

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF MONITOR
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
June 5, 2012

The meeting was called to order by Chairman J. Bellor at 7:10 p.m.

Pledge of Allegiance recited by all.

Members present: J. Bellor, C. Hoyle, J. Frank, B. Campbell, D. Darland, M. Morin, E. Arnold
Members absent: None
Also present: R. Sheppard, Planning Attorney; J. Jackson, Planner
Many residents of Crossroads subdivision.

Motion by Hoyle seconded by Frank to adopt the agenda as presented.

Motion carried.

Motion by Campbell seconded by Frank to rescind the motion of May 1, 2012 giving tentative approval to the Sports Complex.

Roll call vote:

Yes: Hoyle, Campbell, Darland, Frank, Morin, Bellor, Arnold

No: None

Absent: None

Motion carried.

Motion by Campbell seconded by Frank to approve the minutes of the May 1, 2012 meeting as corrected. The motion regarding the Sports Complex is removed since notice had not been sent to neighbors before that meeting.

Motion by Hoyle seconded by Campbell to approve the minutes of the May 29, 2012 special meeting as presented.

Motion carried.

Public Comment/Input

Chairperson Bellor opened public comment at 7: 15 p.m. Several residents of Crossroad subdivision spoke against allowing a sports complex next door to them. The following issues were raised: It would cause a traffic problem. Why would the township put a commercial facility in a residential area? This is an AG zoned area. There is indoor soccer in other areas and it can go to commercial areas. They don't wish to live next to a commercial facility. There is a fear that property values would decrease. There is a concern that the vacant lots in the subdivision would not be developed. Questioned why everyone in the subdivision did not get written notice. Attorney Sheppard explained the 300 foot notice requirement.

Public Input closed at 7:24 p.m.

Items for Consideration

Jackie Campbell Sports Complex 09-100-024-200-020-00

The site plan was displayed on the easel and Commissioner Frank pointed out the subdivision, detention pond, parking area, outdoor field and the building.

Jackie Campbell explained the complex and discussed the intended uses. Everything would be inside—soccer, gymnastics, tennis. Although the engineer put a warm-up field outside on the print, she doesn't want to have anything outside. The power lines run right along the property. It is planned for the furthest corner away from the subdivision. It is not a really large building, 230' x 195'. It is bermed all the way around. Campbell said that she had not heard that there were wetlands on the property as some neighbors have mentioned. Inside the building would be scheduled league play.

The developer noted a retention pond to gather water; berms to insulate sound and sight; a lot of green space in the back; crowding the use to the area furthest from residential. Traffic generated will probably be less than that generated by a residential development comparable to this.

J. Campbell has looked for a property for about two years. Other parcels were in the millions of dollars or not centrally located.

There were no additional questions from the Planning Commission that had not been covered at the last meeting.

The facility will be used primarily for soccer, tennis, gymnastics, and other indoor mainstream sporting activities. J. Campbell said that there will be other uses; it will be more of a training center. There is a long list of possibilities as sports are changing, so any type of sports you can train.

Frank is concerned about the sewer hook-up going through the Crossroads subdivision and then to Donald subdivision before getting to a main line. It is his opinion that a study is needed to inform the Planning Commission that the sewer hook-up would not create any problems in the subdivision. His concern is that Donald Subdivision is old and the sewer requirements were different then.

The developer acknowledged that this is a legitimate question that will be addressed down the road.

J. Campbell said that she hired a business consultant out of Ohio who said the property values will increase in the area. There will be games, but only six people on a side. She would guess that there would be one hundred people or less in the building at one time. There could be some overlap of activities. The developer said that there would be four possible uses at a time.

Planner Jackson noted that when the Planning Commission is considering the special use that is being requested, the zoning ordinance lays out the kind of things that should be considered. It has to do with compatibility with adjacent property and it also has to do with what else could go in this property and would the impact of this be greater or similar to another use that could go on this property. The property is zoned Agricultural, so we considered what other uses could go on this property under an Agricultural zoning district. In addition to single family homes, there are a lot of other uses that could go on this property. You could have a school, a church, public athletic fields, a public park... So, when you consider the impact of the use of this facility, you need to consider possibilities other than residential.

Planner Jackson also noted that they had done a traffic analysis based on what would happen if this 20 acres was developed with 10 homes and a 10 acre municipal park. The traffic generated by that was greater than what would be generated by a sports complex. We have asked for more detail on the things that will go on there to better define those numbers.

Attorney Sheppard said that the discussion tonight was to determine if this use was appropriate on this piece of property. Other uses that could happen under the AG zone are corn fields, beet fields, a cattle farm, pig

farm or any other agricultural use that the residents of Crossroads may not like, but that is what it is zoned. Sheppard noted other Special Uses permitted on AG zoned property. We are here to decide whether the proposed use should be considered athletic grounds which are allowed on AG zoned property.

Public Hearing opened at 7:57 p.m.

Trustee Malkin felt that the ZBA needed to define “Athletic Grounds”. He is also concerned what happens to a building like that if the business doesn’t succeed, and parking is a concern considering the parking issues with the soccer fields by the ISD.

In response to T. Gibas, 4525 E. Crossroads question, J. Campbell said that she has no plan to use the area behind the building.

J. Hanover of 4513 E. Crossroads is concerned about 195 parking spaces if this isn’t supposed to generate more traffic. Planner Jackson explained how parking determinations are made and the inability to expand or change use without coming back for approval from the Planning Commission as a Special Use facility. Joe Wiskey of 2817 Hotchkiss noted that the concern has been over what happens if the business fails. The inverse is also an issue. If it is successful, it will expand.

Several others voice similar concerns as those recorded above.

Harold Miller said that the sewer for Crossroads was turned over to the Department of Water and Sewer.

Public input closed at 8:19 p.m.

Sheppard explained that with a special use permit the business can be sold as long as the use stays the same.

Frank moved to send the issue to the Zoning Board of Appeals to make a determination whether Athletic Grounds and a sports complex fit. Supported by Morin.

Roll call vote:

Yes: Hoyle, Campbell, Darland, Frank, Morin, Bellor

No: Arnold

Motion carried to refer this to the ZBA.

Motion by Darland supported by Arnold to table the Special Use hearing regarding the Campbell Sports Complex 09-100-024-200-020-00 until after the Zoning Board of Appeals defines “Athletic Grounds”. Motion carried.

