

**WHITE LAKE TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION**
Regular Meeting
7525 Highland Road
White Lake, MI 48383
February 7, 2008 @ 7:00 p.m.

Chairperson Birkle called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. Roll was called: Mr. S. Anderson and Mr. Long were absent. Mr. Birkle led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ROLL CALL: Steve Anderson, Secretary - **Absent**
Todd Birkle, Chairperson
David Lewsley, Vice Chairperson
Michael Long - **Absent**
Steve Martinko
Gail Novak-Phelps
Beverly Spoor, Board Liaison
Stan Woodhouse

Also Present: Sean O'Neil, AICP, Planning Director
Jason Iacoangeli, Staff Planner
David Campbell, Township Consultant
Ole Anderson, Township Engineer
Lynn Lindon, Recording Secretary

Visitors:8

Approval of Agenda:

Mr. O'Neil asked to add under Other Business a discussion on Glenmore Village Condominium.

Mr. Woodhouse moved to amend the agenda to include this addition. Mr. Lewsley supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote: (6 yes votes)

Mrs. Novak-Phelps moved to approve the agenda as amended. Mr. Woodhouse supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote. (6 yes votes)

Approval of Minutes:

- a. Regular study meeting of January 17, 2008
- b. Special Joint Training Session of Township Board, Planning Commission and Zoning Board of Appeals January 29, 2008

Mrs. Spoor moved to approve the minutes of January 17, 2008 and January 29, 2008 as corrected. Mr. Woodhouse supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote. (6 yes votes)

Call to the Public (for items not on the agenda)

Mr. Birkle opened the discussion for public comment on items not listed on the agenda, but none was offered.

Public Hearing(s):

a. File No. 07-026 North Shore Apartments, LLC

Location: Property is described under parcel number 12-21-176-001 located on the north side of Highland Road, west of Porter Road, consisting of approximately 6.63 acres, currently zoned (RM-1) Attached Single Family Residential District.

Request: Rezoning Request from (RM-1) Attached Single Family Residential District to (GB) General Business District (1.09 acres of a 6.63 acre parcel)

Applicant: North Shore Apartments, LLC
Matthew Sprader
970 Village Drive
White Lake, MI 48383

Mr. Campbell reviewed his report dated January 4, 2008. The applicant originally wanted a split zoning, as well as a parcel split. Village Drive to the west is the only driveway into the complex. He stated Birchler Arroyo could not recommend approval of the proposed change in zoning. They believe a commercial land use on the subject property would be inconsistent with the objectives of the Planned Community designation approved in the Township's Master Plan. Given the size and dimensions, commercial development of the property would have an adverse impact on the residential condominiums and could not satisfy the intent of the Zoning Ordinance standards with respect to setbacks, parking, landscaping, buffering/screening, and access management. The Master Plan designation is for a coordination of residential and retail uses with shared parking, etc. for a cohesive development. In addition, the site has a significant grade change and any development would require extensive grading and retaining walls. There doesn't appear to be a feasible way the site could be developed with a General Business use and maintain the natural features when compared to the zoning requirements for buffers and screening. They are also concerned with how to access this site if it were developed General Business. There is the potential for a driveway on M-59 and potential curb cut, assuming the site will be brought down to the level of M-59, but MDOT may not look favorably at another curb cut on M-59. And lastly, the apartment residents will look at the back of a retail building.

Mr. O'Neil referenced his memo dated January 31, 2008. He agreed with Mr. Campbell's recommendation and questioned whether or not a parcel of this size and shape would be able to support a commercial development and still meet the many requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. He as spoken to the applicant and has strongly suggested he bring back a rezoning request that encompasses the entire parcel. By doing this, the applicant would have an opportunity to propose a more cohesive plan that could meet the intent of the Master Plan and comply with all Zoning Ordinance requirements. However, the applicant is unwilling to do so at this time. Given the facts in this case, Mr. O'Neil is also recommending denial. Approving this request would be contrary to the Master Plan and the intent of the Zoning Ordinance. The departure from the Master Plan is the greatest concern at this point. Mr. O'Neil noted there were footnotes to the Schedule of Regulations that weren't discovered until today. There is a section that pertains to minimum lot size. What wasn't addressed (and an error on Mr. O'Neil's part), is the fact that in making this change, the RM-1 parcel where the condos would remain (6.6 acres) would require 180,000 sq. ft. (or 11.5 acres) of land for the site to function properly. The site is currently legally non-conforming. Mr. O'Neil discussed this with Mr. Sprader. The creation of a General Business zone would make this parcel more non-conforming, which would leave 5.5 acres of RM-1 property where 11.5 would be required. The Zoning Ordinance does not have the ability to deviate from this and the request would require a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals. Mr. O'Neil apologized for this oversight, but feels without this new information, there was still sound reason for denial.

