

**City of Brighton  
Planning Commission  
Meeting Minutes  
September 17, 2018**

1. Call to Order/Roll Call

Vice Chairman Petrak called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

The following Commissioners were present:

Susan Gardner	Steve Monet
David Petrak	Robert Pawlowski
James Bohn	William Bryan
Michael Schutz	David McLane

**Motion** by Commissioner Monet, supported by Commissioner Bohn, to excuse Commissioner Smith from tonight's meeting. **The motion carried 8-0-1.**

Also present was Nate Geinzer, City Manager; Michael Caruso, Community Development Manager; Kari Jozwik, Tetra Tech; Paul Burns, City Attorney; Scott Barb, Livingston County Planning; Jill Bahm, Giffels-Webster and an audience of 57.

2. Approval of the June 18, 2018 Meeting Minutes

**Moved** by Commissioner Pawlowski, supported by Commissioner Gardner, to approve the June 18, 2018 minutes as presented. **The motion carried 6-0-3 with Commissioners McLane and Monet abstaining.**

3. Approval of the July 30, 2018 Special Meeting Minutes

**Moved** by Commissioner Gardner, supported by Commissioner Bryan, to approve the July 30, 2018 minutes as presented. **The motion carried 6-0-3 with Commissioners Monet and Pawlowski abstaining.**

4. Approval of the September 17, 2018 Agenda

Commissioner Gardner requested that Item 9 be changed to Item 5a, Item 10 be changed to Item 6a, and Item 11 be changed to Item 7a.

**Moved** by Commissioner Gardner, supported by Commissioner Bohn to approve the agenda as amended. **The motion carried 8-0-1.**

5. Call to the Public

The call to the public was made at 7:05 p.m.

Sue Ellen Ikens, 702 State., stated there was more than one person with a disability in the hallway who did not have access to the room and asked if anyone would give up their seat to make the meeting ADA compliant. She also stated that the volume on the tv in the hall was low and asked that they find a way to allow everyone to be able to hear what is going on. She stated if not everyone can hear they are not in compliance with the Open Meetings Act.

Mr. Geinzer stated the room was at capacity and that they had accommodated as best as they could for the meeting. He believes it is loud enough as he can hear himself coming from the television in the lobby.

Ms. Ikens asked if the meeting could be tabled and rescheduled.

Mr. Geinzer stated the meeting could not be tabled and that the agenda had been accommodated by grouping together items for which people were specifically present.

Elaine Jankiewicz, 920 State St. asked why the meeting could not be held in an auditorium.

Mr. Caruso stated the meetings have to be published at the beginning of the year by ordinance stating the specific time and location.

Glen Ikens, 1058 Hillcrest, stated that the conditions for this meeting were unacceptable. He stated the meeting should be rescheduled at a larger venue where everybody could be present. He stated this meeting was too important for the committee to assert their prerogative over the prerogative of the voters and that he would highly suggest the meeting be rescheduled for an appropriate venue with enough room.

Vice Chairman Petrak closed the call to the public at 7:10 p.m.

5a. Site Plan #18-09 – 300 E. Grand River – Bountiful Harvest

Mr. Caruso stated Lindhout Associates had submitted a site plan on behalf of the First

Presbyterian Church and Bountiful Harvest Charitable Organization for a proposed accessory structure which would be located on the back of the property. He stated Bountiful Harvest is currently housed in the basement of the church and utilizes the City's community center. He stated the proposed building would be the new home for Bountiful Harvest and is designed to meet the organization's needs. Mr. Caruso stated the proposal has met all of the concerns by the City's consultants.

Mr. Lindhout stated there is an existing garage which will be demolished. He stated the new building will include space for storage as part of the layout.

Commissioner Bohn asked if all of the issues in Tetra Tech's review letter had been addressed.

Mr. Lindhout stated corrections are being made to comply with those requirements and that the site plan approval could be conditional on those items being addressed.

Commissioner Monet asked if there would be a clause stating listed hours for Bountiful Harvest to address parking issues.

Commissioner Schutz stated he would have to recuse himself from this item due to a conflict of interest.

