

**ALPINE TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING  
Thursday, November 15, 2007**

**07-56 CALL TO ORDER/ APPROVAL OF MINUTES/ PUBLIC COMMENT**

The Alpine Township Planning Commission held its regular meeting on Thursday, November 15, 2007, at 7:30 PM at the Alpine Township Center, 5255 Alpine Ave., NW, Comstock Park, MI 49321, with due notice. Present were Chair Jim Townsend, Secretary Nelda Johnson, and members Jim May (Trustee), and Jason Rosenzweig. Excused were Vice-Chair Greg Madura and member Dick Sedlecky. Absent was Max Dunneback. Township Board members in attendance were Supervisor Marta Brechting, Clerk Jean Wahlfield, Treasurer Jan Brechting, and Trustees (in addition to May), Ron Cordes, Sharon Steffens, and Ted Wallace. Others present included Planning Director Sue Thomas, Township Planning Consultant Tim Johnson, Recording Secretary Patricia Kolkman and multiple Township citizens.

Townsend called the meeting to order at 7:30 PM with the Pledge of Allegiance. He commented that Commissioner Sedlecky was absent because he was hospitalized, and asked that everyone keep him in their thoughts and prayers. He then said that since this agenda is full, speakers during public comment should be brief and non-repetitive, because he hopes to conclude by 10:30 PM.

Townsend then apologized to audience members if they were here because of the Grand Rapids Press article about the Master Plan, since the paper had erroneously said that the Township would be rezoning properties. This is false, since the Planning Commission is just presenting its summary of how they view the Township in the future. Alpine Township is not changing the zoning of any land, and it affirms a property owner's right to use his land under its current zoning.

He asked if Commissioners had any changes to make to the minutes of the October 18, 2007 Regular meeting, but none were requested. **May moved, with support from Rosenzweig, to approve the minutes from the October 18, 2007 Regular Planning Commission Meeting as presented.**

**Ayes: 4**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion Carried.**

Townsend offered audience members an opportunity to provide comments on items not on the agenda, but none were forthcoming.

**07-57 PUBLIC HEARING: Proposed 2007 Alpine Township Master Plan**

Townsend then summarized that Alpine Township's Planning Commission had unanimously approved the revised Master Plan at its August 16, 2007 meeting, and then recommended the Township Board distribute it to adjacent communities for comment. The Board sent out the Plan text and Future Land Use Map, but received no feedback during the comment period which expired November 6, 2007. The Planning Commission then scheduled another public hearing (tonight) to present the final draft to the community. After considering any additional comments from tonight's meeting, the Planning Commission will then recommend the revised Master Plan for adoption to the

Township Board. The Board will then hold a Final Hearing before adopting a resolution to make the 2007 Master Plan official.

Planning Director Thomas first commented that several minor editing changes had been made to Master Plan text, after a review by Sharon Steffens. At Townsend's request the Planning Director gave a Power Point presentation illustrating the timeline with the components of the 2007 amended Master Plan:

- Thomas first read the Master Plan's Vision Statement, and then summarized that a "kickoff" meeting between the Planning Commission, the Township Board, and the public was held to introduce the Master Plan review process in September of 2003. A "SWOT" exercise was used to help identify the **S**trengths, **W**eaknesses, **O**pportunities, and **T**hreats to the Township's future. Earlier informational meetings were held regarding the Master Plan as early as August of 2002.
- The Township engaged the services of Beckett & Raeder, an Ann Arbor Planning firm, to guide the Township through the review process. They drafted several land use scenarios to illustrate various development densities and also hosted several "neighborhood" meetings with residents to hear their concerns and summarize their desires for future development. A proposed Future Land Use Map was created after several Master Plan Subcommittee sessions were held. Tim Johnson of Mainstreet Planning then continued the Master Plan process with the Planning Commission to "fine tune" the Future Land Use Map, and to draft the Master Plan text which accompanies the map.
- Thomas pointed out that it is the Zoning Ordinance which functions as the largest Master Plan implementation tool.
- Future Land Use Map designations will not always match those used on the Zoning Map. There may be language differences between the two documents; the terms used for future development on the Future Land Use Map may not exactly match those used in the Zoning Ordinance.
- Adopting a new Master Plan *does not* change the zoning designations of parcels; a property owner must request a rezoning. Until then, property owners may continue to use their land for any of the allowed uses specified for the land's zoning district.