Mrs. Novak-Phelps asked what the Master Plan is calling this parcel. Mr. O'Neil indicated the parcel is designated as Planned Community. If the entire property were rezoned, it could potentially meet with the Master Plan vision for this area. With a Planned Development, there would be a site plan attached to this. He informed the applicant and recommended a different course of action and to go through the

Planned Development request. He noted that a new owner is planning on taking control of the property and Mr. Sprader was not willing to go through this process.

Mr. Woodhouse stated when talking about a Planned Development being proposed, the commission would be looking at a development. Another consideration is that the main green space they currently have today would be taken away to create a commercial development and he feels this would be a travesty on the site.

The applicant, Mr. Sprader, indicated that the actual green space is not green space, but rather the septic field. He has worked with the township before and he is not opposed to constructing a retaining wall. He is asking for a split and rezoning – that's it. He referenced Kohl's and noted their hill was 30-40 ft. higher than Alpine and they knocked that out. He has no say to what goes in next to him. Again, he is not asking to build buildings, he is asking for a split and rezoning. The apartments would hook up to sewers, every tenant was notified of this and there doesn't seem to be much of a problem. He only found out today there was a problem with acreage.

Mr. Woodhouse stated that whether this green space is sewer or not, it is open space and when the development went in, this area was dedicated as the open space. This would change the density factor and take away from the people who have bought in there. This parcel, with its extreme slopes is barely buildable. Since 1959, he hasn't seen anything like this. It is contrary to the Master Plan. To create a parcel, with the slopes, etc., is not what is envisioned in the Master Plan for this property. Mr. Sprader referenced parcel in Milford.

Mrs. Novak-Phelps stated she has concerns with this development. If the commission approves General Business, the township is stuck with it. The commission would have no control whatsoever if it is not zoned for Planned Development. There are current issues with traffic, ingress/egress, bus stops, and confusion with traffic.

Mr. Martinko agreed that there are challenges with this site. The key thing is the RM-1 square footage. The commission is not capable of amending this ordinance. He feels this is a black and white issue. Mr. Sprader stated he has been dealing with this for 4 months, but Mr. O'Neil stated this issue doesn't change the fact that his request doesn't comply with the ordinance. This is a deviation from the Master Plan and his recommendation from the beginning was denial. He apologized that this issue came up today and he sympathizes with Mr. Sprader's position, but the facts in the case have remained the same.

Mr. Birkle opened the public hearing at 7:40 p.m.

Bill Wright, 430 Trotter Trail, Milford, asked if the density were to change from 81 units to less, would the commission consider. Mr. O'Neil stated it could be possible, but he would have to look at the plans. As long as the proposal was compliant with the Master Plan and Zoning Ordinance, it could improve the situation.

With no other comments, the public hearing was closed at 7:44 p.m.

Mrs. Spoor noted that we are talking about non-conformity. If this were approved, it would be less non-conforming. It will always be a challenge to make this parcel conforming. There were many discussions in the past and we need to understand that this will not be conforming unless it is tied to other properties. The Planning Commission has made appropriate decisions on properties with shared access. To make another business on M-59 with a shared access, she doesn't see why this would be so much of an issue, compared with other issues. If we considered this parcel with commercial, perhaps a beauty parlor or dentist office, she feels this could be complementary. We can't get into issues of making this conform to the Master Plan when this development has been here for years. The parcel is not close to 11.5 acres. A PBD is a possibility, or Restricted Business. She noted that there is a similar situation across from Kroger's and in front of that is a dentist office. As far as the buses, when they stop, you have to stop. There are shared accesses, and there is a driveway to accommodate 81 units. If there were a low volume business, she wouldn't see this as deterrent. The green space was due to the fact they needed a septic system. She does not care for the retaining wall at Kohl's and she doesn't want to consider another one. There is the possibility of having a zoning that will work for the township and the residents and still give control to the township and Planning Commission.

