

**PLANNING COMMISSION
FINAL
BUSINESS MEETING AGENDA
January 15, 2007**

CALL TO ORDER: 7:30 P.M.

MINUTES 1. December 7, 2006 Workshop

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

PUBLIC COMMENT: Items Not On Agenda

PUBLIC HEARING

COMMUNICATIONS:

1. Letter (12-11-06) from Greg Need re: Conforming to Zoning Enabling Act
2. Letter from Paul Rabaut dated 12-13-06.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Springfield Marketplace – Concept review proposed PUD consisting of 320,283 s. f. of retail space on 37.7 acres. Retail will be a mix of large-format retailers and out-lots for restaurants and other small scale retail uses.

NEW BUSINESS: 1. Election of Officers, Chairman, Vice Chair and Secretary

OTHER BUSINESS: Miscellaneous

1. Update Priority List

NEXT MEETING DATE February 19th, 2007

ADJOURNMENT:

The Mission of the Springfield Township Planning Commission is to guide and promote the efficient, coordinated development of the Township in a manner that will best promote the health, safety, and welfare of its people.

**Springfield Township
Planning Commission – Business Meeting
Minutes of January 15, 2007**

Call to Order: Chairperson Roger Lamont called the January 15, 2007 Business Meeting of the Springfield Township Planning Commission to order at 7:30 p.m. at the Springfield Township Civic Center, 12000 Davisburg Rd., Davisburg, MI 48350.

Attendance:

Commissioners Present

Roger Lamont
John Steckling
Bill Leddy
Dean Baker
Bill Champion
Ruth Ann Hines
Frank Aiello

Commissioner(s) Absent

Staff Present

Leon Genre
Collin Walls
Nancy Strole

Consultants Present

Randy Ford
Sally Elmiger

Approval of Minutes: December 7, 2006

- ★ Commissioner Baker moved to table the minutes of December 7, 2006 until next month. Commissioner Steckling supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Aiello, Baker, Champion, Leddy and Hines; No: none. The motion carried by a 7 to 0 vote.

Approval of Agenda:

There was unanimous consent to approve the agenda as published.

Public Comment: None

Public Hearing: None

Communications:

1. Letter (12-11-06) from Greg Need re: Conforming to Zoning Enabling Act
2. Letter from Paul Rabaut dated 12-13-06

- ★ Chairperson Lamont moved to accept the communications as presented. Commissioner Steckling supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont,

Steckling, Aiello, Baker, Champion, Leddy and Hines; No: none. The motion carried by a 7 to 0 vote.

Unfinished Business:

1. Springfield Marketplace – Concept review of proposed PUD consisting of 320,283 sq. ft. of retail space on 37.7 acres. Retail will be a mix of large format retailers and out-lots for restaurants and other small scale retail uses.

Ms. Elmiger of Carlisle/Wortman summarized their review dated December 15, 2006. She noted that the changes to this site plan are positive changes. It is her opinion, that this proposal meets more of the required criteria from the Master Plan and the Dixie Highway Overlay District and on the criteria for a Planned Unit Development. Ms. Elmiger noted that the economic impact is still unclear and should be studied further. Moving retail building C closer to the fountain to create more of a cluster of buildings around the fountain should be explored. In regard to the amount of parking spaces, Ms. Elmiger said they have not received sufficient information to be able to determine what is required under the ordinance. However, the applicant has provided a calculation proposing 750 spaces less than the calculation of what is required by the ordinance but that does give 4.5 spaces per 1,000 square feet of retail square footage. Carlisle/Wortman considers this parking space proposal relatively appropriate. The construction of a boulevard on Dixie Highway is a material benefit to the community; however, Carlisle/Wortman questions whether the length of the proposed boulevard is sufficient. Carlisle/Wortman recommends upon final site plan review that plants be figured into the storm water facilities and shown in detail on the plans. It is the opinion of Carlisle/Wortman that these proposed plans meet the PUD, Master Plan and Dixie Highway Overlay District standards much better than previous submittals and with further modifications the plan can come into better conformance with the Township's goals and ordinance Standards. **[A copy of the full review by Carlisle/Wortman, in its entirety, is on file at the Office of the Clerk, Springfield Township].**

