adequate parking spaces were being provided, there were two issues that needed to be addressed:

- The spaces shown in cross-section A were 18 feet deep with a 22-foot drive aisle and a 2-foot overhang. The spaces scaled 20 feet deep. The spaces at the northwest corner facing Eldred Street did not have a 2-

foot overhang due to the wall abutting the lot. The applicant needed to clarify if the spaces in this section continued to be 20 feet, or if they had been reconfigured.

- The applicant had also proposed 7 spaces at the northeast corner of the site facing Middlebelt Road. Those spaces were located within the 50-foot minimum front yard setback for the site. Section 34-5.2 prohibited off-street parking with the minimum front setback for this district. Therefore the applicant should remove those spaces from the plan. If the spaces were removed, there was still adequate parking to meet ordinance requirements, and there also was room to incorporate spaces elsewhere if the applicants thought this necessary.

Regarding access, Eldred would be paved up to the point of the new access there.

Regarding exterior lighting, the applicant should show documentation for meeting all lighting requirements. Also, the maximum pole height was 15 feet, not 20 feet as shown. Additionally the 4:1 average to minimum ratio had not been met.

Regarding the tree removal permit and landscape plan, there appeared to be some sort of fence or wall proposed along the Middlebelt frontage, but no details had been provided. A 2-foot continuous screening was required. Also, a revised landscape plan should be submitted with a table reflecting the additional trees (10 foot evergreens or additional 3" caliper deciduous trees), and the plantings shown by symbol that were being used to satisfy this requirement.

Parking lot and landscape trees needed to be distinguished on the plan.

The applicant was proposing the required 6-foot wall along Eldred and along the west side of the property, but was asking for relief for the required wall on the south side, where they wanted to use evergreen trees. Given the fact that this was an existing development and that portion of the property was itself already a greenbelt, this seemed acceptable. The applicant had met with the pastor who lived adjacent to this property, and he was satisfied with the landscape plan as presented this evening. At the previous approval of this plan the Commission had accepted this type of configuration as being reasonable.

An updated landscape cost estimate was needed.

Commissioner Orr noted that the Fire Marshall wanted the canopy to be 13'6", or approximately two feet higher than shown on the plan. Planning Consultant Arroyo said he did not think there would be a problem with meeting this requirement, and the necessary changes in the plan could be approved administratively.

In response to a question from Commissioner Orr, Planning Consultant Arroyo said that a 2-foot wall or berm was required along Middlebelt as long as there were parking spaces in the front yard.

Bill Meier, Meier Group Architects, Ann Arbor MI and Rick Mehrer, Administrator of the Manor of Farmington Hills, 21017 Middlebelt Road, were present to speak on behalf of this application.

Mr. Meier said that last year they were before the Planning Commission with a similar project; they were returning to present changes that had been made in the plan. Tonight's project fit within the footprint of the previous approval. The addition to the west was within a couple of feet of the same footprint that they had before; the front addition was substantially less. The parking and the site circulation was nearly the same. The only modifications were the changed entry, so that drivers could circulate through the drop-off and then back to the parking area. The exit was exactly the same spot as it was previously.

Regarding the parking spaces along the wall in cross section A, Mr. Meier said they would clarify the parking on the plan; the parking spaces did meet ordinance requirements. If necessary they could pull the parking south, but he believed the spaces had not been represented accurately on the plan – they would be 18 feet with a 2-foot overhang.

Mr. Meier said that last year when they had met with the Engineering Department, Engineering staff had wanted them to pave Eldred and Kenwood Streets. At that time they had come to an agreement that they would participate in a neighborhood assessment whenever it was deemed that the road would be paved, but that it was too much of a burden on this project to extend all the utilities and to pave the entire length of those roads. They had agreed to pave up to the new driveway. However, when the final Engineering comments came back for tonight's application, they were again being asked to pave the entire road and provide a traffic study. The applicants were adding about 10 trips maximum per day. A \$3500 traffic impact study did not seem necessary.

Mr. Meier showed the Commission a rendering of the new project, which again was very similar to the one previously approved. The drive-through canopy could be raised to 13'6", as requested. They were completely refacing the front of the building with brick and trim. He noted the picket fence they were proposing along Middlebelt, along with a new porch for dining activity.

Regarding the 7 parking spots in the front yard setback, Mr. Meier said they were trying to get as many parking spaces as close to the front door as possible. Was it possible to keep those?

Planning Consultant Arroyo said there was a 50-foot front yard setback, and the parking spaces were within that. They had to be removed. However, there might be room to add a few parking spaces if the front island was redesigned.