Mr. Lewsley stated that he has tried to be open-minded with this request. When we went through the Master Plan process, we had a public hearing and a lot of residents came and said they wanted residential properties along M-59 and did not want M-59 100% commercial. This parcel was already multi-family residential and remained on the Master Plan. What has happened since then, the area west of Porter Road has changed in character. Hypothetically, he could envision commercial in front of this parcel some day and agrees this is a challenging parcel as far as terrain. There has to be some kind of idea of what can be done with the parcel before considering rezoning. Access will have to come from Kohl's or the private driveway. The fact that this parcel has always been a part to be used for septic, and the septic is still being used to service the apartments, if sold off the residents will have to pay to hook up to the sewer. Mr. Lewsley feels the Mr. Sprader has a duty to take care of this for them. Mr. Sprader noted there is a stipulation in the by-laws of the association. Mr. Lewsley added that if this were split off and sold, the residents would be cut off. This is a non-conforming parcel and it is not possible to split this off and create a more non-conforming situation. He would suggest redoing the entire parcel and buying out the residents. He just doesn't think this request makes sense.

Mr. Woodhouse noted the density factor was used one time to create open space. Now the applicant wants commercial property out front with walls, etc., and he cannot see this happening. It is not fair to the residents in the developments. Mr. Lewsley added that he sympathizes with the applicant, but he cannot support a movement on rezoning the front of this property.

Mr. Lewsley asked Mr. Sprader if he wanted to table this and come back with another plan. The consensus of the Planning Commission is to go Planned Business for the entire site. Mr. Sprader stated he would like the commission to vote on the request this evening.

Mr. Woodhouse moved in File 07-026 to recommend approval of the rezoning request from RM-1 to GB. Mrs. Novak-Phelps supported and the MOTION FAILED with a roll call vote: Woodhouse – no; Novak-Phelps – no (it is inconsistent with Master Plan); Spoor – yes; Birkle – no; Lewsley – no (it creates additional non-conformance); Martinko – no; (1 yes vote; 5 no votes)

Old Business:

- b. File No. 06-029 Village Lakes/Retail "E" (tabled January 17, 2008)**
- Location: Property described under parcel number 12-22-301-006, located on the southeast corner of Highland and Elizabeth Lake Road (Building "E" is located on the northwest corner of the approved Village Lakes plan), currently zoned Planned Business District.
- Request: Preliminary Site Plan Approval
- Applicant: GKMS Village Lakes, LLC
Mr. Lloyd Sova
101 W. Big Beaver, Ste. 200
Troy, MI 48084

Mrs. Novak-Phelps made a motion to remove File 06-029 from the table. Mr. Woodhouse supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote. (6 yes votes)

Mr. Campbell reviewed his report dated January 30, 2008. There are a lot of concerns with the west side of the building. A sub-committee met on January 22nd and the applicant submitted 3 renderings on January 25th. Mr. Campbell reviewed the graphics. He stated the most significant change is that they added an element to the north corner and a roof element in the middle, which creates harmony when looking from the north and also dresses up the west side. There is a reduction in the landscape plan, but the plantings are now grouped together.

Mr. Woodhouse, who was on the sub-committee, stated he sees a very dense planting along the east side of the road. He noted there was also a grave concern and major objection that there was no longer a split in the building. A compromise was discussed with putting in pedestrian path to try to create a visual effect coming eastbound on M-59 and he was concerned with a building backing up to a major entrance. He felt there should be some signage on the rear of the building (very tastefully done and only

25% of that permitted on the front) listing the name to bring people around to the front area where the main plaza is.

Mr. Campbell continued reviewing the graphics and noted there is a new provision without a gap that will be seen from now on. There is a raised portion on the rear with panels coming up on the west side, and canopies over the doors, which will break up the façade of the building. His idea was to take 15 ft. out of west façade and recess it 10 ft. with a planter island without access to the building. He feels this is an alternate that can be looked at. A standing seam metal roof was added and shows the possibility of tenant signs over each tenant space and adds more 8x16 split masonry within the panels. Based on their dimensions, this gives the impression of bricked-in garage doors. The suggestion is to perhaps add another band of split-faced blocks. Mr. Woodhouse noted the landscape plantings were grouped to allow a view through to the building.