**Moved** by Commissioner Monet, supported by Commissioner Bohn, to approve site plan 18-09 with the conditions identified. **The motion carried 7-0-2 with Commissioner Schutz abstaining.**

## **Public Hearing**

6. Public Hearing on Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) – Site Plan #18-10—  
1010 State St. – Brighton Village at Mill Pond

Mr. Caruso stated the site plan was slightly modified since it was originally submitted in 2015, where it received preliminary approval by the Commission. He stated the applicant, Pat Battaglia, did not submit a final site plan at the time and is back with a submittal for preliminary approval. Mr. Caruso stated preliminary approval was a required step of the PUD process which happens after a pre-application meeting between the developer, staff, and consultants. He stated once a site plan is submitted, the Planning Commission holds a public hearing to receive public comment and then decides whether to approve, deny, or table the site plan. He also stated the applicant has six months to return with a final site plan and PUD contract after receiving preliminary approval. He explained the process for final site plan approval and rezoning by City Council.

Vice Chairman Petrak closed the meeting and opened the Public Hearing at 7:19 p.m.

Patricia Mack, 810 Chestnut, stated she would like to know what is being proposed before making any public comments.

Jeff Stone, 422 N Fifth, stated the sound from the microphones and the tv was scrambled and that he would hope future meetings would be accommodating to those who are hearing impaired. He also stated the development was not appropriate for a residential area and compared it to the size of a Home Depot. He stated this kind of development would not be something anyone would want in their backyard. He suggested having the site be residential-transitional and that the development be kept to one level, which would fit the neighborhood.

Mary Cullen Bryan, 1024 State, stated her house is probably the closest to the proposed development. Ms. Bryan gave a history of her neighborhood and the former Lindbom School stating she was very invested in her community. She also stated she was weary of the vandalism on that site and the frequent police calls that have been made. She stated she supports the development which would allow the potential residents to be part of a walkable neighborhood.

John Johnson, 7909 Magnolia, discussed the PUD regulations of section 98-761. He stated the 65-foot building height was not compatible. He also discussed the burden to public services, streets, and utilities, and possible cost to residents if the City takes on those burdens. Mr. Johnson stated property values will plummet from having back yards look out onto this development. He listed all the possible traffic that would come with this type of development. He discussed the development not being consistent with the goals of the master plan and compared it to Main Street Crossing. Mr. Johnson stated the City has worked hard on a new Master Plan and he would hope the committee follows the Master Plan and denies the PUD.

Sheryl Krueger, 915 State St., stated she has no opposition to including the elderly population in her neighborhood. She stated she was extremely concerned about the plume and is opposed to the City not considering the safety, health, and well-being of the residents. Ms. Krueger discussed a letter from Rebeca Taylor of the DEQ which discusses funds being available to remediate the brownfield. She asked that the proposal be scaled down to one story residential-transitional housing. She also stated that the site must be ready to receive the development first and must be cleaned up.

Elaine Jankiewicz, 920 State, stated her home is five to ten feet from the proposed development and that this would be too huge of a facility. She stated the proposal should be scaled back and not be three stories high because she would not like to see such a huge development outside her window. Ms. Jacobs asked what kind of underground detention facility would be there. She reiterated that the proposal was too huge and too close to the homes in that neighborhood.

Joyce Powers, 982 Hickory, stated she used to live at 202 S. Seventh and is here on behalf of her daughter Kelly Powers who lives at 120 N. Fifth. She commented on the property not being kept up properly and discussed the previously proposed charter school for that site. Ms. Powers stated the plume solution seemed vague and that residents needed to know exactly what would be done to address it. She stated a lot of work had been done on rezoning and the master plan. She asked the City not to undercut the work that had been done. She stated Brighton is a community of high quality and the developer is not capable of handling this project. She asked the Commission to be careful.

Christopher Habsburg, 7940 Holly, stated he lives next door to the proposed project. He stated the proposed three-story building would be next to his house and stated it was completely out of place and would destroy his property values. Mr. Habsburg stated the proposal was out of context with the surrounding neighborhood and that every development of this type in the city had been held to a single story except one. He also stated it would create too much traffic and that destroying his property values would be a criminal act.

Glen Ikens, 1058 Hillcrest, stated residents want the development to be balanced. He stated they are fine with a retirement community on the property, but that the proposed development was out of context for that residential neighborhood. He also stated he attended Lindbom and that his family goes back five generations in Brighton. Mr. Ikens asked that the City would not sacrifice the beauty and integrity of their neighborhood in the name of economic development. He stated the existing trees on that site added a priceless aesthetic to their town. He also stated it was criminal to put a three-story building next to the existing homes. He asked that a reasonable plan be developed that is single-story and integrated with the neighborhood, not something that is dominating. Mr. Ikens stated this was unbridled overdevelopment and that there was no place in that neighborhood for that type of building. He asked that the context be considered as well as the residents and spoke about the beauty of Brighton. He also stated that housing for seniors was needed, but could be done in a reasonable way.