Commissioner Orr said the picket fence along Middlebelt did not meet the 2-foot shielding requirement. The ordinance required a 2-foot wall or solid landscaping. Mr. Meier said they could meet this requirement.

Commissioner Orr confirmed that there was enough room to place a berm along Middlebelt Road. Planning Consultant Arroyo said he thought there would be room.

Commissioner Blizman said that he felt a requirement to pave all of Eldred was excessive for this project; it seemed to him that people living on Eldred should bear the cost for this when the paving was accomplished.

Seeing that there was no more discussion, Chair Topper indicated she was ready for a motion.

**MOTION by Fleischhacker, support by Schwartz, that Site Plan No. 55-3-2016, dated March 11, 2016, submitted by Farmington Hills Senior Leasing be approved because it appears to meet all applicable requirements of the Zoning Chapter. This approval is subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. A revised plan addressing the following items is submitted for administrative review:**
  - a. The deficiencies identified in the April 18, 2016 Clearzoning review report**
  - b. The seven (7) parking spaces located within the required front yard setback be either removed or relocated outside of the setback**
  - c. A two foot tall berm be added between the parking areas and Middlebelt Road**
  - d. The height of the canopy be increased to a minimum of 13'-6"**
  - e. All new lighting be in compliance with zoning regulations and be shown on a revised landscape plan**

**The following determinations were also made:**

- **The existing vegetation, grade change, and the planting of additional evergreen trees between the subject parcel and the parcel to the south in lieu of a masonry wall is acceptable**
- **The height of the cupola as shown on the plans – and extended to 13'6" – is acceptable**

**Motion carried 8-0.**

**MOTION by Fleischhacker, support by Blizman, that Landscape Plan No. 55-3-2016, dated March 11, 2016, submitted by Farmington Hills Senior Leasing be approved because it appears to meet all applicable Zoning Chapter requirements and applicable Design Principles as adopted by the Planning Commission. This approval is subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. A revised plan addressing the following items is submitted for administrative review:**
  - a. The deficiencies identified in the April 18, 2016 Clearzoning review report**
  - b. A designation be shown between which trees are replacements and parking lot trees**
  - c. The heights of all required evergreen replacement trees be increased to 10 feet**
  - d. The landscape cost estimate be revised**

**Motion carried 8-0.**

At this time Chair Topper returned the meeting to Public Hearing *Item B.1.SUBDIVISION OPEN SPACE PLAN 1, 2016*, which had been tabled earlier in the meeting.

## **PUBLIC HEARING**

### **SUBDIVISION OPEN SPACE PLAN 1, 2016**

Paul Elkow, 28701 Wintergreen Drive, Farmington Hills, was present on behalf of this application, which was to request tentative approval for a site plan, tree removal permit and landscaping open space plan for Halsted Hollow North, a single family detached condominium project with an open space option.

Mr. Elkow said that he had given a copy of the deed showing that they were the owners of the property to Staff Planner Stec. They had made all the corrections requested at the last Planning Commission meeting. He was here to answer any questions.

Commissioner Orr noted that there would be some work done on areas outside the subdivision, including the extension of roads north and south, necessitating the removal of the cul-de-sac on the north and landscaping around it. Would the applicant be responsible for that work? Mr. Elkow said they would be.

Noting that he was not present at the last meeting, Commissioner McRae wondered why the connecting road with Goldsmith was not lined up with Teal Court. Was it possible to do that? Mr. Elkow said that originally they had flipped that area the other way, but they had been asked by the Commission to design the road as it was currently configured so that their open space would join with the Halsted Hollow open space to the south. They moved Lot 17 from the south to the north in order to accommodate this.

Chair Topper invited Planning Consultant Arroyo to give his report.

Utilizing overhead slides and referring to his March 17, 2016 review letter, Planning Consultant Arroyo gave the background for this request. He reviewed the location and surrounding zoning, and pointed out the existing stub streets to the north and south of this proposed development.

Planning Consultant Arroyo pointed out that this was a special study area in the Master Plan and in fact the Master Plan envisioned the stub connections and a subdivision open space type development with open space, similar to what was being presented this evening. The area was zoned RA-1 one-family residential, which was a predominantly low-density zoning district. This was also consistent with what was being proposed. The lot sizes met the dimensional requirements of the subdivision open space plan provisions. Lot width issues called out in the last meeting had been resolved. A large open space area was created on the southeast portion, and now the open space area extended all the way to 8 Mile Road. This was considered a benefit.