Mr. Randy Ford of HRC summarized their review dated January 4, 2007. Mr. Ford said with respect to grading and drainage, the current plan is an improvement over the previous layout and with respect to preservation of the tree line along the westerly property line common with the adjacent residential development. He would like more details for storm water management. With respect to site utilities, Mr. Ford noted that the on-site well is adequate. HRC's viewpoint is that site access is most significant and the boulevard is an improvement but needs more work. Lavon needs to be focused on further, in his opinion. **[A copy of the full review by Hubbell, Roth & Clark, in its entirety, is on file at the Office of the Clerk, Springfield Township].**

Mr. Ken Till of REDICO explained that REDICO still strongly believes in the commercial nature of this site and believes they have made good strides in meeting the objectives of the Township and of the community as well as being able to keep the project economically viable. Mr. Till said REDICO believes the design has met and addressed all of the concerns of the Township as well as the residents. They are seeking preliminary approval this evening. REDICO still has Letters of Intent from retailers and they hope to open Phase I in the spring of 2008. Phase II would incorporate the second Big Box format store.

Mr. Till said in regard to the density issues raised, they have reduced the square footage of the development from 380,000 square feet to 320,000 square feet. This allowed for a green space increase from approximately 11% to almost 30%. Reducing the density also allowed the building setbacks to be increased from 65 feet to 95 feet. The minimum distance between the residential and retail buildings has also been increased from 82 feet to 130 feet. Reducing the square footage has allowed the developer to retain the existing natural tree line between the residential neighborhood and the retail development. With respect to runoff water from the parking lot, the applicant has replaced the underground retention originally proposed with an above ground storm water system. REDICO will continue to work with the Township and their consultants to ensure that the system not only exceeds the MDEQ discharge requirements but meets the other concerns of the Township. Mr. Till said in regard to the dock areas, by reconfiguring the buildings on the site, they were able to move the dock areas to along the retention ponds and I-75.

Mr. Till explained that REDICO takes a very active role in the management of their properties and would continue to do so with this development. The noise generated from the development will comply with any Township noise ordinance. In regard to lights, REDICO will work to minimize any impact they may have. Mr. Till said they can look at relocating retail "c" when they move forward with this project and will continue to work with the Township planner and their architect. They will also continue to work with the Township and MDOT in regard to the boulevard. In regard to signage, REDICO is open to whatever the Township wants to see there. Mr. Till said, as they move forward they will continue to work closely with the Township and residents to ensure that this project maintains the rural character of Springfield Township.

With respect to the issues raised in the planner and engineer's review, Mr. Till said they believe the length of the boulevard is sufficient. If and when additional development is to occur, it would make sense to extend the boulevard section at that time. REDICO believes that there are opportunities and the economic impact may be increased for some of the local retailers. As far as the northern drive, it is primarily intended for right-in and right-out. It is not specifically configured that way but people do have the opportunity to go to the primary entrance to facilitate their left turn onto Dixie Highway. With many of the comments by Carlisle/Wortman and HRC regarding the general design, REDICO will work closely with the Township on those details such as the bicycle paths, the screen walls and the rooftop equipment screening. They will also work with HRC to ensure that all of the utilities are designed appropriately and that we do not have any negative impacts.

