

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CANTON
PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS
October 4, 2021**

A Regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Charter Township of Canton was held by video teleconference (Zoom) in accordance with Michigan law on Monday, October 4, 2021. Chairman Greene called the meeting to order at 7:06 P.M. and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

ROLL CALL:

Members Present: Acharya, Eggenberger, Foster, Okon, Weber, Zuber, Greene.

Each member noted that they were video conferencing from Canton Township, Wayne County, Michigan.

Absent: Engel, Singh

STAFF PRESENT: Patrick Sloan

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 13, 2021

Motion by Zuber, supported by Weber, to move to approve the Minutes of September 13, 2021, as presented. Motion passed unanimously by those present by roll call vote, 7-0

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

Motion by Zuber, supported by Weber, to move to accept the agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously by those present by roll call vote, 7-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

OLD BUSINESS

1. 126-SPP-6651 **ANAND VILLAGE** – Consider Preliminary Site Plan on parcel no. 126-99-0008-701. Property is located at the southeast corner of Geddes Road and Denton Road.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Acharya, to remove the Anand Village item from the table. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 7-0. (7:11pm)

Mr. Sloan gave a brief synopsis explaining that the project sponsor proposes a 43-unit single-family detached condominium development on 11.51 acres at the southeast corner of Geddes and Denton Roads. As a detached condominium development, the units won't be on individual lots. At the last meeting, the Commission looked at some plans and had recommendations for some changes. One change was the removal of the emergency access from Hawksbury on the south side of the site, and the emergency access from Denton on the north side will be paved. The plans this evening show that the grass paver emergency access on the south side has been removed. There are some remnants of this access and gates on some of the other pages of the plans that will need to be removed. The landscape and photometric sheets were not updated since the last meeting because of the turnaround time, but the remaining sheets have been updated to show the removal of that access from the development to Hawksbury Court in Crystal Village.

Mr. Sloan stated the most significant item that was discussed and the reason the item was tabled was due to the architectural elevations. At the September 13th meeting, the Planning Commission reviewed the elevations and decided to table it pending the receipt of revised elevation drawings and additional details to the elevations. The elevations that were proposed at the September 13th meeting were the same elevations that were approved in 2019. However, since that previous site plan expired, this is reviewed as a brand new application. Anything that was approved in 2019 is not necessarily the same as what would be approved in 2021. The revised architectural elevations have been submitted for consideration, including a letter from the applicant describing the changes.

Mr. Sloan explained the major changes to the architectural elevations since the September 13th Planning Commission meeting include coloring the elevations and adding a gable roof with reverse gables instead of a hip roof. There are some inconsistencies between the elevations and floorplans, as well as photographic image of the elevation. Staff recommends that the elevations be drawn to be more reflective of the photographic elevation presented, which includes higher reverse gables, shutters, and other architectural details. We also recommend that the rear elevations and layouts account for the rear decks and patios, as well as door-walls which will be likely.

Mr. Sloan stated that Staff's recommendation is that if the architectural elevations are acceptable to the Planning Commission, Staff would recommend approval of the Preliminary Site Plan, subject to the applicant including a 4-foot horizontal offset in the rear of each unit pursuant to Section 26.06 of the Zoning Ordinance and renaming Heather Place to a name that is not duplicated elsewhere in the Township. This excludes any additional requirements or conditions that may be adopted related to the architectural elevations. The Planning Commission may adopt additional conditions for those elevations, including any conditions to be addressed prior to Final Site Plan review.

Chairman Greene explained this is not a Public Hearing, but the Commission does like to hear from the project sponsor.

Mr. Sloan said that Mark Mahajan, the project representative is one of the attendees in the audience.

Mr. Bob Vora stated he has part of the ownership for the project. Mr. Vora wanted to alleviate any concerns about the aesthetics and the appearance of the buildings. The buildings that were submitted three years ago were approved. They are basically submitted to the Township primarily to get preliminary site plan approval. The buildings that will be built will have to be market relevant, and have to be very pleasant and something that would sell. This project got into a bit of delay because of COVID and they initially believed that they were just coming for an extension. Mr. Vora said what they have been working on to develop, when they get the approval, are multiple elevations. Mr. Vora had sent some of the sketches to Mr. Sloan, and the Commission will have time to review all of those during final approval. Their entire team are coming from architectural and engineering backgrounds, but they are not builders or developers as their primary business. Mr. Vora stated the elevations will be market relevant, very pleasing, and what the buyers and Canton demands. At this time, they have already completed substantial engineering, Wayne County permits are in place, and they hope to start the project soon. Mr. Vora stated he is asking the Commission to take him at his word, and see the final results in final engineering, and bless this project so they can get going.