Janice Parish, 1017 State, stated she lives across the street from Lindbom School. Ms. Parish discussed the activity that goes on and the dangers of the property remaining vacant. She stated the police are called all the time. She also stated property values would decrease due to the vacant building on the site and discussed the conditions of the streets in that neighborhood. Ms. Parish stated her concern for the public health due to the plume that is underground. She stated she is uncomfortable with something being built without knowing firsthand if it is safe to dig there. She stated she wants something built safely and that homes would not sell if anything were to be found in the air or water.

Ashely Teffer, 914 State, stated her property backs up to the school parking lot. She stated she loves the safety of the community and her neighbors. She stated the proposed development is

unacceptable and will ruin the peaceful neighborhood that she bought into. Ms. Teffer also stated studies had shown property values will decrease by more than twenty five percent and that she would not be able to sell her home if this development is built behind her.

Brian Klear, 225 N. Fifth, stated that he was at the meeting in 2015 when the development was originally proposed. He stated he still has concerns about the project. Mr. Klear stated the properties in the adjacent township should also receive notices from the City. He stated he has watched the property decay for two years and that even though it is zoned for single family homes, he does not know if that type of development will ever happen due to the existing plume. He asked the Commission how they planned to assist in developing that site as single family residential. He stated if no plan existed then the property would just sit there and that the proposed development would be the next alternative. Mr. Klear stated the development needs to be reduced and provide enough screening. He asked what the zoning was for the assisted living on Rickett Road and who the point of contact is with MDEQ. He stated the MDEQ is not aware of the proposal and that he was concerned that issues may arise causing the development to halt or be abandoned during construction.

Mara Ikens, 125 N. Fourth, stated the development was too large and did not provide enough green area. She stated it was upsetting that this was coming into her neighborhood. Ms. Ikens stated the road was too close to her neighbors and was concerned about the lights streaming through her neighbors' windows. Ms. Ikens stated she supported a senior development, but not the draft that was in front of them. She discussed issues with parking, drainage, and traffic on her street. She also stated that residents could not protect themselves and were paying taxes to have someone protect them.

Delia Bryan, 1024 State, stated a lot of people were concerned with light pollution and traffic, and stated these things existed when Lindbom School was open. She discussed needles being found on the property and was concerned about that element being in her neighborhood. Ms. Bryan discussed her concern for safety. She stated Lindbom School was two stories and the proposed development was not that much bigger. She also stated it was important to take care of the elderly the way we take care of our children.

John Berry, Fenton, stated he owns the Lindbom property, which he bought six years ago with the intention of building a charter school. He stated he would not develop something if he did not think it was in the best interest of the community. He stated he had received proposals for apartments but did not think it was right for that site. He stated there would be less traffic than Lindbom and he envisioned residents from the community moving in to the facility as they got older. He discussed the dangers of the existing site and the need for it to be redeveloped. He stated there were over four hundred plume sites in the state and that he had met with Rebeca at the DEQ, who had said they would need a vapor barrier to ventilate the site properly. He stated

the current plume runs underneath Brighton High School and Brighton Lake and is slowly moving south. He stated the proposed development was a better alternative than the school that currently sits there.

Jim Aker, 7901 Magnolia, discussed the zoning language in Section 98-3.22 of the zoning ordinance. He stated site was zoned R-1 and that whether a PUD would result in a better development than what is allowed in R-1 was subjective. Mr. Aker discussed an article in the Livingston Daily from September 13, 2018 stating that Mr. Battaglia discussed two million dollars in offsite improvements and that this would be an unreasonable burden to the City if it were not paid. He also discussed a letter from Rebeca Taylor of the MDEQ stating she had grave concerns over the consequences of a development of this type on this site. Mr. Akers stated studies have shown a loss to property values and discussed the requirement for consistency with the goals of the City's master plan which calls for single family housing.

Kate Bryan, 1024 State, stated she and her family have been very active in the community. She discussed Brighton and having treasured memories of Lindbom. She stated it was heartbreaking to watch the school be vandalized. Ms. Bryan discussed the community atmosphere that existed between people of all ages. She stated she was sick and tired of seeing the school fall apart and could not think of anything better to go into this community. She also stated she hopes the proposed development will mesh well with the neighborhood and hopes people will welcome it.