Thomas then explained that the demographics of the Township have changed since the last (1998) Master Plan was adopted. As an example, the number of persons per household has dropped, and the average age of Township residents has also declined.

*Dunneback arrives at 7:45 PM.*

In response to a question from Townsend, Planning Consultant Tim Johnson said he had nothing to add to Thomas' presentation.

**Rosenzweig moved, with support from May, to open the public hearing.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

Cathy (Jost) Kennedy, representing the Jost family, said she appreciates being able to get details on the Master Plan and its Future Land Use Map from the Township's website. She speaks for the Jost family's interest in their two parcels at 4605 and 4823 Baumhoff, both of which are directly across the street (west) from Alpine Elementary School. The Future Land Use map presented at this meeting reflects a different designation than those used originally for them at earlier meetings which showed the southern parcel, 4605 Baumhoff, as RE (Residential Estate) with the northern parcel, 4823 Baumhoff, designated as AG (Agricultural). At some point since the last Master Plan Open House, in October of 2005, both parcels are now designated as AG.

The Jost family knows that the RE designation in the Master Plan is used for residential development near Agricultural areas, acting as a buffer between working farms and more dense residential development. She added that she has never received a satisfactory explanation on *why* the southern parcel (4605 Baumhoff) was changed to AG, but said that she has heard two possibilities:

1. The south parcel was "traded" for an AG parcel in the Township's northeast quadrant, so that *all* land in that quadrant would be consistently Residential Estate; and
2. The Township does not want to encourage property owners of other Agriculturally zoned and Master Planned parcels to ask for a change in designation to RE. (If the Township were to amend the designation for the Jost land to RE).

Jost and her family do not think either of these explanations adequately explains why the future land use designation was changed, and she again asks the Planning Commission to reconsider its designation choice for the family's land.

Al Korhorn, 1581 Alpine Church, commended the Planning Commission for all of its hard work on this Master Plan. Korhorn said this latest Future Land Use Map "splits" his family's single 80-acre farm into two pieces, with an AG portion to the north and an RE portion to the south. His family has owned this single parcel of land for over 60 years, and was surprised to find that they will not be unable to develop it as one piece. He also pointed out that if divided, the north piece of the family farm would become an AG parcel of 30 acres or less. His family prefers that the farm be shown with one designation, and that it should be RE. Korhorn added that he thought the Township didn't want to create any new AG parcels of less than 80 acres.

- Townsend at this point summarized for both Kennedy and Korhorn that the Planning Commission reviewed this area of the Township extensively and had decided that in order to protect farmland along 6 Mile Rd. and north, a buffer border of RE land was needed between it and the future more dense residential development to the south. It (the PC) recognized that this might require that some land be "stepped down" (or broken into multiple designations) ~~along this diagonal border to preserve existing farmland~~ as you move away from the 6 Mile Road/ Alpine Ave. intersection.

Fritz Wahlfield, 730 Marlene St. NW first said he had met earlier in the year with both the Planning Director and the Planning Commission Chair to resolve some discrepancies in land designations west of the Westgate subdivision when he planned the Westgate Dr. road extension. Now he hopes the PC will amend what he views an error in the designation for other pieces of his land. They are east of Alpine Ave., and south of 8 Mile Rd., immediately north of several homes in the Marway Plat. The parcel

is an approximate 2.82 acre piece that is now zoned for Commercial use on the Zoning Map, and he wants it to retain a Master Plan designation of Commercial, since he also hopes to resolve some family business issues.

Thomas explained that Wahlfield owns two small pieces of land in this area north of the Marway Plat and south of 8 Mile Rd. in addition to the two large vacant pieces along Alpine Ave., which are largely, but not entirely designated for Commercial Future Land Uses. The vacant 2.82-acre piece is designated for residential uses, and the occupied smaller piece was erroneously designated for commercial uses by mapping staff and should be planned for LDR. He now wants the smaller pieces to be designated for Commercial development. Wahlfield added he never intended to separate the narrow strip of land to the north of the creek, and needs it designated Commercial to implement his business plans.

George Hofacker, 3633 4 Mile Rd., owner of land on 4 Mile Rd. currently zoned C-2, was surprised to see it designated as a "Sub-Area" on the proposed Future Land Use map. He recalled that in the past he had submitted several development proposals to the Planning Commission and fears this "Sub-Area" designation may thwart its development potential.