Chairman Greene stated that since this project was tabled because of the aesthetics, he would like to ask Commissioner Zuber, who is an architect, what she thinks of what she has seen with the packet.

Commissioner Zuber stated there have certainly been some improvements from the last meeting, but she shares the concerns that Mr. Sloan outlined in his presentation about the plans and elevations not matching up with each other. Commissioner Zuber said she would love to see some kind of rear exit, such as a patio

door or something coming out of back. Specifically, she thinks that the gables make the houses look a little nicer. The tiny picture that they included on Page 33 is a much nicer looking structure than the drawings. Commissioner Zuber stated she understands that they want to keep moving on the project and understands that they are assuring the Commission that they will build a beautiful saleable product, but she is not sure that what she sees here gives her confidence in what will be built. Commissioner Zuber said she would not feel comfortable approving what she is currently seeing.

Mr. Vora stated that he also comes from an architectural background and has spent 40 years in architectural engineering. He stated when they submitted this plan, they were looking for an extension. Meanwhile they have been working on building this project so they have been working on different elevations. What the Commission saw was a three-year-old product, and between September and now, they had just couple of weeks to do some quick work, which is what they did. Mr. Vora said the Commission will have all the time and all the authority to see everything that is in the elevations before the final engineering. For the back-door entry, fortunately or unfortunately, the site plan which was reviewed and approved at that time did not require that. Mr. Vora stated they are working on a plan with a four-foot notchback that is required by Canton. They were in the stages of developing different floor plans and elevations, none of them were in a state that could be submitted between the September meeting and this meeting. It would have been half completed drawings. Mr. Vora stated all he can give is his assurance, and the Commission will have full time to review this during the final approval process. He stressed they need to get going. They have substantially completed engineering based on the past approvals, Wayne County permits are in place and that will expire, as he wrote in his letter, and that is going to cause a substantial financial hardship also. Building plans and building elevations would meet the Township's satisfaction, but all he can tell the Commission at this time is he can give them his word.

Chairman Greene stated that he understands the pressures from Wayne County, but the Commission has a job to do which is consistent with looking after products that are coming into Canton. He stated the applicant had maintained they are going to do something that will be market valuable, people are going to want to buy this. Chairman Greene stated he has not known any individual residential scenario that doesn't at least offer an option of having an entrance at the back where there can be a patio and/or a deck because, people enjoy being outside of their homes. He asked if the applicant could expand as to why that is okay in today's market.

Mr. Vora stated the plans that were submitted were to get approval from the Township. The plans and the designs that would be offered to the public will have multiple options, different elevations. When they submitted the plan, at that point they had no idea which builder or which developer they would be teaming up with. Now that they have a partner to build, the plans have been developed. You have to offer multiple options and have to offer options on the plans, you have to offer plans on elevations and on interiors also. Those things are being developed and will be presented to for final engineering or architectural review. Mr. Vora stated because of COVID it got delayed, so they submitted the plans basically to get an extension even though they are working on other simultaneous plans differently. He does not know what additional explanation he can give.

Commissioner Weber stated this is a preliminary site plan review. If the Commission were to approve this with conditions tonight, what other review is there from the Commission that would occur?

Mr. Sloan explained that because this is a condominium development, there are two stages, Preliminary Review and Final Review. At this stage of preliminary review there is the layout, and a lot of the details of what the development will look like are addressed. It is recommended by the Planning Commission and then goes to the Township Board for final action on the Preliminary Plan Review. After a condominium project gets through Preliminary review, it then goes to Engineering. The applicant designs detailed engineering plans, and goes through the County for engineering review permitting for stormwater, right-

of-way permits, etc. They then will go through the Township's Engineering Division for their review. Once the project gets those engineering reviews from the Township Engineering Services Division and the County, including any review that may be required by the State, they come back to the Planning Commission for Final Site Plan Review. The Final Site Plan should look the same as it does now. There may be some modifications from the plan which Staff may look at to see if it's anything substantial, but when the Final Site Plan is reviewed for a condominium, at that point it has been engineered, and that layout will be final and almost ready to go. Also, at that time they should have their builder on board with their final versions and elevations.