Mr. Till said, with regard to community benefits, the most significant is the construction of a boulevard section. They continue to be confident that this shopping center will provide a gateway to the community and provide shopping, dining and gathering opportunities that currently do not exist. REDICO feels strongly that the jobs this will bring to the community will be significant during the construction phase and during the ongoing operation of the retail center. They continue to highlight the fact that there will be an increase in the tax base and understand that some portion of that may go to offset additional services. However, given the strong manner in which REDICO manages its retail centers and with them providing their own on-site security, they do not believe it will have a large impact on community services. Mr. Till said they truly believe a commercial center is coming here at some point and REDICO believes this is the

highest and best use of this site and will result in a development that will have more features than currently exist. It also preserves the lower impact use of the Holly Rd. site for the Master Plan with Dixie Baptist Church and school moving to Holly Rd. It results in the long-term protection and preservation of the Holly Rd. site and it ensures development of the Dixie Baptist site by a well-regarded Michigan based developer who has had a great deal of success. Mr. Till reiterated that REDICO is requesting preliminary site plan approval from the Planning Commission tonight. Following that, they would like to have another informational presentation to the Township Board in February. Over the period of time from January to March they would work on developing the final plans with the intent of having a presentation to the Planning Commission for a final approval and recommendation to the Township Board in April and finally have final site plan approval in May.

Commissioner Champion asked where the trees proposed along I-75 that were previously on the plans went. Mr. Mark Drane of ROGVOY Architects said there is still an opportunity to screen along that line and they can put trees 30 foot on center in the new plan. Commissioner Champion asked regarding the 8' wall on the western boundary, how far along the boundary would the detail prevail? Mr. Till said they have added landscaping and the berm and wall were eliminated from the plan. The residents in that area said they would like to see both the natural tree line remaining as well as the berm and the wall. He would work with the architect to see how both amenities could be incorporated in. Commissioner Champion asked what phase of the project would the boulevard be constructed in? Mr. Till said they would work with MDOT in that regard but they would like to see it prior to Phase I. Commissioner Champion said at a previous meeting, it was commented that, from an architectural standpoint, the front, rear and sides of the buildings would receive the same detail. He asked if that is still the intent? Mr. Till said yes.

Commissioner Baker said when looking at the design of the boulevard, he questions how the Lavon residents will access northbound I-75. Mr. Till said, the way the residents do it now is extremely unsafe. Mr. Walter, REDICO's traffic engineer, said the existing condition does not make that an easy maneuver and this does not solve the current issue. If drivers are going northbound on I-75 they should go to the Holly Rd. interchange now and at this point in time, that is the way REDICO is looking at it. Road alignment does not provide for that movement now or with this type of boulevard. Commissioner Baker asked if a method could be incorporated or is it not feasible? Mr. Walter said it is highly unlikely. It is feasible but the question becomes what are we accomplishing by doing this. If a vehicle wishes to go north on I-75, what is the next interchange they come to. Commissioner Baker explained that someone coming north on I-75 and wishes to get gas at the BP gas station does not necessarily know they have to go five more miles up the road to get back on I-75. Residents of this area may know that but general travelers will not. Therefore, they will make that turn even though unsafe. Mr. Ford commented that with the boulevard and a left-turn pocket, it could be constructed to make a u-turn movement as well as a direct-left in. Mr. Walter said that is certainly feasible. They have evaluated that need and have determined that there is not a demand need for a dual left based on the projected volumes turning left. However, the plan also calls for a continuous right-turn lane across the frontage of the property which, in essence, increases the width to make that u-turn up to 36 feet.

Commissioner Baker said a congregating area is proposed by the middle driveway and it appears the design funnels the vehicle traffic right through the center. He said he likes the concept but asked if there is a way to move it to the side so it doesn't interfere with traffic or put some kind of traffic bumps in. Mr. Till said they intend to work further on this as the plan moves forward. Commissioner Baker asked which entrance would delivery vehicles use? Mr. Drane indicated that they would use the main entrance where the light is located. Mr. Till said as they continue to work with this plan, they will try to reconfigure how the retail on the bottom of the plan toward the retention ponds would access that loading area coming down through the main entrance and not winding around toward the back of the property line. Commissioner Baker asked how the wastewater treatment system would work? Mr. Butler, REDICO's civil engineer explained that it will be a rapid sand infiltration system. Commissioner Baker asked where the trash receptacles are proposed? Mr. Drane indicated that they would be in the truck wells for the larger users.