Motion by Hoyle supported by Morin to adjourn Public Hearing on the Campbell Sports Complex until next month.

J. Campbell was requested to get with the Building Official and give him a more detailed list of what may be in the building..

COPOCO Credit Union 09-100-V06-000-002-00

Planner Jackson listed the outstanding issues:

1. Details of exterior of the building—Done
2. Stacking spaces for the drive-through—Done
3. Landscaping—Done
4. Letters from other agencies—Done
5. Details of signs appear- ok. Still need to get appropriate permits. Possible change in a directional sign from six feet to 4 feet.--Agreed
6. Photometric plan—Provided

7. Details of trash enclosure—Done

Planner is fine with everything as long as they can demonstrate that they have all the agency approvals and have addressed the concerns of the engineer.

The Fire Marshal's concerns have been met.

Jess Fitzgibbon of Gerace representing the owner of COPOCO noted that they had responded to the issues listed. They have a copy of the covenant and restrictions for Tech Park and they have reviewed our plans. Tech Park wants us to add irrigation and make sure that we don't have a red roof that matches McDonald's. They have verbally approved the plan.

Discussion regarding what things need to be noted on the site plan before approval and what can be approved with conditions.

Motion by Darland supported by Campbell that the site plan be approved contingent on a building permit not being issued until a complete and accurate site plan is received by the township addressing all the issues of the planner's and engineer's review letters with administrative review by the planner and engineer.

Roll call:

Yes: Hoyle, Campbell, Darland Frank, Morin, Bellor, Arnold

No: None

Motion carried.

Bayfield Assisted Living Center 09-100-012-300-090-13

Planner Jackson summarized the McKenna review of May 23, 2012. In general, plans conform to ordinance requirements. There are a couple of issues with parking, landscaping, and signage to address. Any approval should be contingent on an approved lot split and approvals from other agencies.

Jim Klein of Axiom Consulting Services is the engineer on the job. The business manager, Greg Saxton and the construction manager, Randy Oliver were also present.

This is a joint venture between two companies, Leisure Living who has done 26 of these in the state, and J. E. Johnson out of Midland. This is phase 1 of a multi-phase development. He responded to McKenna's review:

- The drive location has been approved by the Road Commission.
- Klein has met with the Drain Commission and there weren't any issues. They need to pay the fee and have final inspections.
- There is a shared detention pond for the entire 27 acre parcel.
- He moved the restrictor of drainage to meet the current ordinance.
- Has two letters from both owners saying that the turning radiuses in the area to accommodate the type of delivery vehicles used and they don't wish to add any more pavement at this time.
- He brought a plan which shows adding the requested shrubs and moving the five shrubs. Minimum landscaping is shown at this time.
- Application has been made for a lot split with the township.
- Location of sign is noted on the plan and will comply with the ordinance.
- Klein met with Fire Department. The building is fully suppressed. The chief won't know if the access road is needed until he sees the building plan.
- The state agency that licenses these buildings has approved it without the access road.
- There is a hydrant located on the plan which is labeled better on the new plan.

Gregg Saxton explained the use and operation. There is typically one person per room although they do accommodate couples.

Jackson would like to see architecture for the project and was satisfied with the turning radiuses.

Darland moved that the site plan for Bayfield Assisted Living Facility 09-100-012-300-090-03 be tentatively approved on the contingent that a building permit not be issued until a complete and accurate site plan is received by the township addressing all issues in the planner and engineer review letters, with the administrative approval of the final site plan by the planner, engineer and fire chief/marshal. Support by Bellow.

Roll call:

Yes: Campbell, Darland, Frank, Morin, Bellow, Arnold, Hoyle

No: None

Motion carried.

9:13 pm 5 minute break.

9:20 reconvened.

Harold Miller Site Plan Review 09-100-037-400-050-00

Planner Jackson gave background. The applicant's request for a side yard variance for the south side of the building was denied. Since that area is still in contention, the site plan review that the planning commission is considering tonight does not address that area. That part on the south side of the building is excluded from any action that the planning commission is going to take tonight.

When we did our initial site plan review and they submitted this, we decided to err on the side of being conservative and we included the entire area of that building for parking calculation purposes. I would like to modify that and say that the parking requirements should be reduced by approximately one parking spot to reflect that it does not include that area.

This is a special use as well as a site plan approval. We need to re-do the special use because of the expanded retail area addition. We reviewed it in accordance with all the ordinance requirements for special use approval and, provided that they meet the items in the site plan review, we find as we did before that this use would be appropriate, the expansion would be appropriate from the special use standpoint. Again that is subject to them addressing the site plan related issues.

And those issues, I mentioned that it excluded the building to the south. The one difference from the plan that we've reviewed in the past, I should probably summarize this real quick. They've added seven parking spots on the south side of the building. They've also relocated the sixteen spots on the north side of the building and provided access to those sixteen spaces. They did indicate that they are going to have rental trucks. I'm not sure where those are located on the site plan, but those, the area that is going to be occupied by the rental vehicles can't be counted toward the parking. So whatever the maximum number of rental vehicles you are going to have, that number of parking spaces is going to have to be excluded from the number of parking spots that they have on site.

Bellow: The rental truck question, there would probably be a half dozen of them. Do they have to designate a spot for where those rental trucks will go? I know they drop them off, pick them up.

Jackson: Just from an operational standpoint, I think it would be better if they designated some spots so that it doesn't interfere with parking for the customers. We have limited parking available in front of the building which is going to be at a premium for the customers, so maybe they want to put most of the trucks back behind the building and maybe, if they are worried about visibility, they can put maybe one truck in front, but keep most of them in the back so it doesn't interfere with the way the parking works.

Darland: Harold, I don't know how many rental trucks you have and that may vary, but you only plan on having one or two out front so they are visible?

Miller: Yeah. They only want to put two out there and sometimes we'll come in and there will be three, but they will just come in the middle of the night and when people come in the morning they will put them in their proper places. And I believe on that print we did show Penske trucks, didn't we? At the south end of the lot?

Klein: There were seven more spots which have now been reduced to five more spots.

Miller: Yes, Dan, to answer your question, they only want two or three smaller ones out front because they block the exposure of the building so we are setting it up so they can be parked out in back in a graded area beyond the parking which is in the west.

Jackson: Is that Penske? Is that on this plan? What is the date of the plan that has that on it because I don't see that on this plan.