Henry Vry, 2350 Indian Mill Creek Dr., said he lives immediately east of the Gracewil Country Club land on Walker Avenue. He thinks changing the future land use designation for Gracewil from its current designations of "Rec/Res" to "LDR" will increase traffic near his home and include a "high degree of rental units". He also said scheduling this hearing on the opening day of firearm deer hunting season was not reasonable.

- Planner Thomas commented that the designation for this land on the 1998 Master Plan was "RR", which meant Low Density Residential/Recreational for the southern portion, and RA- Rural Agricultural for the northern section, whereas the proposed Future Land Use Map identifies the entire site as Low Density Residential. Thomas added that a municipality cannot dictate ownership of housing units.
- Townsend added that the Township is **not** planning for more apartments, but anticipating the possibility of new single family homes. He said also that the Planning Commission had considered the opening day of the firearm season when scheduling this public hearing, but decided to hold the hearing at its regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting, instead of scheduling a special meeting during the Holidays. In response to a question from Vry, Townsend said that the Planning Commission will be considering all comments made tonight.
- Wahlfield also commented that the County Park at 8 Mile Rd. and M-37 should be more clearly identified on the Future Land Use Map. At present, the undeveloped part of the park is shown as "future park". Thomas noted that since there are occupied homes in this area with life leases, the Commission did not want to

**May moved, with support from Johnson, to close the public hearing.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

Townsend then summarized the requests and comments offered, and commended Cathy Kennedy for her consistency in pursuing her family's (Jost) interests. He said the Planning Commission understood what both Kennedy and Korhorn were asking for, and

that their requests will be considered. He then directed the Planning Commission to discuss each of these issues presented:

- Wahlfield's request for a Commercial designation at 8 Mile Rd. and Alpine Ave.  
Townsend asked for additional information.

Thomas explained that Mr. Wahlfield refers to land east of M-37 and the creek, and is occupied by the existing commercial structure on 8 Mile Rd. She pinpointed the location as "beneath the Wa of the street name Wahlfield Ct." on the proposed Future Land Use map and as being incorrectly designated Commercial by mapping staff, and which should be LDR. . Thomas does not recommend it be changed to a Commercial future land use designation since undeveloped Commercially zoned land remains west of this specific parcel and the property is residentially zoned. The second piece is vacant, and lies south of the existing commercial building on Wahlfield Ct., and lies "under the hl of the street name Wahlfield Ct." on the Future Land Use map. Thomas does not recommend this piece to be changed to a Commercial Future Land Use designation either, since undeveloped commercially planned and zoned land lies to the west. Wahlfield Ct. is a residential road, and it is adjacent to the residential Marway Plat.

Rosenzweig asked if the natural features of this area could be used to separate the two designations, i.e., the creek. Wahlfield commented that the Township Board had rezoned a 40-foot strip of land in the past. Planner Johnson confirmed for everyone that the 40-foot strip of residential land referred to had been designated residential to act as a buffer between future commercial uses and the residential land in the Marway Plat. A poll of Commissioners reflected unanimous agreement to retain the residential designation for Wahlfield's land.

- Hofacker concerns regarding Sub-Area 2 designation at 4 Mile Rd. and Fruit Ridge

Planner Tim Johnson explained that this designation was in the 1998 Master Plan in anticipation of development in the City of Walker, and it specifies cross access management with future development. It also limits the number of driveways allowed and establishes greenspace and setback requirements. This designation does not change the land use designation, but is used to give advance notice to the Planning Commission, the public, and the adjacent community that when developed, access management issues must be addressed. Hofacker did not agree that a 50-foot landscape buffer should be required at the north end of the lot, since there is already a drainage easement in place, adding that he also already has driveways on both 4 Mile Rd. and Peach Ridge. Townsend confirmed that "Sub Area 2" was on the 1998 Future Land Use Map and was not changed during this Master Plan review. He solicited opinions from other Commissioners, asking if they felt Sub Area 2 presented any problems. Dunneback, Johnson, May and Rosenzweig each saw no problem, with Johnson adding that the Sub Area designation is being used to clarify that development plans for this parcel must resolve traffic management issues.

Townsend confirmed with Planners Thomas and Johnson that the State of Michigan requires each Township to review its Master Plan no less than once every five years. He also said the resulting Master Plan does not mean that a municipality *expects* all development to occur, but defines *how* it may occur.