Commissioner Aiello said he appreciates the addition of the fountain and plaza element but asked why the developer chose these particular items instead of perhaps an outdoor play area? Mr. Drane said they explored playscapes but playscapes and passive open spaces do not get used. Intense small gathering areas do get used and that is why they are proposing a fireplace and fountain. Commissioner Aiello asked why the need for the extent of impervious surface in the back of the buildings? Mr. Drane indicated an area that could be reduced to a 30 foot driveway (depending on what the Fire Marshall would like). He personally thinks a 20 foot driveway is fine. Mr. Drane indicated that another area is a home improvement center and those retailers require more space for certain loading functions. Commissioner Aiello asked the developer for his thoughts on the comments regarding the boulevard utilizing trees and an irrigation system from the planner? Mr. Till said they can look at maintaining the boulevard. As far as what it can be landscaped with ends up being something they have to work with the Road Commission on. There are issues with site lines and so forth, but they would recommend some sort of native vegetation that requires minimal maintenance and is hardy and looks good.

Commissioner Hines said it was mentioned about abandoning the third northerly curb cut. She asked if there has been any consideration of abandoning the center road cut and making the northerly one the right-in, right-out drive? Mr. Drane explained that the circulation pattern would still be between the buildings.

Chairperson Lamont asked if the development is entertaining any 24-hour operations? Mr. Till said, no. Chairperson Lamont asked the developer to explain how they anticipate the pedestrian flow to move throughout the project from the two large retails to the restaurants? Mr. Drane explained how the sidewalk looks and links through the landscape area. There is also a pedestrian corridor along the fronts of the buildings and along one side of the driveway which links up to one building.

Commissioner Steckling commented that the ordinance has two sections he feels are germane to this consideration. One being, PUD Section 14 and the other is the Dixie Highway Overlay District, Section 18. He believes both are fairly subjective and believes that it does meet the Master Plan in the context of the requirement because the Dixie Highway Overlay District has been enacted with the Master Plan in mind. It basically permits that any use permitted in the

ordinance is permitted in the Overlay District with the idea that if it can be shown to fit it would be a permanent use. Commissioner Steckling said he feels that this fits and is obviously an intensely commercial use but that is permitted in our ordinance. The fact that it is congregated together is actually a benefit and will make the overall project stronger because of the drawing power of several of the key tenants. He thinks it will also make some of the businesses that are envisioned in the smaller retail spaces more viable because it will provide bodies with money and that is what is necessary to make this survive and be viable. In regard to Section 14.01, he feels that it is consistent with the goals and policies of the Springfield Township Master Plan. A key item is demonstrating one of the three items set forth under Section 3.a; two clearly do not apply and the third item, dealing with recognizable and material benefit to the ultimate uses, he is in favor of it because he would like to see the retail services available. He did have a problem with the early proposal because he felt it was too dense but it has been downsized with it enough that he is comfortable with it. Commissioner Steckling said he is very excited with the boulevard but with respect to the proposed boulevard, he is a little disappointed with this one and would like to see it stretched along the whole piece of development. He is not necessarily interested in requiring this applicant to pay for it; he would like to see something done in conjunction with the Township and/or the property owner on the other side because it is not fair that this developer should have to pay for it all. Commissioner Steckling said he would like it to be designed and constructed with ultimate development growth in the visual aspect and impact in the community. He thinks it is better to do it the first time and not have to tear it up again later. Commissioner Steckling said he believes this does provide a benefit to the ultimate users in the community. He does not believe the density is over the top based on the land and square footage proposed and does not think it will unnecessarily impact utilities and the proximity to I-75 is a great plus and that has the least amount of impact on our community. It is not inconsistent with public health, safety and welfare and he does not see a negative environmental impact. He also does not see a negative economic impact on the surrounding properties as we don't have a lot in this community and this may enhance exposure in business to some that are here. The applicant has met the single-ownership requirement. He believes parking is more than adequate and that banked parking is a good idea because he would like to see less impervious surface. Commissioner Steckling concluded by saying that this is a viable project and could continue to move forward.