Klein: There is nothing that designates Penske. The only thing that was changed was that those seven spots to the south and Harold said, "We put those seven spots on the south there so we could park those one or two rental vehicles there with the balance of them in the back." But, there is nothing that says, "Penske Truck Parking".

Jackson: And the seven spaces have been reduced to five because of the setback requirement for the parking.

Klein: Right and I made that change when you guys sent that.

Jackson: Ok.

Klein: Can I ask you about the parking reduction when you said that? You said one spot, but, it is one per 300 square feet, right, because that is what we calculated on the requirements so it would be more than...

Jackson: Well, we estimated that, if the building were to comply with the ordinance requirements and it were set back, you would lose about 300 sq. ft. of space. So that

Klein: Oh! If you set it back, not just totally, right? Gotcha.

Sheppard: If that south wall were moved back...

Klein: I was thinking if we took it totally off, it would be...

Sheppard: That is the one space. So the plan review now is, assuming the building is in compliance with what the township thinks it should be, that is how your parking is calculated.

Jackson: Yeah, we asked for clarification on lighting. Are there any pictures that are going to be added?

Miller: Other than what we submitted, that is all. We did show...the lighting engineer did have a... he sent over a print. I have a copy

Klein: There would be one, two, three, four light poles. (pointing to fixtures on the plan.)

Jackson: No lighting on the building?

Klein: Harold submitted the photometric, evidently, and...

Jackson: ... and that showed the lighting on the building?

Miller: No. There's no lighting on the building. All there are are the four lights across the front and that was submitted. And those four lights are going to go down on the parking lot and not on the building so we don't have to worry about any shooting in the traffic or on the neighbor's property.

Jackson: The...I don't want to assume anything, but the dumpster enclosure is...because there was no detail submitted on the revised plans and...

Klein: I've got all three plans. You only received one, for whatever reason, but when this was submitted, the same detail sheet that was originally submitted that showed the dumpster detail, so I...just so you can see (showing a plan to Jackson), but I think when it was sent, you only got the middle plan so there is a topo and demo plan that was updated also.

Jackson: ok

Sheppard: The dumpster will match the building...

Klein: Yes. This is the exact same one from when it was approved last August.

Jackson: And the final condition we put on here is that there be a surety bond in the township to ensure that all the site development will occur in accordance with the approved plan.

Sheppard: Just to clarify the clarification, I guess. As John said, we aren't dealing with the south wall so everybody knows an approval we give will not include the south wall. That is between the township and the applicant to be dealt with and we have taken out that 300 sq. ft. and taken out the requirement for that one parking space. If you move that wall back and get it in compliance, it would be a great development.

Darland: If it is on the site plan, how are we not acting on it.

Sheppard: By the minutes that you are taking and by the report that... all of the reports say was specifically not addressing the south wall as part of the special use permit approval. But, if your minutes,...Specifically, that is why we removed that one parking spot. We are calculating the south remodeled area to be in full compliance with the setback and we removed 300 sq. ft. from that 6200 sq. ft. remodeled area. So it would be closer to 5900 sq. ft. And, everyone has the print, but the way the lot does a little zigzag down there, you would only have to have your setback from that residential line where it is now 13 feet, go back to 25 feet or it's 12 something from that point...

Frank: So the township is going to address that issue?

Sheppard: Yeah, we don't...we are here for a special use permit to approve the addition on the north which we have already approved once and now we are just looking at it again because of the bigger size. The township will have to deal directly with the applicant on that intruding south wall that was removed and rebuilt. Our approval would be assuming that it gets built to spec of the ordinance. If there is some other arrangement on the amended site plan, they need to be filed to incorporate that south wall once the township and the developer have dealt with it. Everybody clear on that?

Darland: A building area in violation is a township board issue.

Bellor: Questions?

Sheppard: If we could coach you into moving that wall back that 15 x 13 foot or whatever it is, that would be great. You were nodding for everything, but that one, Harold. We got to the...

Miller: Well, here's the thing. Here's my position. I worked with the building department right from the beginning and Mr. Sabias knew what was going up all the way, and we weren't told we were in violation until we were 90% complete. And that's our position that the building department failed to bring it to our attention that there was an error there.

Sheppard: And I'm not asking you to ...'cause I'm not the judge or the jury or anything...

Miller: No, I'm just coming right out and tell you that's our position, that if he would have told us that right in the very beginning we could have made it very simple. A little zig in that wall, but as it is, it is going to

cost us roughly \$25,000 to demo it and just put this little 11' x 20' zig in that wall which is not our fault. It is the building department's.

Sheppard: And that 11' x 20' we are not counting for parking until it is all worked out between...

Miller: It is going to get worked out one way or the other. We got to get through this system to get it worked out.

Sheppard: And really, all we are trying to do is get done with the north addition so that...

Miller: ...get the building going...It's been down since February 17.

Malkin: I had asked before, I don't know if Harold ever thought of this, but we have an ordinance on expansion on a non-conforming use, and I had wondered if Harold had applied for special use under that provision if that would have been a good fit. In other words, it was designed for buildings that were non-conforming, the person is trying to improve what is there, which is what he was doing, and so, you are expanding...and there are some percentages, it can't be more than 50%. And actually, in his case, it would be zero percent because he is rebuilding trying to improve what is there. My understanding is that it would require a separate special use permit, but I guess my question is...I recall that we had actually adopted the ordinance. If my memory serves me right, Serenus Johnson was expanding a building that was non-conforming and it seems to me that that might have been a good fit. I don't know if Harold ever looked into..., But it is more of a question, too. It seems to me that that would alleviate the problem of him having to move it if it was approved under that scenario. He's basically not doing anything other than improving the wall that was there in the exact same place.

Miller: There is also something in the ordinance that I was told, that if a building is in bad condition. That isn't the word, but that is what it meant, that the building could be re-improved as long as it was put back in the exact same footprint. And this is what my people tell me that could have been done, also. This building was in that bad a condition which we have pictures of and ...because it was damaged by the weather and the roof was blowing off. And that is why we brought it up with Sabias at the time and he said, "Yeah, he didn't see a problem with that," because of the condition of the building.

Sheppard: There is a provision to repair a non-conforming structure without replacement, but the definition is going to be that SEV value of the building. The cost of the repair cannot exceed the SEV of the building. So, if it is 25 grand to move that 11' x 20' section, the cost of that remodeling had to be more than the SEV value of that 6000 sq. ft. building.