Mrs. Novak-Phelps indicated that she was also at the sub-committee meeting and they tried to give the views of the Planning Commission. They expressed breaking up the back of the building and the middle. They also wanted to see classic looking signs that would not be distracting and more architectural detail. She feels the grouping of the trees is nicer. They also talked about putting another peak on the right side, but the applicant felt it would look like a castle. Mr. Campbell stated they would like to see the same treatment, particularly windows, on each corner. Mrs. Novak-Phelps indicated they suggested that, but this area is their storage. Mr. Campbell continued to note that the parapet was raised 2 ft. to screen the mechanical equipment and they would also like to raise it on the front. He added that if the rear signs were small and tastefully done, it would be appropriate.

Mr. O. Anderson stated nothing has changed since his original report.

Mr. Lewsley feels the new plan looks like the back of the building from their earlier renderings. He would prefer 2 buildings, not 1 long one. He doesn't want this looking like an outlet mall. In order to have open space, there needs to be a break in the building with some sort of plantings and/or pathway.

Mr. Martinko asked where the water, electric and gas meter would be located and feels landscaping can soften this area.

Mrs. Spoor asked why there was no peak when looking at the west level. Mr. O'Neil indicated the applicant objected because it was costly. Mr. Martinko doesn't know that this would be seen from M-59 anyway. Mrs. Spoor would like to see something innovative to make the building attractive, perhaps false windows with scenes rather than just a block of breaks. She is also concerned with the types of plantings that will go in, something pleasant to look at year-round. She doesn't want to see them bare during the fall and winter months. She stated she likes the extra 2 ft. parapet to cover the mechanicals. She does not want to see the mechanicals showing in the front. Mrs. Novak-Phelps added that she wanted to see architectural features on the back, not the "garage door" look they are proposing.

Mr. Fossey, the architect for the project, noted there are screens behind the mechanical units. When standing on the site, the mechanicals are not visible from the front. The mechanical units are typically located on the back third of the building. They would be more seen from the west than the east and that is why they raised the parapet on that side.

Mr. Birkle feels this is a large step in the right direction. He agrees the building should be staggered so it is not the same depth. Mr. Woodhouse would like to see an indentation.

Mr. Piat addressed the concerns from the commissioners. He reviewed a new graphic for breaking up the façade with different materials and Mr. Fossey cited those main differences. They have added a gable and feature, and awnings over the service doors. A variety of material was added to the elevation and they changed the landscaping to group the trees together. Mr. O'Neil asked if they object to the glass option. Mr. Piat indicated he understands the concerns from the commissioners, but the difficulty is the economic reality with rent capabilities of retailers. They are at a breaking point. They want to keep the leasing ability to get the tenants, who are demanding lower rent. The glass is more expensive than brick, overall a 20-25% increase in the cost of glass vs. brick. Mrs. Novak-Phelps noted that some things could be substituted. For instance, they are saving money on trees and they raised the middle section and added a tenant sign. Mr. Martinko pointed out the graphic shown is not the same as the landscape

on plan they are proposing. The commission is not looking at a true landscape. They could lose a few Linden trees by grouping them around the Spruce.

Mr. Lewsley stated there are no issues with the parking and they could lose some spaces. The building is almost to M-59, and coming into the entrance you would be looking at the back of retail. He questioned why they couldn't put in a break to open the view into the site and do a separation in the building. He suggested sacrificing some parking and shifting the building back to break it up. His problem is with one long building, he feels this is a disservice to the tenants. Mr. Piat feels there is a comprehension issue here: The back of the building – and he feels there is always an issue whether a split, alley, etc. The average consumer won't comprehend the alley or break. Artistically it adds variety, but it also adds costs. This would alter structural steel and more labor. Mr. Lewsley noted the original plan showed 2 buildings and it was the general understanding going into this. Mr. Piat said there is a significant economic reality that has changed. In the last 180 days, retailers are willing to pay less, gas is going up, and there is a breaking point. He is requesting a compromise. He will acknowledge this is a better design, but they have to deliver economically. He feels when looking at development in totality, they have significantly raised the bar and to say the future of White Lake will be jeopardized by not having a break in the building is a bit narrowly focused. Mr. Lewsley stated the Planning Commission was clear early on that there would be no drive-thrus, however, the applicant had told the Planning Commission to overlook this area since there wasn't a tenant and the Planning Commission would still have to revisit this later. The Planning Commission specifically stated no drive-thru, now Mr. Lewsley wants the applicant to give the Planning Commission 2 buildings. He does not want to see a big building on this site. He feels this is a significant deviation from the original plan. The back of the building will be a wall.