Commissioner Hines said it is difficult to see this property change from its current use but that is reality and she understands this is a viable piece of property for commercial development. Therefore, we need to plan for that appropriately. Commissioner Hines said she works in a REDICO managed building and agrees that REDICO is very responsive with difficulties, though they are few and far between. She has a lot of confidence in this project and moving forward would be a benefit to this community. With the addition of the boulevard the plan does provide a material benefit to the community. She concurs with Commissioner Steckling in that she would like to see further development of that concept to meet this proposal and any future development in this area. Commissioner Hines said she appreciates the community design features and would like to see retail "c" moved closer to the fountain. If possible, the applicant should further explore eliminating vehicular traffic through the gathering point/plaza area. She does believe the plaza and the water features meet the intent of the ordinance to provide community features. She commented that the proposed parking is adequate and banked parking

is a good idea. The density reduction is appreciated which provides more open space. Commissioner Hines said she looks forward to this development.

Commissioner Champion commented that he believes there is a recognizable material benefit to Springfield Township with this development from several standpoints. He concurs with Commissioner Steckling and Hines in their statements. He thinks the execution of a commercial retail in this manner with REDICO is in itself a material benefit to the community. In regard to the criteria, he appreciates the reduction of density and the sensitivity to the neighboring condominium complex. As far as being consistent with public health, safety and welfare, the utilization of Best Management Practices for storm water runoff, the retention basins, bio-retention swales and the use of evaporation and percolation in keeping storm water runoff out of wetlands and Softwater Lake, definitely is consistent with our public health, safety and welfare. He does not see any unreasonable negative environmental impacts on the site and in regard to negative economic impact, that is hard to measure because we do not have a lot of retail activity along Dixie Highway that would be competing and not knowing what will go into the smaller retail units. Commissioner Champion said he is comfortable with REDICO and believes the steps taken are consistent with the goals and policies of the Township. He would like to see the boulevard further designed and constructed. The applicant has been sensitive to the neighboring condominium complex and that speaks strongly to the community. He is in favor of decreased parking requirements and believes the applicant has demonstrated a genuine willingness and ability to execute in a manner that will augment Springfield Township, its residents and provide the community with a more attractive and safer Dixie Highway.

Commissioner Baker commented that this design has come a long way since its first presentation. He appreciates the reduction in the square footage of the site, the increased green space, the shifting of the larger buildings away from the residential property, the efforts to preserve the trees on the west side of the site and the storm water principles being used. With some more modification those can be stellar with some of the comments from Carlisle/Wortman. He appreciates the developer working with the neighboring residents, is supportive of reduction in parking and believes the boulevard entrance meets the requirements of the material benefit to the community. However, he is not currently prepared to accept the design as presented right now as it being the best it could be. He would like to see something to help people get back on northbound I-75. Commissioner Baker said he would appreciate a commitment to permit an evaluation of the screening on the west side of the site at the conclusion of the development to insure the neighboring residents that the necessary opacities are maintained. He said he thinks this, as presented right now, meets the requirements for a PUD.

Commissioner Leddy said he agrees with most of the comments made by commissioners. He likes the way it will introduce the Township to the people coming in and thinks it will be much more beautiful landscaped with a fountain. It is a plain-jane piece of property now. He believes that another material benefit is that it will provide the church and school with a new piece of property and new building. He agrees that we must have a boulevard that allows for a turn-around and access back onto northbound I-75. It is not reasonable to expect people to go four or five miles up Dixie Highway and East Holly Rd. to get there. Commissioner Leddy said this is a material benefit not only in the looks of the project but also is a material benefit for the people of

the community because it would save driving to get to shopping and would provide jobs. Commissioner Leddy said he would recommend that we move forward with this.