Miller: I had no problem at the time making that change if we would have known that we had to make the change. It was so simple. It was all on blueprint. All we had to do was put a zig...but when we were told that we could go ahead and we got 90% complete before we were stopped and told you have a problem here. Why in the hell didn't somebody tell us we had this problem? Waited until the roof, the eaves trough, siding, windows, drywall, insulation, electrical and now they tell us we have a problem? I don't think that was being handled right. That's when we went to the Board of Appeals and said, "Hey, look it. We would have did it the way it should have been done, but we weren't told."

Sheppard: You know I'm not here to argue and no one is trying to argue. That's kind of water under the bridge and we all have to live with that, but let's try to see if we can get the rest of it under...

Miller: It's too bad, because the neighbor who is affected has no problem with it. He gave us a letter and you have it on record that he was here saying that he didn't have a problem with it. We put up a new six-foot steel fence to shut, to help...so everything was done right it is just we have the issue..

Sheppard: Right.

Frank: On John's comments, number 6. I don't think this board ever saw a site plan review for a sign I see is already erected.

Miller: Are you asking me something?

Frank: How could you do it without approval?

Miller: The building department approved it. You will have to take it up with him. All I am going by is what your local building department said.

Bellor: If you look at this permit it is to reface the existing sign, not to build a new one. That was my concern and I went to the building official and he dug that out. It was issued by Mr. Sabias to reface the existing sign.

Miller: Well, we talked it over with Dave. We told him what we were going to do because the wind took it over and we got his approval, so you will have to take that up with him.

Arnold: I guess my one question is, if I take out a building permit to put an addition on my house, then I change my mind and I say I'm going to have the whole house, put a new house up, I mean the first permit is not very good, right? So Mr. Miller says, "Take it up with our official." We've got on our print here it says, "Township permit # 3660" which is a permit to reface an existing sign which isn't even in the same location as the new sign. It's a brand new sign. Everything on this print is supposed to conform.

Then, the other thing, Harold's got on his print here...I'm really confused, because every time I look at something I learn something. It says, "Not approved for any use." And then it's got 3070 sq. ft. I have no idea where 3700 sq. ft. is and it is just amazing to me that we can't decipher a print that is sitting here in front of me. It's like the information on the sign; we have a sign that doesn't have a permit. I'm not arguing with anybody, but the sign does not have a permit. He had a permit to reface the existing sign which he tore down, so we are starting with a new sign which he doesn't have a permit for. That would be a violation right there. Then I'm looking at this, "Not approved for any use." If you remember, I was on Harold's side on that at the very first meeting, because I thought it was kind of absurd that you could take away somebody's property and not be able to use it. But I don't understand where this 3700 sq. ft. is yet. Until this is all drawn out so we can figure it out, I mean, you can't keep building without a permit. I mean, where is this 3700 sq. ft. that he can't touch?

Jackson, Sheppard: 30,700

Arnold: 30,700 sq. ft of existing open space not in use. That is a lot of land there, so I don't understand where all of this is. So, until I know what I am looking at, I can't make heads or tails out of this. It says in here you can't expand anything. It's like...if he can't do anything, how come he keeps doing stuff?

Bellor: My question for you, John, is this 30,700 sq. ft. in question part of the land?

Jackson: It is the part of the building that is to the west and it is comprised of a series of greenhouses and other things that he had no proposed land use for, so we didn't feel...and it was a condition of the original review when we did it, that until he came up with a description of what was going to go on in there, we didn't want to give him any approval. So, 30,700 sq. ft. is, you can see the outline of the building. It goes all the way to the back...

Klein: This is a plan that you guys did not receive; there are three plans in the packet; you just received the middle site plan. This was the first sheet in the package that was the demolition and survey plan. It crossed out what was demo'd and shows the balance of the building that we are not going to use. (Klein pointing out area on site plan.) The area that is on there is cross hatched in there and it is also on the site plan because John asked to put dimensions in there.

Arnold: Well, just a second. You said this is all cross-hatched. This is cross-hatched. I don't see any dimensions on any of this stuff, so how do I know where 30,700 sq. ft is?

Klein: The dimensions are over here on the site plan along the cross-hatched piece. Those were added. And again, all the other pieces we said what we were going to do with them and we have included them on the plan. This piece we have dimensioned and said it is excluded from the plan. It is the existing building less the uses that we have included on the plan.

Campbell: Is that all under roof right now?

Klein: Yes.

Campbell: And it goes up to about here?

Klein: Yes.

Morin: I have a question for you. I have a print here from June 13, 2011 and it says 35,400 sq. ft. not to be used without review and approval. So, where did the 5,400 sq. ft. go?

Klein: We demo'd. When they actually tore buildings down and we were asked to provide a plan that dictates or show you what was out there. They tore more of the building down so the use went away. You can see from this plan. This just showed a cross-hatch from here which would be across from here, they tore some larger areas down inside of this plan, so that is the difference there. We actually went back out there after this last time and located what was torn down. This is actually what was torn down.

Bellor: John, is this the first you've seen this tonight?

Jackson: Yeah.

Bellor: Anyone else? Questions?

Campbell: One thing I would ask, I guess, of a general nature. I haven't been around as long, I guess, as some of you fellas have. How do we ever get satisfaction as commissioners about responses to the township engineers issues? I would expect to get a response in writing or a copy of it. Who reviews that? Kibbe has eight separate issues here they are concerned about? Do you eventually review that, John, or is that done administratively here? How do we get notification that Kibbe is satisfied?

Jackson: It is the building official that would have to get a letter from Kibbe that they are satisfied. The building official is the last person that reviews it before granting a permit, so they would have to have a full sign off from the township engineer saying that all of the engineering issues have been resolved.

Campbell: You get a written response to your reviews from the applicant, and the township engineer does also. But we have to assume that the building official is satisfied with the engineer's position on an issue. That is never really communicated to us, I think. Do we need to trust that step? I'm asking a generic question here.

Jackson: There is final engineering that gets done between the time that the planning commission reviews plans and the time that they do a building permit. So, you know, they would have to resolve all those final engineering issues before a permit could be issued. We don't require final engineering to be done at the planning commission level.

Arnold: I kind of differ with that opinion, because, Carol was our chairperson and at the end of her reign, I think we had a file and we had to have that stuff checked off, that the chairperson had to make sure that the engineer checked off on everything and the planner checked off on everything. We went through that, did we not, Carol, at the bitter end? Because that was one of our questions just like Bob had, how are we going to make sure that that stuff was done. I think at one of the last ones, I thought you had on file that you drew some lines across, and the chairperson, Jim, is in charge of verifying that those things are done. That is part of being chairperson.