Sue Ellen Ikens, 702 State St., discussed the unintended consequences of the proposed development. She discussed the constant deliveries of food and medical supplies. Ms. Ikens stated there would be a lot of pavement on the site and discussed runoff issues. She also talked about the Headlee override failing due to possible loss of trees for sidewalks and curbs. Ms. Ikens discussed the underground detention system being problematic due to the existing plume. She stated her concern for any disturbance which would create vapor intrusion and affect the residents of the surrounding homes. She also discussed her neighborhood being multigenerational and fears the development will push the elderly out. She stated the development was more commercial than it looks on paper.

Robert Stonik, 405 N. Fifth, stated the building was unsightly and the City has not done enough code enforcement on the property owner. He stated the City has no money to fix the streets and utilities and that their neighborhood has been neglected. Mr. Stonek stated he lives on the east side of the school yard and will not have any privacy if a three-story building is constructed behind his back yard.

Donna Kennedy, 304 N. Fifth, asked if there was a guarantee that no one will get sick from any development taking place as well as a disclaimer for any resident that moves into the assisted living facility stating they will not have more health issues from living there. Ms. Kennedy

discussed the trees that will be cut. She also discussed the cancer cases that have resulted from the plume and was concerned with any potential disturbance that may result from developing the site.

Susan Backhaus, 907 Brighton Lake Rd., stated she used to live on State Street. She stated the former city manager; Dana Foster had said the city had money to fix the streets in that neighborhood. Ms. Backhaus stated the City chose to spend the money for streets someplace else.

John Johnson, 7909 Magnolia, stated he was the third house where the plume was discovered and that he was starting radiation treatment for cancer tomorrow. He stated all his children went to Lindbom and are also being tested for cancer.

Ashley Teffer, 914 State, discussed there being a housing shortage for families in the city. She asked what was being given back to the City financially that would be long term and sustainable.

Discussed the criminal activity on the Lindbom School site and stated that an out of scale development was not the option. He discussed the assisted living facilities in the city that were single story. He stated the proposed building was too large and out of context.

Vice Chairman Petrak closed the public hearing at 8:32 p.m.

6a. Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) – Site Plan #18-10—1010 State St. – Brighton Village at Mill Pond

Pat Battaglia, 12334 Gaynes, stated he has been involved with the project since 2014 when it was originally proposed as a school. He stated the site plan has changed since 2015. Mr. Battaglia discussed the road design which addresses the building distance from the neighbors and provides emergency access. He also discussed light pollution concerns and a photometric study that was done which shows there are no foot candles of light along the property lines. He stated he would like to come up with a comprehensive landscape plan after discussions with adjacent owners. He discussed having a canopy of deciduous trees to provide screening. He also discussed the traffic study performed and stated there would be less impact than with the former school. Mr. Battaglia discussed the facility having active and engaged residents. He also discussed the school building being a community treasure and addressed concerns about the plume. He stated he has been in touch with the MDEQ throughout the development process and will take the proper steps to protect the residents.

Commissioner Bryan stated two thirds of the houses in that neighborhood are two-story and

average twenty-six feet in height based on his own research. He compared the proposed height of the new building and existing school building to what is currently in the neighborhood.

Mr. Battaglia stated they had their architect do a comprehensive study and design a building that fits the architecture of neighborhood. He stated the wings of the building would be twenty-eight feet high.

Steve Williamsen, 29126 Camel Dr., stated he has been involved in the development since 2015. He gave an economic analysis of the development and stated it was designed to have a campus setting and maximize the amount of green space on the property. Mr. Williamsen discussed the senior demographic of Brighton and the future demand for senior housing. He also discussed opportunities that would be available for medical students at this facility and the creation of about two hundred jobs.

Commissioner Bryan asked what the estimated property taxes would be once the property is developed.

Mr. Battaglia stated property taxes would be about half a million dollars a year.

Commissioner Bryan suggested that City Council consider capturing increased tax revenues from the development to fix the streets in the northwest neighborhood.

Commissioner Bohn asked if the Planning Commission would determine whether the six conditions listed had been met for approval of a preliminary PUD.

Mr. Caruso discussed which conditions had been met and stated the applicant would not be able to receive final site plan approval until all six conditions were met. He stated the current land use map shows the property as single family residential, but the future comprehensive master plan shows it as a redevelopment site for medium density residential.

Mr. Barb stated outstanding issues will be addressed in the PUD agreement which will be reviewed by the City Attorney.