Commissioner Weber stated he doesn't really see much improvement in what he saw last month. He understands that they have a timeline to meet, but the Commission also has rules and guidelines that need to be followed. The Commission cannot just take someone at their word that they will do something. Commissioner Weber referred to the letter from the applicant that states there will be different elevations and different home plans and the developer is coming in. If this is all true, why isn't that developer here, and why aren't those drawings part of this packet? Commissioner Weber said that when the Commission tabled this last month, we didn't impose a deadline to return this month. We expected the applicant to come back with a saleable product. Commissioner Weber stated he is not inclined to approve this, he feels it is a poor package.

Mr. Vora stated they are coming here after going through review by the Township for two years, having been reviewed and approved. So, when they came, they had no reason to believe there was anything not taken care of. Their approval got delayed because of COVID last year and it expired, but for two years and three reviews by the Township. The Planning Commission and Board of Trustees have reviewed the plans and they approved it before.

Commissioner Weber stated he cannot speak to those who were on the Planning Commission two years ago. He is giving his opinion. If his colleagues choose to vote differently, that is their prerogative.

Chairman Greene stated he agrees with Commissioner Weber. He does not see any real improvement here and it concerns him that they are to present this to the Canton public. Chairman Greene said he would like to hear what the other commissioners have to say.

Commissioner Okon stated he does not mind working with the applicant and try to get them to stay on schedule and move along. There will be more approvals coming up anyway so he would have no problem continuing the process.

Chairman Greene asked Mr. Sloan that if the Commission approved this with conditions, can the conditions be so tight that gives the applicant clear direction and little discretion. Or could we get something a lot better by holding that final review back? What is our leeway on this?

Commissioner Weber wanted to add before Patrick Sloan answers, his concern is that if we need to put conditions on, whatever they may be, and make them quite detailed, would we be assured that they would be done before they go to the Township Board? Commissioner Weber personally does not want to present this package to the Township Board. This doesn't meet with the spirit of what the Planning Commission is supposed to be doing in the community. He appreciates the effort to try to move them forward, but there has to be some sort of a timeline or something for them to get this done.

Chairman Greene said he is trying to see what leeway they have while still holding their feet to the fire on a good product.

Mr. Vora stated they would be willing to accept any strict tests in the most definitive conditional approval,

and they will make that. The Commission can give the tightest conditions they want to, and they will be binding to them in that timeframe. He stated they could even put in a schedule for new elevations even before the final approval.

Chairman Greene thanked Mr. Vora for offering that.

Commissioner Foster stated she cannot speak for the entire Township Board, she can only speak for herself. She would like to see something more complete before it gets to the Township Board. Commissioner Foster said she was hoping that when this was tabled, they would have a more complete product to evaluate. Unfortunately, that is not what is presented here.

Chairman Greene asked Commissioner Foster, in her opinion, if an approval on Preliminary with a bunch of conditions would not be sufficient?

Commissioner Foster said she would want to hear what those conditions are before making a final decision.

Commissioner Okon stated that this would still need to come back to the Planning Commission for Final.

Chairman Greene stated, yes for final. But we want to make sure that we have the ability to say “no.”

Commissioner Foster stated her concern is that even though it comes back to the Commission for Final, between the Preliminary and the Final there is a lot of work done by the Township Planning staff and by the County. So, she wants to make sure that they have a good product that they are working on before it comes to us for Final.

Commissioner Weber said his understanding from Patrick Sloan’s explanation was that this is the stage at which we are addressing the aesthetics and all that. When it comes back for Final, they will be looking at more of the engineering, the project is almost shovel-ready to go. Commissioner Weber said that if they wait until Final, they are not going to see aesthetic improvements until way down the road. He said they will not know if it is good or not, so for the Commission to put the conditions on, then Commissioner Zuber may as well design the project for them. He feels the Commission is being asked to do too much.

Commissioner Acharya stated he agrees with the other Commissioners that the project sponsor should have done a better job given the fact that they have engineering and architectural backgrounds. They should have presented the best product rather than give us the diverse product and ask us to expect something better later. Fundamentally there was some carelessness or oversight, the situation should not have been this desperate. Commissioner Acharya said he sympathizes with them, but he feels there’s control and at a later stage we can probably rectify it. The Commission could probably agree to have some conditions to let the applicant know we require rear doors etc., something substantial. If that works, he would be okay with it, but he feels the project sponsors should have done a better job.

Chairman Greene asked if Commissioner Acharya feels that the writing of the conditions is too extensive to include in a package for approval? In other words, is it too much to go through at this time?