Hoyle: Again, the engineer had to go to the building official.

Arnold: But when we had this debate for many months, we had the same question. How do we know that this is signed off. And it is the ultimate decision of the planning commission to verify. We can have

somebody else look at it, but it is our job to verify that the facts are facts. And I remember, if you look back through one or two of the last ones that you were, I think you did that.

Darland: I know twenty years ago, Mr. Sheppard was here and I was here as chairman at the time. Yes, quite often I would come into the township office and sign the site plan. Or, if it was approved as presented, I would sign the plan at that point. And if there was a minor change, let's say you have to move these trees from here to here, that was done on the site plan right then. The person petitioning signed right then that those trees would be moved to that location and I signed it.

Hoyle: (Obscured by noise.) I didn't take care of it right at the meeting, but I did take care of it after the meeting at the hall.

Arnold: I knew you did it. () those been done yet.

Bellor: Only because they haven't been complete.

Arnold: Bob asked who is supposed to verify. It is the chairperson's responsibility to verify.

Bellor: Prior to a building permit being issued...

Arnold: He can't issue a permit until you sign off, legally, if I remember right. Whether we did it that way or not, that's the way it's supposed to work.

Hoyle: (phrase) you're absolutely right. (phrase)

Frank: For you gentlemen here, the way I look at this, you have asked for a review of that sign? The permit the man has has nothing to do with what he did. So, as far as I'm concerned, in my eyes, he is in total violation. How do we correct that? You asked for review. That's policy. He has to bring us a plan for that sign. Now the sign is standing up there.

Jackson: Right. I'm not sure what happened at the administrative level...how that got approved. I don't know.

Bellor: The project was started under one building official. That one was terminated and another one stepped in in the middle of the program and he was here less than thirty days. Then they hired another one. So, you basically have three people involved in this program. I really don't know if the right hand knows what the left hand is doing yet.

Darland: Shouldn't the sign location be on a site plan?

Jackson: The sign location is on the site plan.

Sheppard: It is on this site plan.

Darland: On the site plan, is that where the sign is actually put?

Miller: Yes. The sign is placed exactly where the other one was even though Arnold said it wasn't.

Arnold: Then it would be illegal because it was right next to the road and you've got it set back.

Miller: The foundation... No, it isn't. It's sitting right there where it belongs. We left the foundation. (papers rustling—missed the end of Miller and response by Arnold.)

Arnold: The print even says...we have the original print. I don't have no argument. The sign is not the original sign.

Darland: Is the sign located on the print that was approved back in August?

Jackson: He had to go to ZBA to get a variance and he didn't get it.

Arnold: The first print of Harold's sign had the correct location for the sign. It is altogether different than it is today. It is taking up parking space. Before, parking went straight across.

Jackson: The sign is not in the same location as it was originally depicted.

Arnold: I don't understand how the footings could be there if it isn't even in the same place.

Miller: If the issue is a permit for this, I will get another permit, because the sign is exactly where it was and we saw the requirements. Everything is there, but, if the issue is the permit, we'll buy another one.

Dave wrote it.

Arnold: I talked to Dave this morning, and Mr. Dave did not inspect the sign. Out of his own mouth to a township official. I'm not arguing with you, Harold, but I called this morning and Dave told me he did not issue a permit. He did not inspect the sign. Period. Those were his words to me.

Miller: Dave approved the sign square footage and we placed it on the print and I had already bought the permit...

Arnold: ...you had a permit.

Miller: Wait a minute. Just a minute. I want to really know. It sounds like this is strictly argumentative. What the hell is the problem here? Tell me what we were supposed to do, what we didn't do and we will do it! All you want to do is argue about the sign.

Arnold: You came up with that the last time, Harold. We aren't arguing at all. You got on this drawing you got 30,700 sq. ft. and you aren't going to use it. You've got a sign that says, "Permit #3660", which is not the permit for that particular sign. I don't know how many other things on this print are not correct.

I'm not arguing. I'm looking at the facts that you presented to me. If you..., I just don't understand it! Why do you think I'm against you? I'm really not. Why wouldn't I want you to be in business? All you have to do is have this print right.

Jackson: Is the location of the sign that is on this latest set of plans accurate? According to this plan?

Klein: If you are pointing to the most recent plan that you received, that sign, we actually shot the location of that sign so that is the actual location.

Darland: Is that the one received by the township on May 11?

Jackson: Is the sign that is out there right now the same height as the original?

Miller: No, it is lower.

Jackson: The sign that is out there right now is lower than the original sign?

Miller: The other one was twenty feet. I think this one here couldn't be any higher than the height of the sign from the setback and that is exactly what it is. So I think it is fifteen foot and it is actually fifteen foot back from the right-of-way.

Bellor: I need your name.

Ross: Nickie Ross. 2104 Karl Dr., Bay City. Mr. Chairman, I guess I have a...I'm not sure about this. I just need to clarify myself. When we were here at the last meeting, you are talking about the sign, I was there with Mr. DeGrow, and Mr. DeGrow stated...and I don't know if this is what you are getting into, but it was about the square footage of the sign. And he admitted that he had already approved that sign and he approved for 100 sq. ft. He got into multi-use. And it was Earl that got into this debate about the 45 sq. ft., I believe, don't quote me quite on that as opposed to the 100 sq. ft. and there was a discrepancy. At that point I got the impression they didn't even know for sure what the actual law, rule, regulation, whatever you want to call it, ordinance because Mr. DeGrow sat right here and said, "A hundred square feet because of multi-use as opposed to forty-five." My understanding is they were going to try to figure out...you, the board, whomever, exactly what square footage was going to be permitted. Dave DeGrow sat right here, if you look at your minutes, admitted that he already gave Mr. Miller approval for one hundred square feet. And he debated that, he went back and said, "This is how I interpret it". And he gave him the permission and at that time everything was ordered. So, I don't understand now how this seems to be a problem when this inspector approved it.

Arnold: The 100 sq. ft. there is no debate about. We are in agreement on 100 sq. ft. that the sign can be. We worked that out and I didn't say it was 45. John kept saying it was 45. The ordinance reads 100 sq. ft. for a multi-use building that doesn't use the same common entrance or hallway, so he is 100% correct. The sign can be 100 sq. ft. There is no problem with that. The signage that is up there today was issued on a permit that was to reface the original existing sign which is not there anymore; we have a brand new sign. So, the sign was put up without a permit. The permit that was there when the sign was tore down to the footings, to the ground, that permit was no more good at that point in time.