Commissioner Aiello commented that the progression of this plan is impressive. The development of the Dixie Highway Corridor is important, inevitable and a positive thing: the tone we set now for this corridor, is the tone by which the rest of the corridor is developed. Therefore, it is extremely important we get it right here. It is positive in that it will provide a boost to the tax base and could be a spark but may not pay for itself right away. Commissioner Aiello said he thinks REDICO is the partner for this site from what he knows about REDICO. That being said, as of yet, he does not personally believe this proposal meets the PUD criteria. When he looks at the criteria as a whole he challenges REDICO because he knows they can do better and meet the innovation required for this site. He does not believe they are quite there yet, although moving in the right direction. Commissioner Aiello cited Section 18.13.4 and said he does not see the innovation in land use yet as encouraged by that section. The PUD approval requirements and the Dixie Highway District require that all criteria must be met and in his opinion, the material benefit to the community has not been met with the boulevard as proposed and it will not improve the traffic flow in a significant way. The proposed development must be consistent with the goals and policies of the Township Master Plan. Goal 4 of the Master Plan is to maintain the rural character of the township. He thinks the architecture is innovative but the use and amount of green space is not rural. Goal 5 is to improve the conditions which lead to private economic growth in a planned and thoughtful manner. He believes this provision calls for Springfield Township to think differently than other communities in southeast Michigan as to how we preserve our natural resources. In regard to Policy 20, he sees in this plan the grouped buildings and plaza concept but is not convinced that we have done everything innovative on this site in order to make big boxes not be the theme of the site. Policy 22 states that up to 40% of the off street parking may be permitted within the front yard outside of the front yard setback. Commissioner Aiello said if the main anchor tenants are how we are judging it, we definitely have more than 40% of the parking in front. Sub-requirement H of Section 18.13.4.c states it is the intent to provide high quality and complementary building architecture and site design... Commissioner Aiello said he does not feel like we are quite there yet. Section 8.13.4.d requires pathways and sidewalks. In his opinion, this was met in the cluster and in the plaza area but otherwise, it seems they are taking a big box development and adding a pedestrian element in the corner. This is not, to him, an overall pedestrian development. Commissioner Aiello said the quality of tenants is important and would like to have some assurance of that built into the plan. In conclusion, Commissioner Aiello said the plaza is a great element but the landscaped fountains are emblematic of sprawl development, they are not rural or innovative. He suggested pine trees.

Chairperson Lamont thanked the applicant for working with the Township and noted that this plan is much improved from what was presented last fall. The reduction in square footage is an improvement and represents a 15% reduction. Increased green space has moved from 11% to 29.%. Natural features show an improvement with tree preservation which is important. Increased setback is also an important revised feature. Chairperson Lamont said we must have a material benefit and there are three features of this development which he believes could qualify. In regard to the boulevard, it is a great idea but in its current form he does not believe it is a material benefit but could be. Having a new church in the community would be a material

benefit to the community and would not be possible without this development. This development will ultimately bring a substantial number of jobs to the community. Chairperson Lamont said, for this to qualify for PUD, he needs to see more development of the traffic flow and traffic impact, particularly for the residents of Lavon. Also, he would like to see statistical data for required police and fire services for a development of this nature. With respect to the utilities, he believes they qualify based on what the plan is subject to approval by the proper authority. He does not think the plan qualifies right now for the requirement to be consistent with public health, safety and welfare but could with the development of the traffic. He does like the pedestrian sidewalks from the large scale retail to the smaller outlots. The environmental impact on surrounding land and the proposed changes have been a positive impact and he would like to see further detail as this progresses. Chairperson Lamont said he appreciates the applicant talking with the neighboring residents to prevent an unreasonable negative impact. He would like to see some data proving that no negative impact would occur. In regard to single ownership, the applicant is willing to prove that anytime. The applicant has made a tremendous amount of improvements in being consistent with the goals and policies of our Master Plan but in his mind the applicant currently does not meet that criteria. He feels that the natural capacity and limitation of the land to support the development is ok for what is being proposed. Chairperson Lamont commented that he sees the installation of a traffic light is a benefit. He would like to see innovative use of storm water best management practice throughout the development. Screening, in his opinion, should be type 1. The parking proposed is adequate in his mind. However, in regard to delivery routes, he would recommend a turn-around behind retail “b” similar to the one behind retail “a” or perhaps share one turn-around for both retails. He supports the narrower drive behind large retails wherever possible.