Commissioner Acharya said that if it’s something that’s very broad and is also acceptable. If Commissioner Zuber can come up with something that she can recommend, that would help. However, at face value it’s too much, and it’s a bad precedence to set too.

Chairman Greene stated he does not want to see the Commission design anything. This should be presented to the Commission for evaluation. We can demand that they have a back entrance, but in terms of the aesthetic appearance, how do you measure that? How do you put a condition together that requires a certain

thing? We have to see it to approve it. Chairman Greene asked, does the Commission hold the ultimate authority to say “no?”

Mr. Sloan stated that for a condominium type of development in general we can't treat a condominium differently than we would a subdivision type of development or any other type of residential development of the same form. In terms of saying “no” and denying the project, we can't deny it if it meets the Ordinance. They would have to meet the architectural standards of the Zoning Ordinance, the largest being 50% brick and the 4-foot offset in the back. There are some architectural standards in terms of good design that are both in the Ordinance and have been used as precedent by the Planning Commission, so in terms of something that would be a denial, not if they meet the standards of the Zoning Ordinance. It would just be a matter of getting the design up to where we want it to be.

Mr. Vora stated the Commission can give them a conditional approval and one more month. By that time, they can finish the elevations they are working on, and will be glad to present that in an interim review or review approval. He stated the Commission needs to realize why they are here. They came in with the idea of getting an extension of a project that was approved. It was very hard to get people to work during COVID also, so when a commissioner says there is no great improvement, he agrees. It was done very quickly because between the last meeting and this meeting, they only had about two weeks. Mr. Vora said they are not going to build houses that they cannot sell. He stated the Commission can give them some conditional approval that meets their requirements, and the project does meet all the zoning requirements. He wanted to reiterate that the project was previously reviewed and approved by Canton Township three times. They were maybe blindsided by coming and presenting the same thing also, to realizing that there might be some additional concerns on the project that was already approved. It has come to light, and they will address it. He stated again that the Commission can put binding conditions and put deadlines that they can work with and they will meet those.

Chairman Greene stated that when the project came before the Commission for this property the two previous times, they were senior developments, the Commission may have looked at things differently. But the point is this is what we have before us now.

Commissioner Eggenberger stated her concern at the last meeting was that the applicant was told these places aren't looking good and need to be improved. Her understanding is that they asked for this meeting, but came back with plans that do not look good. Commissioner Eggenberger said based on what she is seeing, she does not feel confident that in moving forward with an approval, they are going to get something that's going to look very good. But at that point when making the final decision, the applicant might choose something different that is not attractive. Commissioner Eggenberger said she has sympathy for the position the applicant is in, but they were told at the last meeting to come back with better drawings. That's why it was tabled.

Mr. Vora said the reason they asked to come back in a hurry, which they had not done in the previous two years, this is a true condition that they have a potential purchase in execution that they will lose if they do not get the site approval to proceed. That was the only reason to ask for the quick meeting. Mr. Vora said in all honesty, the Commissioners need to understand their point because they believe they are bringing a project that has been approved.

Commissioner Eggenberger said that is not what is happening here. She understands that they were confused in thinking it was approved, but it wasn't and the Commission told them specifically to come back with better drawings. So now they came back trying to get it approved, but did not come back with better drawings. Commissioner Eggenberger does not feel she needs to approve something without good drawings.

Mr. Vora stated again the project was approved previously by Canton Township.

Commissioner Weber said the Planning Commission has been over this. What happened two years ago is irrelevant now. Those approvals expired so it's now as if that never happened. This is the standard that's being applied now, and it is not inconsistent. The Planning Commission is acting in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance, so they are trying to work with the applicant here to come up with a solution. But if the applicant keeps dwelling on the fact that it was approved before, there's nothing else they can do. The Commission is trying to work with them to see what is a suitable solution.

Commissioner Weber asked Patrick Sloan if the applicant is willing to come back in a month with a better plan, not approving it now conditionally but come back again, tabling this again until the November 1st meeting. Did the applicant say that earlier?

Mr. Vora stated he was hoping the Commission would give a blessing with contingent conditions.

Commissioner Weber stated he is not trying to impose additional meetings on this group, but in an effort to try and work with the applicant, is it feasible to have a special meeting sometime between now and the next meeting if they could bring something back.

Mr. Sloan said from Staff's point of view, yes, they can arrange a special meeting. It's not a Public Hearing so there's no notification deadline beyond the Open Meetings Act requirements to publish and post the agenda. Mr. Sloan stated there is actually a special meeting scheduled for October 18th for a rezoning that could also include this case.