Ross: Was that brought up by Mr. DeGrow at the time and he realized that Mr. Miller was putting up a 100 sq. ft. sign and was going to be lower than the sign was originally?

Arnold: Mr. DeGrow told me he did not inspect...

Ross: I'm not asking about inspecting...

Arnold: He did not issue a permit for inspection.

Ross: Who says...your inspector, and I'm trying to understand this, because I've been coming and doing this for like fifteen years with builders. But, my understanding is that, if you have an inspector that comes out and he approves and knows that there is going to be a new sign because, obviously, it is going to be bigger, there is a discussion as to the height of the sign. And if he knows that there is a different permit that needs to be purchased, don't you think it is up to the inspector to say, "Ok, Mr. Miller, I'm approving this for 100 sq. ft., it is the multi-use, it does have to be lowered, however, now you have to get a different permit." I don't know. I'm asking.

Arnold: I'm not going to argue with you, because I'm just going to tell you what the facts is... These two people have the ordinance in their hands. I do not have them. The ordinance says that you are supposed to present the building inspector to build a new sign, a set of prints that prove the sign is structurally strong enough to hold the sign. Once he reviews, because we pay our building official to review the plans. Once he reviews the plans, then you have the go ahead to build your sign. Up to that point you have a 'no go'. Now, if I am wrong on my procedure, one of you people correct me, because that is how the ordinance is written and I do know the ordinance.

Ross: And like you said, I don't want to sit here, I could argue with you probably all night long and it's not going to do any good. My thing is to what I originally asked. Going back to what Mr. Bellor said, I kind of agree. I don't think the right hand knows what the left hand is doing. And if you had another third inspector that comes in here, I personally say, I'm not a builder, but I think it's your responsibility and your inspector's responsibility to maybe educate the people like us on what they feel needs to be done. Now if he sat right here...I don't care if he inspected the sign or not, I'm not asking if he inspected it...he obviously knew. He gave approval for this sign that was going to be altered in any way, shape, or form. He knows the law. He knows what we have to do. I'm a township resident myself. Do you think I am going to know these things? I'm expecting this individual which was actually appointed or is on behalf of the Monitor Township people that have our best interest, it is up to him to make sure that I know what is going on, because I don't. So, if you are going to prove to me and approve a sign for so many square feet and I am going to lower it because this is what you are telling me I have to do, then it is up to him to make sure that I have my ducks in a row or guide me. And I think that is the whole problem with this whole thing with the township and the board. The right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing. Instead of working together trying to bring in revenue to this township, I have had so many people disappointed with this township that walk in to our building because they are appalled to think that Monitor Township Board would do such a thing. All we are doing here is trying to create some more jobs, bring in revenue for the township, and give our community an opportunity to see new product that we have been bringing in that people really are thriving on and can't wait and all you people do is put up a block. The only one inspector that was here trying to help was the second inspector you had. And I'm sorry, I was at that building more than once when your first inspector was there...I've been told and I will bring in if I have to because I have names of individuals that had the same problem with Mr. Sabias. Going by, never inspecting anything and just going and saying, "You're fine. It's going good. Not a problem? Yup, that's ok." And I talked to a Bangor Township resident two days ago that I can bring in that is happy to have Sabias over there, because he said, "Heh! As far as the township is concerned, Sabias is a yes man. Do whatever you want." His quote. Exact words to me. And I don't know how you people can just sit here and just want to do nothing but give a person a hard time who is sticking his neck out in this day and age, in this society with the economy the way it is and not want to work together. And somebody else said, "Yeah, maybe you're right. Maybe everything, there is always room for error." Everything is not done necessarily in your time frame or exactly as you want, but, come on. Let's get back together and get going. Let us get our business back in order, bring in revenue for the township and

satisfying our community. That's your job. That's what you got elected for by people like us and we are the people who pay your wages. And that is all that I have to say, but I think it is something that...go back on to MLive.com and start seeing some of the comments that I never even knew was on there.

Bellor: Ok. Let's kind of put an end to that (missed word) only because some of the things you say have a little accuracy to them. A lot of the things you say does not. OK? What I'm going to address here shortly is, I'm under the impression you are a licensed builder.

Miller:

Yyes, for forty-five years.

Bellor: As a licensed builder with 45 years experience, this isn't his first rodeo and I don't think it is ever going to be his last. Now, the guidelines that this township has set forth for builders goes swimmingly. I don't think there is any person who doesn't want to see this thing succeed. But there's guidelines that he has to follow like any other contractor. It's not just Mr. Miller. I don't care if it is Mr. Smith or whoever it is. I scratch my head tonight because, there's a gentleman sitting here that drew two sets of drawings. One set of drawings for the company was immaculate. There's another set of drawings that, they're confusing. Alright. And in my opinion, they are not totally complete and accurate. There is a discrepancy as far as the sign goes and I think the discrepancy is that the sign was taken down and put in another location. Has it been inspected? I don't know. But I do know for a fact that there was a permit issued, and I will agree with Mr. Arnold, that this sign was to be re-faced. If there was a reason for it to come down, it has not been shared with me. Ok?

Anything that comes to this board has to go through these two gentlemen down here in order to make sure that they provide with the guidelines. And Mr. Miller knows those guidelines better than I do. Only because he is a licensed builder! I scratch my head figuring, how did we get to this? We are to a point where we are trying to get this licensed builder's program going. He ought to be telling us what is right and what is wrong, not me trying to figure out what is right and wrong with him. And I agree with what you are saying...but only to a certain extent. Ok. It's your turn.

Miller: Quickly. We have discussed this enough, but this is the fifth time I have been to the planning commission. I hired this man and his company to satisfy the requirements of the township. Every time we come in here, it seems like certain members of this board tear apart what we have brought in here and look for new ways to hold us up. We've been held up now since February 17. It is costing us \$4000 a day in construction interest, lost revenues from people. We have one tenant that has \$80,000 and he is waiting to see the outcome of this meeting tonight, because, if it doesn't get going, it's going to get real ugly. And that's just telling you the way he said it. This board has to make a decision and you were right when you said the left hand doesn't know what the hell the right hand is doing. You've got too many inspectors, nobody seems to really grab the bull by the horns and...I just went through a site plan deal with approval with the City of Bay City. It was done in one meeting and it is the same thing, a strip mall on Wilder Rd.