- Concerns raised by Mr. Vry about high density residential (rental) development at the Gracewil Country Club site.

The designation used on the 1998 Master Plan for this location is "Rec/Res", which combined both the Low Density Residential designation (at approximately 3 units per acre) and remaining open space for the privately owned golf course, with RA at the northern portion. The 2007 Future Land Use map proposes Low Density Residential for the entire golf course. Commissioners confirmed that they still found this selection appropriate, and saw no problems with it. Commissioners did not think that additional rental housing was needed in Alpine Township and so did not designate any additional land for High Density Residential uses.

- Request by Fritz Wahlfield to designate land to the west of Wahlfield Park as "undeveloped park land".

Planner Thomas agreed to consult with Kent County Parks Department on how they wish to designate park land still occupied partially under a life-lease agreement and not yet developed.

- Request of Cathy Kennedy (Jost) to designate the southern family owned parcel for future RE development.

In response to Townsend's request for input, no consensus was reached to alter the designation of AG now shown for the two Jost parcels on the proposed Future Land Use map. Dunneback and May prefer to retain the AG designation for both as now shown, with Johnson and Rosenzweig supporting the use of RE as a buffer for farms. Townsend said he wants to retain the AG designation for the land, though he said he recognizes a future Master Plan review may change it. The PC favors leaving the Jost family land as it is now shown on the Future Land Use map.

- Korhorn's family preference for a single designation of RE for the entire farm.

Rosenzweig said he had concerns about creating a 30-acre AG parcel by splitting the family farm into two separate designations. He agreed with Korhorn that one of the Master Plan's goals was to preserve AG parcels of 40 acres or more. Dunneback, May, and Johnson agreed that the designations used are reasonable and should remain as is on the proposed map, with Johnson adding that a great deal of discussion took place when this section of the Township was reviewed.

- Thomas noted that the parcel Mr. Wahlfield made reference to earlier appears incorrectly on the Future Land Use map as C-Commercial, rather than LDR, Low Density Residential.

Commissioners then discussed whether the "Affidavit of Recommendation of Approval of Master Plan" provided by Thomas should be used to make a motion, and were told that it should be used.

**Rosenzweig then recited the Affidavit of Recommendation as follows:**

1. The Township Planning Act, Public Act 168, of the Michigan Public Acts of 1959, as amended, requires the Planning Commission to make and adopt a Master Plan for the physical development of the Township; and
2. The Commission has prepared such a plan, including maps, tables and descriptive matter dated November 15, 2007; and
3. In the preparation of the Master Plan, the Commission has made careful comprehensive studies and analyses of present conditions and future needs of the Township; and
4. The Commission, on November 15, 2007 held a public hearing in accordance with the procedures of Section 8 of Public Act 168 of 1959, as amended; and
5. The Commission has considered all comments at the public hearing and discussed in detail each concern raised by the public and the surrounding municipalities; and
6. The Township Board of Trustees in Resolution # 03-19 has asserted the right to approve or reject the plan.

Motion recommend approval of the Alpine Township Master Plan dated November 15, 2007 was made by Rosenzweig, with support from May.

**Ayes: 5 Nays: 0 Absent: Madura, Sedlecky Date: November 15, 2007**

**Motion carried. Master Plan referred to the Township Board for adoption.**

*At 8:55 PM, Township Board members left, along with Planning Consultant Tim Johnson, with the exception of Supervisor Marta Brechting and Trustee Ted Wallace.*

**07-58 PUBLIC HEARING: Proposed Ordinance Amendments to Chapter 1, Definitions, Section 2.43, Fences, and Section 2.44, Commercial Building Design Standards**

Planner Thomas explained that amendments to the Zoning Ordinance have been drafted to resolve some language conflicts and to add a definition that had been omitted.

- Chapter 1, required the addition of the definition for retaining walls, and deleting the definition of "Billboards, Signboards or Signs" since it had been inadvertently forgotten when Chapter 20 had been amended earlier.
- Section 2.43 required language clarification, since the Ordinance is in conflict with Township practice. Illustrations were also made clearer.
- Section 2.44 provides clarification to the Commercial Building Design standards outlined.