Mr. Piat addressed the site line issue. The idea of the Planning Commission was to raise the parapet on the front line. Mr. Fossey indicated they are raising it on the back, but raising it on front, he doesn't feel there is any place on the site that the mechanical equipment can actually be seen. Mr. Lewsley noted that the Farmer Jack situation could be seen a mile away. Mr. Piat added that the screening might be seen far away, but keep in mind that the cars are doing 50 mph. Attention will go to the building and not to roof. Mr. Lewsley stated that hundreds of residents complained about Farmer Jack. He would like the applicant to provide site lines and Mr. Piat agreed that they would. Mr. Fossey indicated the type of screening is designed so it could be added after the fact. He added that the quantity and size on Farmer Jack is 10x larger than what they will have on their building. Mr. Lewsley stated that he doesn't want to see this. Mr. O'Neil noted that the roof is sloped and Mr. Fossey added that the mechanical units would be located on the back third of the roof.

Mr. Piat addressed the issue with utility meters. Mr. Fossey indicated that there would be an internal utility room and only the gas meter would be located outside for necessity. The building code recommends a height of 3-4 ft. and Mr. Martinko feels landscaping may be able to soften the appearance of the box.

Mr. Piat feels the signage requirement is reasonable and would be attractive on the rear of the building. If the goal is to create a destination point for travelers coming from the west, the signs could give them some advance notice when coming upon their destination. They can address the artful aesthetics at a later date. Mr. Woodhouse made it clear that the Planning Commission will not assign the same size signage in the rear of the building as they will in the front. It would be more like 25% of the total front size. Mr. Piat stated he is empathetic to all the issues, but he can't stress enough the economic pressure.

Mrs. Spoor wanted to address the dumpster enclosure. Mrs. Novak-Phelps stated this was discussed at the sub-committee meeting and the applicant was told they didn't like their rendering. They talked about changing the color to off-white. Mrs. Spoor would like to see something "fancy" on top that is pleasing. Mr. Piat feels this is easy to solve. Mr. Martinko noted it has to be a durable vinyl so it can maintain consistently. Mrs. Spoor would like the applicant to come up with a different design. Mr. O. Anderson indicated that he has been recommending a heavy composite decking type wood that can withstand impact. Mrs. Spoor feels this is a nice development and doesn't want to throw it away with a dumpster gate. She feels this is too plain Jane and wants it to look nicer. Mr. Martinko noted that landscaping would also soften the look.

Mr. Birkle noted that this is preliminary and there are other issues that won't be resolved this evening.

Mr. Martinko stated that he likes the Design 3 rendering of the proposal, as it is within reason of what can be done. Mr. Lewsley suggested a partial setback to create some differential. He would like to see the building pushed back into the lot away from M-59 to give the space to create a break. Mr. Piat stated the consequence of this is a retail issue. The further back the building the more of a marketability issue this becomes, but Mr. Lewsley noted that as people come into development, they will get to it faster and if the view is opened up, he would go along with the signage in the rear. Mr. O. Anderson indicated that the utilities have already been installed for one pad and Mr. O'Neil added that the final plan showed a single pad. Mr. Lewsley noted that this was not part of the plan that was approved. The applicant never showed one pad, it has always been two pads and therefore, the utilities should be for two pads. Mr. Piat feels pushing the building back would seem to be a benefit from a marketing standpoint, but the retail environment is so sensitive now that doing anything different from what they are already marketing to retailers would impact them. Mr. O. Anderson also noted that the general catch basins are in place and water lines have been looped around. Mr. Lewsley stated again that the Planning Commission never approved a single pad. At that time, the applicant told the Planning Commission to look beyond this and they would come back when they had a tenant in place. Mr. O'Neil indicated the theme was always the same with an outlot building (or buildings) that would be worked out later, which is now. The arrangement of buildings is still negotiable. Mr. O. Anderson feels when the applicant had the utilities installed, they did it with risks.