Primary access to the subdivision would be from the stub streets or from Goldsmith, located to the east. Goldsmith was a long dead-end street, and the Fire Department and Public Works Department were pleased that there would be a connection for emergency purposes. If Goldsmith were ever blocked, emergency access would be available through tonight's proposed connection, thus significantly enhancing public safety.

Regarding the open space area, the open space should be generally available to all residents. There were no sidewalks on the plan. There were sidewalks in the projects to the north and the south.

Planning Consultant Arroyo reviewed the open space subdivision requirements; these were met by tonight's plan. The actual open space exceeded the requirement.

In terms of process, tonight the Planning Commission's role was to make a recommendation which would then go to City Council, who would be the final decision making body.

Most of the comments and outstanding issues as noted in the March 24, 2016 meeting had been resolved through the resubmittal before the Commission this evening.

Open space improvement costs would be \$45,480.00, which was 150% of the cost estimate for the open space plan submitted by the applicant.

Planning Consultant Arroyo concluded his review.

Commissioner Fleischhacker confirmed with City Attorney Schultz that an approving motion should grant tentative approval, and then the application would move to City Council.

Commissioner Fleischhacker noted that the review letter from Clearzoning was dated March 17, 2016. Since that time revised plans had been submitted. Commissioner Fleischhacker confirmed with Planning Consultant Arroyo that Lot 7 now was the proper width to meet zoning requirements.

Commissioner Orr initiated a discussion regarding sidewalks in the area. Staff Planner Stec noted that typically the sidewalks were the last part of an installation. Planning Consultant Arroyo said that there needed to be access to the open space. If the Commission felt a sidewalk was necessary it could be made a condition of approval. City Attorney Schultz concurred. Commissioner Orr felt that at the least sidewalks should be required to connect to the stub streets to the north and south.

From the podium, Mr. Elkow said the lack of a sidewalk was an oversight on the plan. He was planning on installing sidewalks.

Chair Topper opened the public hearing.

Richard Bringardner, 20150 Goldsmith, said that he lived directly across from the Goldsmith entrance of the proposed development. He wondered why the entrance was on Goldsmith as opposed to Halsted Road. Had a traffic analysis been completed on the three connecting streets? Was the construction of Goldsmith sufficient to carry the extra traffic? Had soil borings been done to determine the roadbed stability on Goldsmith? They had had a problem with roadbed stability on Teal Court during sewer installation. There was an old sinkhole near the manhole at Teal Court. If the roadbed were undermined, would the entire roadbed have to be replaced?

Fred Gerometta, 37186 Forest Court, said that his home was impacted most by the proposed Lot 1 (17?), which had been moved in this resubmitted plan. He would like to have Lot 1 moved back to its original location, with a walkway installed between Lots 1 and 2, to connect the open space. This would increase the resale value of the existing homes.

Julie Levine, 37284 Rosedale, said she lived in the lot probably most impacted by the proposed development. She gave a brief history of her residency in Farmington Hills. She wondered if any Commissioners lived in this specific area. It was not the same thing to look at a Master Plan vs. actually living in the area. She was concerned with density, proximity, and responsibility to the community of people who lived in the area. Goldsmith was a private area, and people who lived there chose that. She was opposed to connecting the streets. She supported an entrance off Halsted. She did not think neighborhoods that had different building standards should be connected. She was concerned about cut-through traffic for drivers who tried to avoid the Halsted/8 Mile intersection and the increase of traffic volume generally. The proposed open space had no meaning. There were unique conditions in this area. The water table was very high. She spoke to Rosedale being curved, and the backup of traffic along Halsted. She would like to have landscaping between existing homes and the new development.

Chair Topper explained that the lots in the proposed development were buildable lots.

Colleen Powers, 20938 Deerfield, agreed that it would be better to have the entrance off of Halsted Road, with no connection to the stub streets or Goldsmith. She was concerned about cut through traffic and new bus routes going through the neighborhoods.

Douglas Barbell, Deerfield Street, was concerned about what would happen to the existing retention pond. Would it fill up and flood basements in the area? He also opposed opening the stub streets, which would provide a cut through for Halsted traffic.

Charlie Meisner, 20930 Goldsmith, said that they did not want the extra traffic on Goldsmith. There were only 23-25 homes on Goldsmith. He opposed attaching another neighborhood to their neighborhood; additionally connecting to Goldsmith would actually be connecting 3 other neighborhoods to theirs. He did not feel the character of the proposed development matched the large lots on Goldsmith, which had no streetlights and no sidewalk.