**May moved, with Rosenzweig's support, to open the public hearing on proposed Ordinance amendments.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

With no comments provided by the audience, **Rosenzweig moved, with support from May, to close the public hearing.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

Townsend said that in deference to Sedlecky's experience as an engineer and because he has actively participated in past Commercial Design Standards discussions, discussion of the Ordinance Amendments should be postponed until the next meeting Sedlecky can attend.

**May moved, with support from Rosenzweig, to postpone discussion of the proposed Ordinance amendments until the December Regular Planning Commission meeting.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**07-59 PUBLIC HEARING: Extension and Modification of approved Special Land Uses**

**4001 Alpenhorn Dr. and 4020 Alpine Ave.**

**Rental Equipment and Outdoor Storage**

**Applicant: Steve Benner, Evergreen Properties**

**Request for additional Special Land Use**

**4001 Alpenhorn Dr.**

**Installation of 10,000 gallon asphalt sealant tank**

**Applicant: Steve Benner, Evergreen Properties**

**Site Plan Amendments to approved Site Plan(s)**

**4001 Alpenhorn Dr. – Evergreen Storage**

**4020 Alpine Ave. Yorktown Center**

**Applicant: Steve Benner, Evergreen Properties**

Thomas introduced the multiple requests Mr. Benner has presented for his Evergreen Storage and Yorktown Center sites, noting that the site plan under review at this time is dated May of 2006. The site was originally approved during the summer of 2004, with the addition of outside storage approved in the spring of 2006. The Site Plan Review Committee also reviewed and approved a request to add a second story to the southern end of storage building "C" in June of 2006.

Thomas added that one Condition of Approval to the outside storage Special Use was that the storage would only be allowed in a "footprint" of the site's future building, until another Building Permit is issued or until July of 2008, whichever came first. A provision was also made for administrative approval or Planning Commission review of an extension until July of 2010. The applicant is now requesting the extension to 2010. The applicant is also asking the Planning Commission to approve an increase to the number of rental vehicles on the site from six (6) to ten (10).

Rosenzweig asked Benner where he wishes to park the additional rental vehicles on the site. It was confirmed that only two storage truck vehicles may be parked on the pavement near the storage unit offices, with the balance parked behind the fence or indoors.

Planner Thomas then presented the request for the installation of a 10,000 gallon asphalt sealant tank at the 4001 Alpenhorn Dr. storage building location. The tank's material is to be sold on a retail basis to the public (primarily small asphalt sealing businesses). Thomas added that the information provided indicates the tank is to be sealed, therefore it should not present any odor issues to the area. She also noted that since this is proposed to be a retail operation, additional customer toilets must be installed per the Building Code. She stated that neither truck traffic nor any other vehicular traffic have been addressed by the applicant.

Townsend asked Thomas to solicit additional information for the Commission regarding any odors which might emanate from this use.

Rick Postema, of Postema Architects and Engineers, then presented the applicant's requests for an extension of the outdoor storage and total rental vehicle parking special uses. Postema stated that the primary reason for the first request is that today's market conditions have impacted the progress of construction at the site, and the project has not progressed as rapidly as Benner had planned. In addition, the U-Haul Corporation also requires that their authorized rental agents receive the vehicles a customer may be turning in once reaching his destination. Postema commented that all information presented by Thomas "is acceptable."

Postema added that he is also requesting a modification in the guardrail height, which he states is consistent with the Building Code.

Benner added that he is approaching the Planning Commission now, since he is finalizing his advertising in the Yellow Pages and wants the ad to be accurate for the services he offers.

**Rosenzweig moved, with May's support, to open the public hearing for the previous Special Land Use extensions, the new Special Land Use request, and the Site Plan amendments presented by Evergreen Properties.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

Phil Brunger, 4647 Fruit Ridge Ave. asked if the asphalt sealer to be sold is a heated or "cold" product, and Postema confirmed for him that the sealer is sprayed as a water based cold product, which dries as a latex sealant.

**May moved, with Johnson's support, to close the public hearing.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

Townsend said that he thought the Commission should begin by reviewing the information on the two previously approved Special Land Use requests for an increase in the number of vehicles for the rental business, and the extension of outdoor storage on the site. He added that the remaining requests require additional information prior to a comprehensive review of the site and the specific requests and he thought those should be postponed to a later meeting when the applicant has been able to provide the required information.