Bellor: I agree with what you are saying. Here's what you need to understand. If this were a rubber stamp issue, I totally agree with you. What I don't understand is why do we have all of these comments? Why do we have all of these comments from this gentleman down here that this needs to be done, that needs to be done...eight or ten different issues. Just a minute. Ok? Here's a site plan presented by the gentleman right here not more than an hour ago. Trivial questions and it was a slam dunk and it is over with and I scratch my head. The next one is, I have all these things. Is it his fault? Because just a minute ago you said you gave all that stuff to him.

Miller: No, I don't think... Are you asking me a question? I think it is a communication between him over there on the end, the planner. He don't have his act together. He does not set guidelines. He should say, "Here is what you have to do. One, two, three, four." That's what the City of Bay City does and that's what the City of Midland does and I work with both of them a lot. They have 8, 10, 25 things. You bring these in

and do them exactly the way we guide you and we will approve it. He doesn't! We get...at the last meeting we had three issues: 13 parking sites had to be added, a letter from the Drain Commission, where are you going to park your Penske trucks? We went back and addressed those thirteen and a week ago Friday we get another letter from him saying that he had to have ten more! Why didn't he tell us last month? He did not do his job and to get another approval just like you said tonight...The guy here on the credit union said...oh you have to send it back to the..."Yeah so he can get another 800 bucks! That's what it is all about as far as he is concerned. It's all about money, their money.

Bellor: I'm not going to argue if it is a money issue, all I know is...

Miller: He could say, "Subject to this here being done, we approve it tonight and get these into your building inspector before starting your job." And it could be done with in two days. You've got some major issues, but you've got them right up here in the front.

Sheppard: Back to Commissioner Frank's question of several minutes ago on what to do with the sign. Many times we administratively assign to the building official the sign permit. So on this particular site plan, having heard what we just went through, the setback appears to have been increased. I know I had a conversation with the building official who I believe said, and I don't know if Mr. Jackson was there or not, that the sign is now set back equal to the height and it may be back to strike out the phrase "per Township Permit" and make it a condition that the applicant get a sign permit from the building official for *that* sign. Not re-facing a sign, but for the location and footings of that sign. Go pay the 40 bucks, get Dave DeGrow to go out and look at what he's got to look at and we've delegated it which we have done 99% of the time with signage—delegated it back to the building official. That should take care of the sign.

Bellor: With this drawing...

Sheppard: But we should just strike out "Per Permit #3660" and have Jim initial that as the architect and make it a condition of whatever approval, should you grant an approval of a special use permit, that you have to go get a sign permit from the building official showing that he has reviewed the prints, and approved the construction, and approved the location of the sign. My understanding is, we have been talking a lot about the sign, but my understanding is it is now a legally conforming distance where the old sign was originally too close to the street. So it may have been we didn't jump through all the hoops in the right order of jumping through the hoops, but we should get the sign done fairly quickly by jumping through the right hoop now. Ok?

But the only other comment is, I'm sorry it is so late, because the more you look the more you...underneath the sign where it says "Requested approved uses," you would have to add that condition that we are we are not granting all those requests for approved uses because of the previous exception to that 6270 because of that wall issue. You know, we can approve the use to the north, obviously the 2900 sq. ft. has not changed at all and then the 6270, that issue would still need to be dealt with with the township, but that 300' is coming off of there like we talked about at the very beginning. From that standpoint, then it is all of the conditional approvals. The engineer, I know John was looking at the engineer's letter, then Bob brought up, who gives us the conforming engineer report? Much of what Jay Wheeler has said, has been addressed, but we don't get a final report from Jay. And what Earl said and what Dan said and what Carol said is that we used to have a checklist of final engineer sign-off, final planner sign-off, and when it is all final and signed, the chairman would go in and sign the print and the building official is only allowed to give a permit after the print is signed by the chair. So those are kind of where we were for the last two, to sum it all up. I get paid by the hour, I'm happy to stay here until one or two, but I know the rest of you want to go.

Bellor: Ok, so if this is approved, he just walks in and gets another sign permit.

Sheppard: That would be the way to answer Mr. Frank's question. To not, to strike from this print that the sign is per a permit, because we believe that permit is not the one that approved the new sign, but a condition

of approval would be that he go get a new sign permit approved by Dave DeGrow for that sign. Hopefully, the sign is completely in compliance with the ordinance, but if not, Dave administratively would have to deal with the sign.

Bellor: Are you still willing to get the new permit?

Sheppard: Are you willing to let Jim strike that “per Township #” out of there and we will just the final...

Miller: I'll get the permit tomorrow.

Sheppard: I forgot what the other issues were, but I'm trying to focus us toward the end of the tunnel so we can make a decision.

Darland: That's ok. I stopped taking minutes (missed the end of the comment.)

Bellor: Yeah, right.

Bellor: Ok, so we, basically, just have to deal with the north portion of the complex and now the sign.

Sheppard: Yeah. And under the requested areas, I would, as the minutes of the meticulously for the fourth time indicated, indicate that your approval does not approve the south 6700 sq. ft. subject to the encroachment to be resolved in the future.

The last conditions that John said that you may want to consider, because everything else could be subject to the administrative review like we've done before, is the bond, the compliance bond. Dave unfortunately is gone. I talked to Dave this afternoon. Dave, John and I were supposed to meet. That meeting fell through, but Dave and I talked about this project and Dave's opinion he said a cash or surety bond of...well, thought the construction costs to bring about compliance would be five grand. He thought about a \$7500 bond would be sufficient.

I told Dave, I know Rick Austin is going to want to write the bond to make...because I don't think the township has one on file, but that would be hearsay recommendation of what Dave said the bond would be is \$7500.

Miller: What is the bond for?

Jackson: It is basically to make sure that everything is done they way the plan says it will be done.

Miller: Did you ask these other guys to put up a bond? I mean, I'm 90% done with the job. All I got to do is put asphalt on the front and put the shrubs in and we are done.

Jackson: Then it shouldn't be a problem.

Miller: Why do you need a bond then?

Bellor: How does the portion in question, the south end. How does that every get rectified?

Miller: How does that get rectified? It's going to have to be worked out through circuit court.

Bellor: Then I think that is where the bond applies.