Sheldon Levine, Rosedale Street, agreed with the concerns expressed regarding traffic and water table. He was opposed to the new subdivision using the same name as their subdivision and also using their entrance. He felt they would be a different class of homes, and would not be paying dues to their association, or paying for wear and tear on their entrance and roads.

Jason Jones, Deerfield Street, was concerned about the additional traffic in terms of safety for the children in the neighborhood.

Joy Bartell, Deerfield Street, was concerned that the builder would not follow through on commitments he made.

Seeing that there was no further discussion, Chair Topper closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Schwartz asked City Attorney Schultz if the developer met requirements, did the Commission have to approve the application. City Attorney Schultz said generally the answer was the Commission did have to approve the application. With a subdivision open space plan the Commission could apply some conditions, but as a general proposition if dimensional requirements were met, the plan needed to be approved. Also, the stub streets were required by Ordinance to be connected.

Commissioner Schwartz asked about requiring the access to be off of Halsted Road. City Attorney Schultz explained that by virtue of the fact that the City had adopted the Master Plan, it would be very difficult to require the developer to provide an access off Halsted Road. It would be difficult to deny the access off of Goldsmith because that was preferred by the Fire Department and Public Works.

Commissioner Schwartz asked if a traditional development was proposed, would there be fewer amenities offered? Planning Consultant Arroyo said that if the developer came in with a straight plat or site condo plan, they would be required to connect to the stub streets because the ordinance required this. There would be no open space though the lots would be a little bigger. There would be no discretion for conditions if the dimensional requirements were met. Such a plan would have to be approved. The difference with tonight's plan was that there would be open space, because there was some flexibility to have some of the lots smaller in order to get the open space.

Commissioner Mantey asked if there was a wetland, and it was less than 5 acres, was there a legal ability to deny development on that property. City Attorney Schwartz replied that Farmington Hills did not regulate wetlands. Commissioner Mantey asked if there were other communities that did regulate wetlands. City Attorney Schwartz said there were communities that did this.

Chair Topper invited Mr. Elkow to respond to the concerns brought up this evening.

Mr. Elkow said that he had developed other communities; he had never developed any that was so close to what was being asked of him by the City. He was somewhat surprised by the reaction this evening. He had no control over the street connections.

Regarding Mr. Bringardner's concerns, Mr. Elkow said they had dug 15 feet into the ground and found rock hard clay. They were planning on boring under the road. It would be better for the developers to make the connection with the manhole, but Engineering Manager Cubera had worked with them for a different solution. Originally they had not planned to connect to Goldsmith but from a planning perspective this was desirable. They had adhered to everything the City had asked them to do. They had complied and were ready to go forward. He thought this was a really good plan. Times were changing and now people were looking for nicer amenities inside their homes, and were not looking for huge footprints. He felt they had been responsive to the Planning and Engineering Departments and what the Planning Commission had requested at the last meeting. They were looking forward to adding to the community.

Commissioner Schwartz asked why Mr. Elkow had not planned an entrance off Halsted. Mr. Elkow said a Halsted entrance would have resulted in two roads within 200 feet of each other. He believed that the road configuration had actually come from the City, based on other proposals that had come to the City prior to this one.

Commissioner Mantey acknowledged that the applicant had flipped the plan in order to connect the open spaces from Halsted Hollow North and Halsted Hollow. However, the connection was fairly narrow – only about 10 feet. Why couldn't Lot 1 be where Open Space 2 was? Mr. Elkow said they had deferred to the Planning Commission regarding this configuration. People were comfortable with a 10-foot walkway. They were asked by the Planning Commission to change the plan to accommodate this connection.

Regarding drainage, Mr. Elkow said the proposed drainage area was going to be deeper than nearby basements and would help with drainage issues in the area. The site moved from west to east, with almost 16 feet of elevation change. They were taking the water to their retention ponds, with metered access.

Commissioner Orr asked where the overflow water from the detention pond would travel. Mr. Elkow said it would travel by gravity via the ditch down Goldsmith to 8 Mile Road. Staff Engineer Darnall added that emergency overflow (a 100-year storm event) would release through a restricted outlet toward Teal Court in a controlled manner.

Seeing that discussion had ended, Chair Topper said she was ready to entertain a motion.