Commissioner Weber asked the applicants if they could get their plans together in time to make it for that meeting?

Mr. Vora asked what would the Commission want them to show?

Chairman Greene said he thinks it's pretty clear that they need elevations that are a lot more pleasing than what we are seeing. Chairman Greene brought up a statement Mr. Vora made earlier that there are other plans and elevations at their disposal through their developer. Those were not presented here, so it seems that the applicant should already have something that they can work with.

Mr. Vora asked if the Commission is looking for completely developed architectural drawing elevations or can they show the samples of elevations that they are planning to develop? Mr. Vora stated he needs to understand the requirements.

Chairman Greene said the requirements are that the applicant shows what they have in mind in terms of, say, four or five different development plans and elevations. The Commission then says they like or dislike.

Mr. Vora said he is asking if a sample of the plan and elevations that they are planning to build and will be developing in detail, and the architectural drawings, is that acceptable or will these have to be fully developed architectural floor plans and fully developed elevations which requires a much longer time to do.

Commissioner Zuber stated there are schematic design drawings, but they need to look good. They don't need to be fully developed. It's embarrassing to her as an architect to see a drawing that you brought before them where the floor plan and the elevations don't even go together. The applicant says they have three architects on your team. This is something she would never show any of her clients, let alone a public board.

Chairman Greene stated the Commission understands the applicant's time constraints, but those are not their constraints. The Commission's constraints are the final product that we would progress into, and right now it doesn't appear that we are going to progress. It appears as though they want the Commission to give approval to move forward, and we are afraid we will end up with a product that just is not suitable. Chairman Greene said we are trying to avoid that, and would love to help them meet their deadlines, but cannot do that at the expense of what we would have to look at for the next 50-70 years in Canton.

Commissioner Acharya stated he would like to make a motion to recommend that we table the project right now and give the applicant two weeks to come up with couple elevations that are suitable. If that works, then it will be approved on that day or it will have to be tabled once again.

Mr. Vora asked if he heard correctly from the architect (Commissioner Zuber) that the schematic floor plan and elevation should be sufficient at this time?

Chairman Greene stated they want to see intent. Something the Commission can look at graphically.

Mr. Vora asked to clarify that the schematic floor plan and elevations with a couple different options would be sufficient.

Chairman Greene said they want to see what the options are that would be presented to their customers for this project. That's what the Commission needs if they are going to submit approval.

Commissioner Eggenberger stated she would like to support the motion that is on the table.

Motion by Acharya, supported by Eggenberger, to table the project now and give the applicant two weeks to come up with suitable elevation options.

Commissioner Zuber called the vote:

Ayes: Acharya, Eggenberger, Foster, Okon, Weber, Zuber, and Greene

Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 7-0 (7:53pm)

NEW BUSINESS-SITE PLANS

None.

NEW BUSINESS-STAFF REFERRAL

2. 040-DIR-6931 **BJ'S WHOLESALE CLUB** – Consider Developer Instigated Revision to Site Plan on parcel no. 040-99-0006-709. Property is located north of Ford Road, between Morton Taylor Rd. and Sheldon Rd.

120-PDP-6941 **CREEKVIEW LANDINGS** – Refer review of Preliminary PDD on parcel nos. 118-99-0005-000, 119-99-0001-702, 119-99-0002-001, 119-99-0003-001, 119-99-0007-0000, 120-99-0002-000, 120-99-0003-000, 120-99-0004-701, 120-99-0006-000, 120-99-0009-001, 120-99-0015-000, and 120-99-0016-000. Property is located north of Geddes Road, between Denton Road and Ridge Road. Proposal is 415 residential units on 207.5 acres, with a mix of detached and attached units proposed.

- 142-SLU-6948 **DUNKIN'** – Refer review of Special Land Use on parcel no. 142-99-0020-000. Property is located at the southeast corner of Haggerty Road and Michigan Avenue, north of Old Michigan Ave. Proposal is a fast food restaurant.
- 073-DIR-6961 **ZAHR PLAZA** – Refer review of Developer Instigated Revision on parcel no. 073-99-0005-713. Property is located south of Cherry Hill Road between Denton Road and Ridge Road. Proposal façade and architectural changes.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Weber, to refer Item #2 to Staff. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 7-0.