Dunneback said that he did not have any concerns about the changes requested for the two previously approved Special Use requests. Rosenzweig commented that the Planning Commission relies on Thomas' staff review to verify that the site is adequate to accommodate the additional rental vehicles and that no new problems are raised with the time frame being extended on the outdoor storage. He added that he did have a concern that if the two requests were granted, the applicant may exceed the approval limits that are defined by the Planning Commission. He commented that he has seen ongoing ordinance violations on the overall site relative to signs.

Commissioners agreed that the Site Plan amendments and new Special Use request should be postponed until all details requested by the Planning Director are provided by

the applicant. In addition, Commissioners concurred that the two Special Use extensions could be addressed at this meeting.

**Rosenzweig moved, with May's support, based on the representations made by the applicant, to approve the requested modification to Condition of Approval (B)(4) of the Special Land Use regarding outside storage of vehicles, previously approved by the Planning Commission on May 18, 2006, on part of property addressed 4001 Alpenhorn Dr. NW, PPN 41-09-36-151-016, as it does meet the requirements set forth in Chapters 12 and 21 of the Alpine Township Zoning Ordinance. The requested modification is as follows:**

**B. Outside storage of vehicles, boats, trailers, motor homes and recreational vehicles shall only occur in those three locations identified on the approved final site plan for the eventual construction of the proposed buildings, subject to the following conditions:**

- 4.) Any outside storage on the site shall cease at such time as the owner or his agent receives a permit for the construction of a building in the location used for outside storage, but no later than July 1, 2010.**

**And the following FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Based on the representations provided by the applicant, we find that per Section 21.02 (h) of the Alpine Township Zoning Ordinance:**

- 1. Increasing the length of outdoor vehicle storage will not change the essential character of the vicinity and is consistent with the intent of the Commercial zoning district;**
- 2. Increasing the length of outdoor vehicle storage will not create excessive cost burdens on public infrastructure;**
- 3. Increasing the length of outdoor vehicle storage will not produce excessive noise, dust, or traffic, and will be adequately buffered from adjacent land uses; and**
- 4. Outdoor vehicle storage is consistent with the use of the property and the intent of the zoning district.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**May then moved, with Rosenzweig's support, to approve the requested modification to Condition of Approval ( C )(1) of the Special Land Use regarding rental equipment previously approved by the Planning Commission on May 18, 2006, on part of property addressed 4001 Alpenhorn Dr. NW, PPN 41-09-36-151-016, as it does meet the requirements set forth in Chapters 12 and 21 of the Alpine Township Zoning Ordinance. The requested modification is as follows:**

**C. Rental of trucks, vans and trailers (collectively "equipment") primarily associated with moving or storing items stored in the self-storage units is allowed, subject to the following conditions:**

- 1. No more than a total of ten (10) pieces of equipment may be parked or stored outdoors on the property at any time.**

**And the following FINDINGS OF FACT:**

**Based on the representations provided by the applicant, we find that per the previously approved Special Land Use and Section 21.02 (h) of the Alpine Township Zoning Ordinance:**

1. **Condition (E): A maximum of two (2) trucks will be parked at any time in the outside area near the office of the self-storage building approved May 18, 2006, by the Planning Commission still applies. Therefore, only two of the requested ten pieces of rental equipment (and they must be trucks) may be parked in the outside area near the office of the self-storage building.**
2. **The parking of the additional rental equipment will not change the essential character of the vicinity and is consistent with the intent of the Commercial zoning district.**
3. **The additional rental equipment will not create excessive cost burdens on public infrastructure.**
4. **The additional rental equipment will not produce excessive noise, dust, or traffic, and will be adequately buffered from adjacent land uses.**
5. **The additional rental equipment is consistent with the use of the property and the intent of the zoning district.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**Rosenzweig moved, with May's support, to postpone further discussion of the remaining requests from Steve Benner (site plan amendments, Special Land Use for asphalt sealant tank) until the applicant is able to provide full information to the Township Planning Director.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried.**

**07-60 PUBLIC COMMENT/COMMISSIONER COMMENT/COMMITTEE UPDATES/  
ADJOURNMENT**

No comments were offered.

May said he wanted to publicly commend the Planning Commission for all its work in reviewing the Township 's Master Plan.

**May moved, with Johnson's support to adjourn at 10:00 pm.**

**Ayes: 5**

**Nays: 0**

**Motion carried**

---

Nelda Johnson, Secretary

---

Patricia Kolkman, Recording Secretary