Mr. Woodhouse stated the discussion is at an impasse. We are talking about two buildings or one building with a recess. He questioned the direction of the Planning Commission. Mr. O'Neil asked Mr. Piat if a recess would work for them if recessed by an "x" amount of feet. Mr. Lewsley stated the most reasonable recess would be a back indentation and this is something that would be done with landscaping. Mr. Martinko noted that this would be a visual only and Mr. Woodhouse added that 8-10 ft. would be needed to get a plant that would last. After discussion outside the meeting room, the applicants returned. Mr. Sova stated there is an 8 ft. area for doors to open, and they could look at putting a 10 ft. long x 8 ft. wide planter box (with year-round greenery) at the back of the building towards the center of the building. Mr. Piat said the purpose for this idea is to avoid loss of area. Retailers have a set template and the commission is proposing a 200 sq. ft. indentation. The commission has been intensely focusing on the rear of the building and they feel this type of detail would be missed by the consumer. Mr. Lewsley suggested that by pushing the building back, they wouldn't lose anything at all. Mr. Campbell noted that when there were 2 buildings on the plan, the drive-thru ran parallel with the main entrance and there were concerns with driveway circulation. They felt it was a benefit that the building was pushed forward. Mr. Lewsley doesn't feel planters are a good idea and it will be confusing.

Mr. Piat stated that this delay is troublesome for them and questioned whether approval this evening be contingent on this. He asked what the process would be. Mr. O'Neil stated that with a negative vote, they have the option of going to the Township Board for a reversal, but he would not recommend this course of action. The Planning Commission would still have the final approval. Mr. Piat asked if this were approved tonight, what the process in time would be. Mr. O'Neil stated the next board meeting is February 19th and any alterations necessary would be corrected and addressed before coming back to Planning Commission. If approved this evening, is there still room for slight deviations to occur, but if the modifications were drastic, he would be concerned with it being so different that Township Board wouldn't approve.

Mr. Lewsley stated the commission is making a fairly minor request and things can be worked out. This is not going to greatly hamper their marketing. Changes to the façade may happen later, but position and size does not change after it is approved tonight. He thinks the applicant can do better. Mr. O'Neil suggested another sub-committee meeting, but there would need to be 3-4 commissioners present really trying to work with the applicant. There are good ideas and different opinions. Mrs. Spoor would like to schedule a sub-committee meeting quickly. Mrs. Spoor, Mr. Woodhouse and Mr. Lewsley stated they were available at 9:00 am on February 12th.

Mr. Piat stated they have tried to address the majority of architectural suggestions. The issue of debate is the 4 corners of the building for reasons stated and risks of adding another 30 days perhaps 45. He is not sure agreeing to another sub-committee meeting. If he had flexibility, he'd move on this tonight. Mr. Woodhouse indicated the basic issue right now is the 4 corners of the building, and whether to separate the one building into two or require an indentation. Mr. Birkle noted that some of the commissioners are

ok with how the building is now. They need to know structurally what the 4 corners of the building are. He knows that Mr. Lewsley favors a separation of buildings and this appears to be the hold up. Mr. O'Neil stated this could be approved and still have a sub-committee meeting, where the sub-committee could be charged with some of the architectural issues.

Mr. Woodhouse moved in File 06-029 to approve the footprint of Elevation 4 drawing of February 4, 2008 and PEA Drawing C3.1 dated January 25, 2008. Mrs. Novak-Phelps supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a roll call vote: Martinko – yes; Lewsley – no; Birkle – yes; Spoor – yes; Novak-Phelps – yes; Woodhouse – yes. (5 yes votes, 1 no vote)

Planning Consultant's Report

Mr. Campbell had nothing further to add.

Director's Report

Mr. O'Neil had nothing further to add.

Other Business:

a. Temporary Zoning Board of Appeals Liaison Appointment

Mr. O'Neil indicated that Mr. Long will be missing the February and March meetings and Mr. Martinko would be filling in.

Mr. Woodhouse moved to approve Mr. Martinko as a temporary Zoning Board liaison for February and March. Mrs. Spoor supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote. (6 yes votes)

b. Glenmore Village Condominium

Mr. O'Neil indicated that back in August the applicant requested an extension. The request came in ahead of their expiration and they would still qualify for an extension.

Mr. Woodhouse moved to recommend to the Township Board a 1-year extension for Glenmore Village Condominium. Mrs. Spoor supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote. (6 yes votes)

Communications:

a. Next Meeting Dates

- Study Meeting – February 21, 2008
- Regular Meeting – March 6, 2008

b. Springfield Township Rezoning Request

- Oakland County Coordinating Zoning Committee

Adjournment:

Mrs. Novak-Phelps moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:54 p.m. Mr. Woodhouse supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote. (6 yes votes)