Miller: ok

Bellor: ok?

Miller: Well, that will be a circuit court decision, whether the building inspector had the rights to allow us to work 90% of the job.

Bellor: And I won't argue that point with you. That is basically the impression I'm under why the bond is to be issued.

Miller: Well, what does the bond have to do with that?

Bellor: Again, it is like John said, the drawings have to comply with what the requirements are. You took a non-conforming use, tore it down and did something different, ok? And I think that's the question in general. So, now, who gets to answer that? You indicated the courts. Once that is decided one way or the other it will be taken care of and this will be water under the bridge. It may be done in a year; it may be done

in two years; it may be done in six years. I don't know what the dockets are, you know, so that is kind of where we stand.

I thought the bond issue covers your backside as well as the township's. One way...unless you tell me that you are going to go tear that sucker down and make it right, that is why the bond is, I thought, a decent idea myself.

Bellor: If there are no more questions, what is your pleasure?

Hoyle: Shall we vote on the special use?

Sheppard: You can do it in one motion, but to do it separately would first be to grant special use for construction of the addition of 6748 sq. ft. to the north portion of the building. Finding that it is not detrimental to surrounding properties, that it is in compliance with special use provisions within the ordinance, and it is compatible and consistent with the existing property subject to site plan approval.

Bellor: Does this include the sign?

Sheppard: This is just to let him build what has already been started on the north side, the 6748.

Hoyle moved supported by Arnold to approve the special use permit on 1600 S. Euclid 09-100-037-400-050-00 for the 6748 sq. ft. addition to the north portion of the building. Finding that it is not detrimental to surrounding properties, that it is in compliance with special use provisions within the ordinance, and it is compatible and consistent with the existing property subject to site plan approval as denoted in McKenna's review letter of May 24, 2012.

Roll call vote:

Yes: Morin, Bellor, Arnold, Hoyle, Campbell

No: Darland, Frank

Motion carried to approve the special use permit.

Bellor: Do we need a motion regarding the sign?

Jackson/Sheppard: That would be part of the site plan.

Discussion as to wording of the next motion.

Bellor: Who obtains the surety bond? Him?

Sheppard: We would refer that to the Township Attorney to draft, but it would go to the treasurer.

Bellor: But it could be rectified if he tore that portion off and ...

Sheppard: Oh, sure! Sure!

Arnold: How can the bond be so low? If the...

Darland: That's what Dave said. Can the attorney determine that? The Township Attorney?

Sheppard: I asked Dave as the building official what he thought it would be.

Miller: We already agreed on \$7500. Now we got to renegotiate?

Sheppard: We haven't agreed on anything yet, but I asked Dave if he could get some prices. He was pretty comfortable with that figure.

Bellor: Ok. Let's go with \$7500 then.

Frank: Can I ask a question? This building permit issue, what would that cover?

Sheppard: The building permit would cover the north addition.

Frank: So he has to get a new building permit for that?

Sheppard: Well, I think he's got a Stop Work Order on, so it would let them lift the Stop Work Order on that building.

Miller: So the permit we got isn't any good?

Sheppard: No, I'm saying you've got a Stop Work Order on that permit. Once these conditions are met, he can lift the Stop Work Order on the permit.

Miller: We don't have to buy another permit. We already have...

Sheppard: Assuming it hasn't expired, I would say not.

Bellor: How could they lift the Stop Work Order when the Stop Work Order includes the south end of the building? I'm under the impression, and I could be wrong, that a Stop Work Order stops the project and there were some conditions.

Sheppard: Part of the problem with the south half of the building was that it wasn't on the site plan when it was approved in August. It didn't show that it was going to be remodeled and reworked, so the motion would simply lift the Stop Work Order on the north half of the building.

Darland: Now the township issued the Stop Work Order. We can't by motion lift it.

Jackson: No.

Sheppard: No, it would have to be the building official.

Bellor: So this is basically...the building official...ok.

Sheppard: I don't know what Dick gave him. I never looked through the construction file so I can't say.

Arnold: There was only two permits issued.

Bellor: If this is approved, this program can go forward minus the south end of the building, the () in question, right?

Sheppard & Jackson: Right.

Frank: Do we have the south end covered? There will be no work...

Bellor: Excluding the south end. That will be determined, apparently at a court of law, or...

Harold Miller Site Plan 09-100-037-400-050-00

Motion by Bellor to approve the site plan submitted by Harold Miller on May 11, 2012 for the property at 09-100-037-400-050-00 with the conditions that 1) reference on the print to a township sign permit #3660 be stricken and the applicant secure a sign permit from the building official; 2) the encroachment to the south property line from the reconstructed wall is not approved by this motion and needs to be reconciled between the township and developer; the south end 6272 sq. ft. is not approved in this motion. 3) All conditions in the McKenna review letter of 5-24-2012, Kibbe review letter of 5-29-12, and the fire department's review of May 17, 2012 be complied with prior to lifting the Stop Work order and reinstating the building permit on the north building. 4) Bond to be posted in the amount of \$7500 (per D. DeGrow) and deposited with the township treasurer in a form satisfactory with the township attorney. Supported by Morin.

Arnold: I only have one question. If the permit...The Stop Work Order is only on the north part of the building, that's the only part he ever was issued a permit to. Is that correct? He never was issued any more permits other than one, so are we right on what we just said there.

Bellor: I haven't looked at the file.

Arnold: I looked at the file. He had one permit plus the sign permit.

Bellor: All of this whole program is one permit.

Arnold: Correct. So are we right on what we just said?

Sheppard: Yeah, because we are not giving permission for the south remodeling to go forward.

Arnold: But he never did have permission for that, right?

Sheppard: Whatever authority the township's stopped it, they still have...

Arnold: Do we know what the south end means there? Shall we include the square footage in the motion?

Sheppard: 6272

Bellor: That doesn't go along with the 2898, right?

Sheppard: No, that 2898 he's not touching. That, hopefully, he can sell or rent.

Bellor: And if he comes in and agrees to tear this portion off, he's good to go. Surety bond is not needed, he just needs to get a permit.

Roll call vote:

Yes: Morin, Bellor, Arnold, Hoyle, Campbell, Darland, Frank

No: None

Motion carried to approve with conditions.

Communications

Motion by Darland supported by Frank to accept Communications.

Motion by Campbell supported by Hoyle to adjourn.

Motion carried.

Meeting was adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Darland
Secretary

DD/jw