

# CLINTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

## REPORT OF MEETING

MAY 9<sup>TH</sup>, 2019

**PRESENT:** Kirkanne Moseley, Chairperson  
Katherine Cherry, Secretary  
George Brumbaugh  
Lawrence Opalewski, Jr.  
Denise C. Trombley

**ABSENT:** Ronald DiBartolomeo, Vice-Chairperson (Excused)  
Joe A. Aragona (Excused)  
Stephen Charron (Excused)  
Daniel Spatafora (Excused)

**STAFF:** Bruce Thompson, AICP, Director  
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Ms. Moseley called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

### APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Thompson stated the Administration, noted there have been numerous concerns that have been expressed to them since this ordinance was noticed in the paper and became public for review, and there is an apparent lack of support for this Medical Marihuana Planned Unit Development Ordinance, so this Administration has decided not to pursue this ordinance. He requested the Planning Commission remove that item (Item #3) from tonight's agenda as they will no longer be pursuing this ordinance.

Motion by Mr. Opalewski, seconded by Mr. Brumbaugh, to remove Item #3 – Proposed Text Amendment: Addition of Chapter 1298.13 – Marihuana Planned Unit Development (“MPUD”) District from tonight's agenda. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Opalewski, Brumbaugh, Cherry, Moseley, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – DiBartolomeo, Aragona, Charron, Spatafora. Motion carried.

Motion by Mr. Brumbaugh, supported by Ms. Cherry, to add Item #3A – Public Comment on former Item #3, with the public comments being limited to three (3) minutes per person, so they are in compliance with the Open Meetings Act for the public to address a public body at the meeting. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Brumbaugh, Cherry, Moseley, Opalewski, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – DiBartolomeo, Aragona, Charron, Spatafora. Motion carried.

Motion by Ms. Cherry, seconded by Mr. Opalewski, to approve the agenda as amended. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Cherry, Opalewski, Brumbaugh, Trombley, Moseley. Nays – None. Absent – DiBartolomeo, Aragona, Cherry, Spatafora. Motion carried.

**PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF CLINTON TOWNSHIP – PART TWELVE, PLANNING AND ZONING CODE**

- **PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT: ADDITION OF CHAPTER 1298.12 – PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (“PUD”) DISTRICT**
  - **PUBLIC HEARING**
- FILE #19-6887: PETITIONED BY CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CLINTON**

Ms. Cherry confirmed there is no correspondence for this item.

Mr. Thompson explained that when he started here as Planning Director six-and-a-half months ago, one of the tools he discussed in speaking with Planning Commissioners, Township Board members and staff members was to try to have additional economic development tools, and a Planned Unit Development (PUD) ordinance achieves that goal. It allows the Planning Commission and Township Board to consider mixed uses on properties that have single zoning designations. It is an important tool that most communities use, and the idea is to permit flexibility and regulation of the development. It allows the Planning Commission and the Board to take into account unique features of property, it can be a tool that can save woodlands and wetlands and will help redevelop corridors. There are industrial corridors in the Township that they are looking to redevelop and having the PUD ordinance provides that opportunity. There are uses that benefit from being on the same property, and the Township can benefit from those uses. He stated this is a standard PUD ordinance, and he felt it is consistent with a lot of other communities as to how it is laid out and what it does, noting there are minimum standards, such as requiring a parcel that is at least one acre in size. It will also benefit any site in the community that needs to be redeveloped, which is going to be the focus of Planning Commission and Township Board from this point forward, since the majority of the Township is already developed. If a development is approved through the PUD ordinance, it has to have some type of recognizable substantial benefit to the community as a whole, so it encourages long-term sustainable use or reuse of dilapidated properties throughout the Township. It has to be consistent with the Master Plan, and it allows the Township to require more amenities, such as more open space, more landscaping, better screening, and possibly usable open space that can be used

in conjunction with Township property, such as bike paths. He explained the approval procedure as outlined in the ordinance, noting it is a two-step process, with the first step to request a rezoning to PUD and a conceptual plan. The second step is the final site plan approval, so the preliminary and final phases of the two sections of the PUD can be heard together, although it does not typically occur that way. It is a way of expediting what they feel may be a good development of property as a long-term sustaining development. The ordinance is not long, but he felt it is necessary as a development/redevelopment tool for this community, so it is being recommended the Planning Commission move this forward to the Township Board and make this part of their Zoning Ordinance.