NEW BUSINESS-SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR OCTOBER 18, 2021

3. 057-RZ-6917 **ALEXANDRA & ARIANA LLC** – Set public hearing for review of Rezoning for parcel no. 057-01-0013-301 (Dogology University site). Property is located south of Ford Road, between Morton Taylor and Sheldon Road.

Motion Weber, supported by Zuber, to set the Public Hearing for October 18, 2021. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 7-0.

MISCELLANEOUS – DISCUSSION

Chairman Greene asked if there is anything to discuss in terms of ongoing project and developments.

Mr. Sloan stated that the industrial project on Michigan Ave. have gotten their tree removal permit and are working on getting their development start permit. We should be seeing some activity there in the coming weeks.

Commissioner Weber asked what was going on with the gas station at Ford and Haggerty, the northeast corner.

Mr. Sloan said they are probably still in the process of doing their engineering. They had their Site Plan review a few months ago, so now they are going through Engineering, the County, and the State to get that done. Mr. Sloan does not know if they will be doing any construction this season, depending on how that permitting goes.

Mr. Sloan mentioned regarding one of the items that was referred for Staff. They had received a PDD application for Creekview Landings at the northwest corner of Denton and Ridge (farther west from Denton). That is a pretty large project, 415 proposed units on 207.5 acres. Planning Staff is in the process of finishing up their first initial Staff review, so it may be a while before that one is ready for the Planning Commission. Also, the Township's traffic consultant has yet to review the Traffic Impact Study that was submitted.

Chairman Greene asked what the status is for the project the Commission approved for a car wash on Old Canton Center.

Mr. Sloan stated that project is still going through Engineering. He had a meeting with the applicant last week about some proposed architectural changes that they wanted to discuss, and they were doing some rebranding. Mr. Sloan said his main message to them was that the Township is still going to be holding them to the 50% brick requirement. They are working on some renderings upholding the 50% brick. If the rebranding is dramatically different, he would expect that to come back to the Planning Commission just for a revised elevation review. The Planning Commission has the authority to approve plan modifications for something that's already approved without having the Board review it again.

Chairman Greene asked if there has been any further interest in that property at Beck and Ford Road, the southwest property?

Mr. Sloan stated he has not heard anything.

Chairman Greene stated he feels that area is an embarrassment, sometimes old cars are abandoned there. He said he hopes somebody is able to do something with it, or it can get taken down. He would rather see just growth there than what is there right now.

Commissioner Foster asked what is the status of Ridge Creek? A Public Hearing was set but then pulled from the agenda.

Mr. Sloan stated the applicant had submitted revised plans and had requested a Public Hearing which Staff proceeded with, and then they requested to come off the agenda. Mr. Sloan stated they have not heard anything from the applicant in terms of what their intent is.

Chairman Greene asked if there is an effort to change the name of Patriot Park? Is the name changing to Ridge-Ford Park or something like that?

Mr. Sloan does not know. He stated that question might arise from the draft Parks & Recreation Plan that has been published. The Leisure Services Department has been working on an update to the Parks & Recreation Master Plan, that is separate from the Master Plan that the Commission will be doing starting in the coming months. There was a presentation a couple weeks ago with the Board of Trustees where some concepts were rolled out. In terms of the naming, Mr. Sloan said he would defer that to the Leisure Services Department.

Chairman Greene stated he feels that changing the name is a terrible idea. We have been waiting for Patriot Park to develop all these years, and it needs to continue. There is nothing wrong with the theme names for the parks, to name an intersection for a park is a bad idea.

Commissioner Weber referred back to the property at the southwest corner of Ford and Beck. A lot of those properties along Ford Road from Canton Center Rd. all the way to the Township boarder are either up for sale or have been sold. Is there any noise about developing all that through there with residential or however it's zoned?

Mr. Sloan stated the Planning Services Division often get calls from realtors asking about splitting properties. In those cases, it's very difficult to split because of having to meet the required frontage and lot standards of the Zoning Ordinance. Sometimes Staff hears from prospective developers or realtors that want to know if they can rezone it for commercial or multi-family, and that's not something that the Master Plan supports in most cases. Mr. Sloan said he has not heard any concrete plans in terms of assembling any lots for any kind of large-scale development. In the coming months when they start the discussion on the Master Plan and look at the Future Land Use map, he thinks they are going to have a lot of discussion on the west parts of the Township, especially the undeveloped areas.

ADJOURN

Motion by Eggenberger, supported by Zuber, to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed unanimously 7-0. Meeting adjourned at. 8:05pm.

Melanie A. Sherwood
Recording Secretary