Ms. Pam Merritt, 9030 E. Blue Water Dr., asked if there are plans to connect to the existing sewer in Independence Township. Chairperson Lamont said, no.

Ms. Joyce Gibbs, 7243 Blue Water Dr., commented that it is difficult to get on Dixie Highway now and two more entrances with no light won’t help. She believes moving building “c” to the front is a good idea but the bottom northwest corner is the most offensive. It is too close and there is little buffer with no privacy.

Ms. Kim Hupperts, 9009 E. Blue Water Dr., commented that there is no current natural screening near her. They only have three pathetic pine trees. She would like to see the berm and wall put back in the plan, removing it was upsetting. She believes retail “c” does not necessarily need moving because it may act as a buffer.

Mr. Andrew Hyde, 9005 E. Blue Water Dr., commented that the back of the store is still very close to the residents and screening will be key. He would like assurance that anyone at the retail center does not have access to the residential area. He would also like the Township to lose the word “box” when referring to this development.

Mr. Robert Gray, 9022 E. Blue Water Dr., commented that he wants building “c” to stay exactly where it is because it will screen him from the lights. We need the berm and wall.

Ms. Carol Cane, 9067 Bavarian Ct., commented that she likes the reduction in density and thanked the applicant for the workshops with the Township. She urged the Planning Commission to go forward with this project as she believes it is a good idea.

Ms. Theresa Kelly, 9042 East Lake, commented that she would like the Township to take into consideration sewers as this corridor continues to be developed.

Mr. Tim Wittebort, 8615 South Shore Pointe, commended the Planning Commission for being open minded and working with the developer. He thinks this is a good project. He commented in regard to maintaining the "rural character," he does not see how anything in this area other than the gun shop has maintained the rural character. The car dealerships and Kroger do not have as much green space as this project. He also believes if we put this at the area of Dixie and I-75 we are less likely to have a development of this size further north on Dixie Highway. He believes this is the best location and the boulevard is a great idea.

Ms. Connie McClellan, 7400 Blue Water Dr., said the majority of people in her complex are not happy about the Big Box idea of this proposal. They are much more pleased with this new plan than they were the first. She is concerned about smells coming from the restaurants and the proposed pond.

New Business:

1. Election of Officers, Chairman, Vice Chair and Secretary

- * Commissioner Steckling moved to appoint Dean Baker as the Planning Commission Secretary for 2007. Commissioner Champion supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Aiello, Baker, Champion, Leddy and Hines; No: none. The motion carried by a 7 to 0 vote.**
- * Commissioner Steckling moved to appoint Roger Lamont as the Chairperson of the Planning Commission for 2007. Commissioner Baker supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Aiello, Baker, Champion, Leddy and Hines; No: none. The motion carried by a 7 to 0 vote.**
- * Commissioner Hines moved to appoint John Steckling as the Vice Chairperson of the Planning Commission for 2007. Commissioner Baker supported the motion. Vote on the motion. Yes: Lamont, Steckling, Aiello, Baker, Champion, Leddy and Hines; No: none. The motion carried by a 7 to 0 vote.**

Other Business:

1. Update Priority List

A Master Plan, Planning Commission Preliminary Review was added to the Priority List for the March meeting. The Planning Commission Bylaws discussion was added to the Priority List for

the February meeting. Article IV & V of Ordinance 26 is still To Be Determined. Ordinance No. 27 Amendments are set for a discussion with Attorney Greg Need for the February meeting. The Dixie Highway Corridor Review is set for the February meeting.

Adjournment:

Hearing no other business, Chairperson Lamont closed the meeting at 10:21 p.m.

Susan Weaver, Recording Secretary