Commissioner Gardner stated the Planning Commission had discussed what would be best for that site and that the proposed development would overwhelm the lot.

Ms. Bahm discussed the purpose of the master plan to guide development in the city and Lindbom being assigned as a redevelopment site for medium density.

Mr. Battaglia stated residential developers do not want to deal with the plume.

Commissioner Monet stated additional work had been done by the Planning Commission in three years since the preliminary approval in 2015. He stated the applicant never submitted any of the requested documentation and that there are issues which still need to be addressed.

**Moved** by Commissioner Bohn, seconded by Commissioner Bryan, to table Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) – Site Plan #18-10 – 1010 State St. – Brighton Village at Mill Pond pursuant to Paragraph 2(i)(b) of the PUD Ordinance until the December Planning Commission meeting to allow the applicant to satisfactorily answer the questions, specifically #3 regarding public safety, health and welfare. **The motion carried 7-1-1.**

Commissioner Bryan suggested the applicant get a report on the plume issue from the DEQ or Western Solutions.

Commissioner Gardner suggested others look at Oak Haven in Howell, which is similar to the proposed development.

Commissioner Monet stated he would like to see other projects the developer has done, a market survey, and whether their other facilities are at full capacity.

The Planning Commission went into recess at 9:40 pm and returned at 9:50 pm.

**Moved** by Commissioner Monet, supported by Commissioner Bohn, to reconvene at 9:50 p.m. **The motion carried 8-0-1.**

7. Public Hearing on Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) – Site Plan #18-11— Flint Rd. – The Bluffs at Spring Hill

Vice Chairman Petrak opened the Public Hearing at 9:51 p.m.

Richard Valente, 1047 Hillcrest, thanked Mike Caruso for his time and answers regarding the proposed development. He stated the current zoning calls for 15,000 square foot lots and the proposed development has 3,200 square foot lots, which is three times what is currently zoned. He asked what the price range would be for the proposed units, what exterior materials would be used, as well as landscaping requirements, and how property values will be affected. He discussed the increased traffic that would result from this development.

Sue Ellen Ikens 702 State St. stated she does not want to live in an area full of congestion. She stated the existing trees can be seen from many points of the city and discussed existing high density developments in that area that were built to fit into the neighborhood.

David Blair, 4583 Spring Mountain, stated he has been a city resident since 2011. He stated he was representing his neighbors, who have concerns about the size and number of lots proposed. He thanked Mr. Caruso for his time answering his questions. Mr. Blair stated the quality of life in Brighton should be a primary concern and that no changes should be made just for the purpose of profit. He raised concerns about the proposed density, lot sizes, and loss of trees. He stated the existing trees help filter emissions and noise from the interstate and discussed the impact on soil, water, and drainage quality. Mr. Blair spoke about the increased number of cars on Spring Mountain and the accident risks with increased congestion at the intersection of Flint Road. He stated residents were told by the City's former Planning and Zoning Director that the City would require a tree preservation area when Spring Hill was developed. He stated the residents enjoy the peace and tranquility the trees provide and that the proposed vegetation will not be the same as what will be lost, taking away from their quality of life and property values. He asked that the proposed driveway be modified and a secondary entrance be added. He also asked that a buffer space be included between the existing properties and the proposed development and that a bond be required to repair the city streets that will be affected from construction traffic.

Scott Phillips, 4634 Spring Mountain, stated a tree buffer was really important for privacy. He also stated the freeway noise was too loud where he lives and that the proposed development will have the same issue.

Maddalena Fanelli, 4589 Spring Mountain, stated she is opposed to this particular development. She stated the trees behind her house give her peace and tranquility and that the health and wellbeing of the community was being compromised in the interest of profit. She stated families that move in to the proposed homes will be breathing the pollution and hearing the noise from the adjacent freeway interchange. She stated the housing values of the existing residents were also being compromised and that the amount of traffic on their roads would be more than tripled. Ms. Fanelli also discussed water drainage and the stability of the land being compromised with the proposed development.

Mike Tokai, 4199 Flint Rd. lives to the north of the Stonex property. He stated the proposed density was too much and that nine lots would abut his property of three acres. He discussed the Spring Hill developer being required to put in a tree easement at the time those homes were built.

Randy Beikmann, 841 Nelson, stated he lives by the proposed emergency access off Hillcrest. He was concerned about flooding issues increasing with paved roads being added.