Motion by Mr. Opalewski, supported by Ms. Cherry, to open the public hearing. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Opalewski, Cherry, Brumbaugh, Moseley, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – DiBartolomeo, Aragona, Charron, Spatafora. Motion carried.

Ms. Moseley explained that they will take comments in an orderly manner, and she reminded they are only talking about the proposed Planned Unit Development (PUD) ordinance and not the Marihuana Planned Unit Development (MPUD) ordinance.

Mr. Thompson noted one item he did not mention is that one of the key components of a standard PUD is that the developers and the Township enter into a written agreement which is signed by both parties. The developer is then required to develop the property exactly according to the approved plan, and if they want to do something different, they would have to go through the process once again. The Township can be sure the development as approved will be exactly what will be developed on the property.

Ms. Fran Lane, a resident of Charter Oaks Cooperative, residing at 20024 Great Oaks Circle N., Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, questioned whether this pertains to medical marihuana.

Ms. Moseley clarified they are only discussing the standard PUD at this time, and they will not be discussing the MPUD because it has been removed from the agenda. She replied to further inquiry they are not talking about either medical marihuana or recreational marihuana. She indicated if Ms. Lane would like to stay for any public comments, that will be later on the agenda.

Mr. Anthony Penna, 37380 Willow, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, questioned whether the audience will be able to address Item #3 through public comments.

Ms. Moseley replied affirmatively.

Mr. Penna stated that, for purposes of clarification, he questioned whether any type of marihuana will be a prohibited use in the PUD ordinance.

Mr. Thompson replied there is no marihuana language included in the standard PUD ordinance.

Mr. Penna questioned whether it specifically states marihuana will be prohibited.

Mr. Thompson replied that is not what this ordinance addresses. He explained zoning ordinances specify the uses allowed, but do not list what uses are not allowed. This PUD ordinance will be a section of the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Penna questioned if marihuana becomes a use that is allowed under an ordinance created by this Board and supported by the Board of Trustees, he assumed it could be incorporated into the PUD.

Mr. Thompson stated that could not occur without changing the language of the PUD.

Ms. Maria Randazzo, 18000 Viola Lane, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, questioned the different zonings that will be allowed in the PUD.

Mr. Thompson replied the PUD ordinance creates a new section of the Zoning Ordinance. He cited examples of the R-5 One-Family Residential District or the I-1 Light Industrial District, and explained if this is approved, there will be a PUD zoning designation, so it will be its own separate and distinct zoning designation. It does not specify it will incorporate some or all of the zoning districts into it, but it stands alone as its own district. He indicated if someone comes forward to develop the former K-Mart site on Groesbeck with a mixed use, they would be requesting to rezone that property to “PUD”, and that PUD zoning designation is what would appear on the official zoning map of the Township.

Ms. Randazzo inquired as to what designation would permit a “marihuana growing house”.

Mr. Thompson replied that is not a use that is allowed under the Zoning Ordinance; therefore, it would not be allowed under the PUD designation.

Ms. Randazzo questioned if someone wanted to grow marihuana or any other type of agricultural plants, she questioned the type of designation that would be required.

Mr. Thompson responded that there are different sections of the ordinance that allow different uses. The Industrial zoning designation allows a nursery. The Township currently has an ordinance, under the Medical Marihuana Act, that

allows caregivers to grow in their home for their patients. There are restrictions as to the square footage allowed as well as the number of plants, and there are nuisance-related issues, such as odor, and proper permits are required. Each district has a use of permitted uses by right, and also lists certain uses as “Special Land Uses”, which are determined to be the uses that may have more impact and they are reviewed by the Planning Commission and decided upon by the Township Board. Each ordinance section has different uses listed. Greenhouses are typically allowed in commercial districts, such as B-3 General Business or in the I-1 Light Industrial District.