**MOTION by Orr, Support by Fleischhacker, to grant tentative approval of the preliminary plan for Subdivision Open Space Plan No. 1, 2016, dated March 29, 2016, submitted by Paul Elkow. Further, the escrow amount for the open space improvements is set at \$45,480.00, representing 150% of the cost estimate for the open space plan submitted by the proponent.**

**This approval is based on the applicant's compliance with the following conditions:**

- **A revised plan showing an internal sidewalk network be submitted for administrative review**
- **The existing temporary cul-de-sac at the south end of Prestwick be removed and landscaped by the applicant**

Commissioner Fleischhacker said that when Halsted Hollow was built, Deerfield was designed to connect to future development to the north; the stub street was designed for growth to happen there. The same thing was true for the stub at the end of Prestwick – it was designed to connect when the subject property sold so that one unique complete subdivision area would be created. The Planning Commission could not now say no to this. This was a proposal for a subdivision with an open space option. If dimensional requirements were met it had to be approved. Regarding landscaping behind homes, unlike a cluster option, for instance, the City had no control over landscaping on individual lots in a subdivision. Landscaping would be up to the new homeowners.

Commissioner Fleischhacker continued that when a new subdivision was constructed, the Engineering Department was charged to make sure there was not an increase in water flow to existing properties. In fact, after the land was developed water flow should be improved through the use of the detention pond.

Commissioner McRae added that the issue of the Goldsmith connection was discretionary. His preference was to connect to Goldsmith for the greater good of the area. While he knew the residents on Goldsmith didn't want the additional traffic, it was inevitable that other properties on Goldsmith would also be developed. While sometimes people wanted their subdivision to be the last one in an area, vacant properties were going to be

developed. In tonight's instance, the proposed plan was following the City's ordinances and the City could not deny a developer who was following the ordinances. He noted that the roads were designed to slow traffic.

Commissioner McRae added that he had grown up close to this neighborhood and had walked it many times before it was developed. But now it was developed and developing. The Commission's job was to make sure development happened in the most organized way possible. The only discretionary thing on the plan was the connection to Goldsmith and how the connection interacted with the open space there. His preference was for the configuration shown in the original proposal. He thought the best connection was to Goldsmith for the greater good and he would be supporting the motion as stated.

Commissioner Schwartz said that this was one of the prime areas in Farmington Hills that still had undeveloped land and it was likely that there was going to be more development on Goldsmith in the future. He noted two things: 1) The proposed development was extremely close to the concept presented in the Master Plan and met the City's rules. 2) The proposed development was better than a traditional plan.

Noting that the overall combined developments were very close in spirit to where he lived now, Commissioner Schwartz reiterated that the plan the City made years ago was to connect the streets. He would support the motion.

Seeing that there was no further comment, Chair Topper called the motion.

**Motion carried 8-0.**

#### **ELECTION OF OFFICERS**

**MOTION by Blizman, support by Fleischhacker, that Beth Rae-O'Donnell be elected as Planning Commission Chair, and that nominations be closed. Motion carried 8-0.**

**MOTION by McRae, support by Stimson, that Steve Schwartz be elected as Planning Commission Vice Chair and that nominations be closed. Motion carried 8-0.**

**MOTION by Schwartz, support by McRae, that Steve Stimson be elected as Planning Commission Secretary, and that nominations be closed. Motion carried 8-0.**

#### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

March 24, 2016

**MOTION by Fleischhacker, support by Stimson, to approve the minutes of March 24, 2016 as published.**

**Motion carried 8-0.**

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Julie Levine made some further comments regarding *Public Hearing B. Subdivision Open Space Plan 1, 2016*. She said she understood the property would be developed, but the issue was how. She was interested in maintaining property values. She did not think the Master Plan reflected what was there today, and the Master Plan could be changed. Would the new development help maintain the access road? She was opposed to the new development also being called Halsted Hollow North, as this would reflect on the existing Halsted Hollow development. She would like the access off of Halsted Road. She felt the placement of the open space was

meaningless. She said the maintenance of the existing walking trail in Halsted Hollow was shoddy and presented security issues.

Casimer Ploski, Waldron Street, and President of Olde Town Homeowners Association, thanked the Commission for the marvelous job they did and for their long-time service. He said this was the best Planning Commission that he had ever encountered.

### **COMMISSIONER'S COMMENTS**

The Commissioners thanked Chair Topper for her service as Chair of the Commission. Chair Topper said it had been an honor to serve.

Future May meetings included:

May 12, possible training seminar.

May 19, regular meeting.

Tentative June dates included:

June 9, possible study session

June 16, regular meeting

June 23, possible public hearing

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Seeing that there was no further discussion, Chair Topper adjourned the meeting at 9:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Steven Schwartz  
Planning Commission Secretary

/cem