Dave Diroff, 4541 Spring Mountain, stated his concern with the main entrance being at Spring Mountain and the increased traffic it would bring. He also discussed storm water runoff and the

decreased water pressure that could be caused by the addition of these homes. He asked for modifications with the pumping station in that area.

John Guth, 4577 Spring Mountain, stated he was also told by the City that a buffer would exist behind the homes when Spring Hill was developed. He discussed the increased traffic volume and safety of Flint Road with the added development.

Bryan Green, 4601 Spring Mountain, stated he was also told about the green space that would exist. He stated there needed to be a secondary access to the development.

Deborah Guth, 4577 Spring Mountain, stated she would like the existing buffer to remain and asked that the Commission go and see the site and what they are in danger of losing.

Beth Walker, 1079 Hillcrest, discussed the A-1 zoning district being the most restricted in the whole city and stated she would like the property to remain zoned A-1. Ms. Walker is also concerned with her water pressure. She stated that when Springhill was developed, her pressure went down significantly.

Jerry Hardesty, 1065 Hillcrest, discussed the topography of the site being very steep. He discussed the PUD requirements and stated removing the buffer would have negative effects on property values. He asked for a greenbelt of at least 500 feet.

Tim Walega, 1049 Hillcrest, stated he would like a landscape buffer to remain and discussed privacy issues.

Paul Sheng, 215 Hillcrest, discussed concerns with the traffic and the loss of the trees.

Becky Sheng, 215 Hillcrest, discussed the proposed development failing the standards of the ordinance and the families in this neighborhood.

Jeff Barnes, 835 Nelson, stated he was concerned about the density, the setbacks, the loss of the mature trees, the traffic, maintenance of the detention pond, and increased noise pollution. He suggested a three-way stop at the intersections of Nelson at Church, Hillcrest, and School Street. He does not believe the second access drive is warranted. He stated the trees should be replaced somewhere in the city and asked that City Council look at a serious way to mitigate traffic in that area.

Molly McDonald-Foster, 247 Hillcrest, stated she was concerned with the proposed density and agrees with the previous statements about noise and traffic. She asked for an in depth traffic study to be done.

Vice Chairman Petrak closed the Public Hearing at 10:51 p.m.

- 7a. Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) – Site Plan #18-11—Flint Rd. – The Bluffs at Spring Hill

Spencer Schafer, Schafer Development, gave a presentation of the proposed development.

Commissioner Bryan questioned the site grading.

Steven Schafer, Schafer Development, provided details of the proposed plan. He stated they will work with the City and the residents to determine what buffers and landscaping can be provided. Mr. Schafer stated the site would be flattened to maintain grades acceptable for driveways, sidewalks, and general movement through site. He stated the long streets were driven by fire protection and that discussions with the Fire Department would allow them to sprinkle the units and alleviate the secondary access requirement. He stated the street lengths would be acceptable to the Fire Department.

Commissioner Monet questioned the density and stated there will be a negative traffic impact on Spring Mountain Drive.

Mr. Caruso stated that Springhill's density is two units per acre and this development's proposed density is 2.4 units per acre.

Commissioner Bohn stated this approval is the same as the previous item. In order for a final PUD to be approved, the Planning Commission must ensure that the six required conditions can be met.

Mr. Schafer stated he will bring back information addressing the six items. He stated the development would have private streets, which will be privately maintained and will not be a burden to the City. He discussed the benefit of updating the water mains for better water pressure for everybody in the area.

Commissioner Petrak asked how much the association dues would be.

Mr. Schafer stated dues would be \$200 to \$300 monthly and would include snow plowing and lawn mowing for the development to look consistent and manicured.

**Moved** by Commissioner Bryan, supported by Commissioner Bohn, to table Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD) – Site Plan #18-11 – Flint Rd. – The Bluffs at Spring Hill pursuant to

Paragraph 2(i) (b) of the PUD Ordinance until the October Planning Commission meeting in effort to gather greater detail on the development regarding water main issues and provision of a greenbelt. **The motion carried 8-0-1.**

**Old Business**

- 8. None

**New Business**

**Other Business**

- 9. Staff Updates

None

- 10. Commissioners Report

None

- 11. Call to the Public

The Call to the Public was made at 11:30 p.m. with no response.

- 12. Adjournment

**Moved** by Commissioner Monet, supported by Commissioner Pawlowski, to adjourn the meeting at 11:30 p.m. **The motion carried 8-0-1.**

---

*William Bryan, Secretary*

---

*Wendy Ayala, Recording Secretary*