Ms. Randazzo expressed concern about allowing marihuana, whether for retail or grow operations, to be allowed in the PUD. She inquired as to a list of what will be allowed in a PUD.

Mr. Thompson replied what would be allowed in the PUD are the uses that are currently listed in the Zoning Ordinance. Medical marihuana, from the standpoint of commercial dispensary or sale, commercial grow operations, transport, research, etc. are not allowed by the Zoning Ordinance; therefore, they cannot be considered when a PUD is submitted to the Township under this ordinance.

Motion by Ms. Cherry, supported by Mr. Brumbaugh, to close the public hearing. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Cherry, Brumbaugh, Opalewski, Moseley, Trombley. Nays – None. Absent – DiBartolomeo, Aragona, Charron, Spatafora. Motion carried.

Ms. Cherry questioned how this relates to the Master Plan and whether there has been settled case law or whether they will have trouble with neighboring rezoning issues if they approve a PUD.

Mr. Thompson stated rezoning to a PUD is a rezoning to something else. There are standards in the ordinance that the Planning Commission and Township Board will have to use to determine whether they are going to support/approve a rezoning. A Master Plan is to be used as a guide, and it should be considered when considering rezoning to a PUD. He clarified that the Zoning Ordinance contains the rules, but the Master Plan only serves as a guide. A rezoning to PUD requires a public hearing like any other rezoning, and at that point, the Planning Department’s job is to notify all property owners and occupants within 300 feet of the property in question. The public then has the same opportunity, whether it is a standard zoning change or a PUD zoning change, to express their comments. He reminded that the PUD is a negotiating tool, which is a benefit, because even if something may go above and beyond the ordinance, it can be incorporated into the PUD. A standard site development plan under a standard zoning has to be approved if it meets the ordinance, even if it does not go above and beyond. He stressed the PUD gives the Township the flexibility it needs to make sure they get a development that is good for the property and the surrounding area.

Ms. Cherry questioned the first sentence in the “intent” section of the ordinance referring to the need for “natural features or occurring within an area or corridor adjacent to a major thoroughfare”. She noted those are two very specific intents, and she questioned whether those are the baseline criteria for a PUD zoning to comply.

Mr. Thompson replied no.

Ms. Cherry felt that language could be revised because it is the first sentence of the intent.

Mr. Thompson clarified the intent is not necessarily regulation. It is not a situation where certain minimum standards have to be met, but the intent section will vary. Some parcels have unique problems and features that will make it difficult for standard development. He pointed out there are other items listed in that section, but it is an issue where, upon Planning Commission review, they determine whether the request meets the intent of what the ordinance is intended to do.

Ms. Cherry questioned the best process of revising and fine-tuning some of the language of this proposed ordinance, such as a typographical error or other change.

Mr. Thompson replied that any changes they have that are not major change to the intent or eligibility can be emailed to him. He assured the Department will double-check that typographical errors are corrected before it goes to the Township Board.

Mr. Opalewski stated he felt it is a great ordinance and he thanked Mr. Thompson and his staff for putting this together. He stated it is an important tool for a Planning Department to have at their disposal, especially for some areas that are in need of redevelopment. He noticed that it specifies one acre as the minimum size property that would qualify for a PUD zoning change, and he inquired as to whether there is a maximum size.

Mr. Thompson replied there is a minimum size but no maximum, noting that would be looked at on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Opalewski noticed that the PUD will run with the land unless there is an application to terminate or amend the PUD. He inquired as to whether there is specific criteria needed to terminate the PUD, or whether it is also determined on a case-by-case basis.

Mr. Thompson explained it would be looked at on a case-by-case basis, and if a developer decides not to move forward, they will typically notify the Planning

Department of that decision in writing. Similar to a Site Development Plan or a variance granted by the Zoning Board of Appeals, the PUD would have a lifespan of 18 months. If they do not pull a permit within that time, the zoning would revert back to its previous zoning and the PUD would no longer be in effect. If they are having issues such as finance, they can request a one-time extension. He anticipates that if a PUD is submitted and goes through the process to get approved by the Township Board, it is likely that the developer has already invested a lot of money and time into it, so he did not anticipate there would be many that would not follow through once approved.

Mr. Opalewski questioned what happens if the property is sold in the future, and whether there is a formal application to terminate.

Mr. Thompson replied the PUD would stay with the land, and if development occurs, the successor is bound by the ordinance to maintain that site in accordance with that PUD agreement. The only way they could change it is if they come back to the Planning Commission and Township Board and request a change. He replied to further inquiry that it is at their discretion and they do not have to approve a change to the PUD.

Ms. Cherry inquired as to whether a denial of such a request would hold up in court.

Mr. Thompson qualified his answer by stating he is not an attorney, but the intent is to create a long-term sustainable development that everyone agrees to, and that they are all confident will be there for fifteen or twenty years.

Mr. Brumbaugh stated he approves the concept of this ordinance and felt it is a good idea, but he claimed he cannot support it tonight primarily because of the language. He felt it needs grammatical corrections and clarifications, including correction of run-on sentences, incomplete sentences and typographical errors. He reiterated he likes the concept and appreciated Mr. Thompson bringing it forward, but he would like to see it postponed so the necessary changes can be made.

Ms. Moseley inquired as to whether the Planning Commissioners should make the changes they feel need to be made. She agreed with Mr. Brumbaugh that there are some changes to be made, but without Mr. Thompson knowing the specific changes to which they are referring, he may not be able to make those changes without the Planning Commissioners' input.

Mr. Brumbaugh pointed out a couple of the areas he felt need revising, but indicated he is not in a position to rewrite the ordinance. He felt that is the responsibility of the Planning Director or Township Attorney to provide the information in a manner that is sustainable if they have to enforce it in court.

Ms. Cherry inquired as to whether there is a time-sensitive interest in this matter.

Mr. Thompson replied no, indicating it does not have to be approved right away. It is something he has been a proponent of since starting here six-and-a-half months ago, and everyone he has spoken to has felt the same way that this is an important tool for the Township to have. He indicated the language was written by an attorney, and he stated ordinance language is written in a different manner than his reports to the Planning Commission. With respect to the intent and some of the changes they have mentioned, he understands, and he urged the Commissioners to forward their changes to him after the meeting, and he will forward that information to the attorney's office.

Ms. Cherry shared Mr. Brumbaugh's concerns and she added that she would like to make sure they get the language right before they recommend approval. She inquired as to whether this can be postponed so they have the opportunity to provide feedback.

Mr. Brumbaugh suggested it be postponed indefinitely so it can be brought back at any time.

Motion by Mr. Brumbaugh, supported by Ms. Trombley, to postpone indefinitely further consideration of the proposed Text Amendment to the Codified Ordinances of Clinton Township – Part Twelve, Planning and Zoning Code, with the addition of Chapter 1298.12 – Planned Unit Development (“PUD”) District. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Brumbaugh, Trombley, Moseley, Opalewski, Cherry. Nays – None. Absent – DiBartolomeo, Aragona, Charron, Spatafora. Motion carried.

**PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT TO THE CODIFIED ORDINANCES OF  
CLINTON TOWNSHIP – PART TWELVE, PLANNING AND ZONING CODE**  
- **PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT: ADDITION OF CHAPTER 1298.13 –  
MARIHUANA PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (“MPUD”) DISTRICT**  
-- **PUBLIC HEARING**  
**FILE #19-6806: PETITIONED BY CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CLINTON**

---

This item was deleted from tonight's agenda.

**DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED TEXT AMENDMENT: ADDITION OF CHAPTER  
1298.13 – MARIHUANA PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (“MPUD”) DISTRICT**  
-- **PUBLIC COMMENTS**  
**FILE #19-6806**

---

Ms. Moseley stated this item was added to tonight's agenda to allow public comments regarding the proposed Marihuana Planned Unit Development

("MPUD"), which was deleted from tonight's agenda. She explained how the comments will be made in an orderly fashion, noting that each person desiring to speak will be limited to three minutes. She stated they will not be having a lot of discussion on this item because it has been removed from the agenda, but comments will be taken.

Mr. Anthony Penna, 37380 Willow Lane, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, stated they have a lot of questions. He questioned why it was placed on the agenda, and why it was removed. He pointed out that the Township Board, at their meeting on April 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2019, opted out of recreational marihuana, for which he and other residents were pleased. At that time, residents asked if the rumors identifying specific locations were true. He claimed he gave the Board a change to dispel that rumor, but he heard nothing from them. He and other residents have heard they are proposing to put dispensaries and grow facilities on Metro Parkway and Groesbeck, between St. Thecla Church and School and another elementary school, as well as residential adjacent to that site. He heard there will be a townhall meeting at the end of May to discuss the marihuana issues, but "that was all". A week later they received notice that this Marihuana PUD has been placed on an agenda, and he claimed that is completely the opposite of what they have been told. He felt they are being lied to, and he stressed the residents need to know who is in favor of this issue, who is opposed and their reasons. He added they need transparency.

Ms. Moseley stated the Planning Commission receives an agenda, and that is what they go by. She stressed they are not the Township Board and do not know of any rumors, so this is not the platform to discuss those rumors. She suggested residents with questions should talk to the Township Board, and she noted Mr. Thompson explained why this item was pulled from tonight's agenda.

Discussion took place regarding who made the determination to pull this item from the agenda.

Mr. Brumbaugh reminded that the Open Meetings Act allows for public comment, but it is not a "question and answer period". He felt Mr. Thompson already addressed why it was removed, although he is free to address it once again if he chooses to do so. He further felt that allowing three minutes per person for public comment is more than adequate.

Ms. Moseley agreed, noting they are not having a debate this evening.

Mr. Thompson stated he already indicated why this was removed, noting it does not have the support and they will not be moving this ordinance forward. He clarified the Planning Commission does not function at the request or the

direction of the Township Board, but they are a separate recommending body to the Township Board.

Ms. Kenova Spikes, 34389 Marino, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, stated she is here tonight to oppose the marihuana ordinance. She questioned whether it was removed tonight because they do not feel safe going forward with it.

Mr. Thompson replied it was not removed to make it “safe”, but he explained they have been working on this ordinance for the last four or five months. It was drafted and comes from Administration, including the Supervisor’s Office, Planning Department, Township Attorney and other departments. They have worked hard to create an ordinance they feel is in the best interest of the community if the Township Board determines they want medical marihuana to be part of this community. There were many changes made right up until the deadline when notice of this meeting had to be published in the paper, but in speaking individually to the Township Trustees, administrators, and having conversations with the attorney, they started receiving feedback from a number of different sources and clearly found there was not support for this ordinance. He understands pulling it from the agenda is last-minute and he apologized for any inconvenience this caused, but it does not make any sense moving forward when he knows there is no support for the ordinance.

Ms. Spikes stated she is the mother of three daughters and it is a difficult battle raising them with all of the influences from social media, radio, music, etc., and to add an ordinance that is not healthy for their children and can alter their development and thinking is a way of desensitizing them to believe that marihuana is o.k. She cited the motto, “God Bless America”, and felt this is not a way God will bless America.

Mr. Vito Strolis, 19862 Westchester, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, recalled that Mr. Thompson had indicated in an earlier comment that they would be interested in approving businesses for a PUD that would be long sustaining, citing “ten years”. He stated he has been in business for forty years and lives near Partridge Creek, he questioned whether they would approve PUDs at Partridge Creek.

Mr. Thompson stated he used that number as an example, but there is no number in the ordinance that states the business must last a certain period of time. It is a judgement call from the Planning Commission when they review it and from Township Board when they consider it, as to whether they feel this use is compatible for long-term sustainability. He commented that the market drives a lot when it comes to longevity of a business, and the Township loves businesses that last thirty to forty years, so if a PUD can do that, the intent is achieved. When a PUD request is submitted, they will be looking at whether it meets the minimum criteria for submittal, as outlined in the ordinance, and he

commented it is not the PUD designation itself but rather the development that results from the PUD that will be considered.

Mr. Strolis felt Mr. Penna raised some valid points. He could understand why some people are skeptical because the timing of this PUD ordinance is coming in at the same time the marihuana issue is being discussed.

Ms. Kim Zuchora, 51777 Blue Spruce, Macomb, Michigan 48042, stated she has worked in Clinton Township for a long time, and she questioned a comment she read in the press today, claiming the Township Supervisor indicated “there will be medical marihuana in the Township”. She stressed that is why there is confusion and so many residents here tonight.

Ms. Moseley stated she cannot comment on that.

Jessica and Mattie, two students from Chippewa Valley High School, 18300 19 Mile Road, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, stated they are opposed to all commercial use of marihuana in Clinton Township. They stressed there is a drug problem in the middle schools and high schools and open dispensaries in an area easily accessible will make the problem worse. They also claimed that students have no problem knowing which doctors will write scripts for medical marihuana when they turn 18 years of age.

Mr. Peter Viviano, 38374 Saddle Lane, Clinton Township, Michigan 48036, stated he stood before the Township Board and asked them if there were any ordinances that were either active or in the planning stages that would allow commercial growing/selling of cannabis. He claimed the Board members responded and said there are no plans, but he learned of cannabis out-of-state entrepreneurs canvassing the south part of Clinton Township between 14 and 15 Mile Roads, near Groesbeck, looking for business properties in which to invest to sell cannabis. He claimed he has heard about the “cannabis golden triangle” referred to by the Township Supervisor, and he has heard of a leading businessman in the community wanting to buy the Parkway Plaza to put in a new mall with a 3,000-square-foot cannabis retail outlet on it. He complained that is too close to his church and the school where he and his children attended. He felt people with the means can move out of the Township, but many people in that area do not have the means to move. He stressed that the Planning Commission is a recommending Board and he felt they should not be taking advice from the Supervisor. He felt there are a lot of missteps occurring in this campaign. He felt there are other options for the Township other than adopting a “PUD” ordinance, and he cited examples of where the Jimmy John baseball field is in Utica, or the Nautical Mile in St. Clair Shores, both of which use different development plan options.

Bishop D.L. Bradley, 22645 Quinn Road, Clinton Township, Michigan 48035, and a resident in Harrison Township, stated he has been a pastor in Clinton Township for twenty-five years. He complained the south end has been a dumping ground for the community for years. He has heard the areas talked about for marihuana include areas south of 16 Mile. He stressed he is interested in the well-being of the community, and he does not know why what was illegal years ago is now legal. He recalled a community meeting in April, and that was about getting a handle on substance abuse, yet the Township is now talking about supplying the substance. He hoped the community will come together to fight this.

Mr. Kenneth Krygel, 42883 Heydenreich, Clinton Township, Michigan 48038, stated he was at a community meeting led by the Township Supervisor, and he claimed he was “booed off the stage”. He indicated most of the people at that meeting were growers and sellers of marihuana. He recalled the Township Supervisor had indicated the marihuana industry will bring in a lot of money to the Township. He stated he is a retired police officer, and noted that he has arrested many, many people who were under the influence of marihuana while driving automobiles. He has dealt with the deaths as a result, but he was told “no deaths happen because of marihuana”. He felt it is sad that everyone feels marihuana is “the wonder drug”. He claimed kids obtain the marihuana from people who have marihuana cards. He is shocked his community is even entertaining the prospect of allowing this industry in the Township, and he is upset that it seems to be all about money for some people.

## **REPORT OF MEETING**

### **-- APPROVAL OF APRIL 25<sup>TH</sup>, 2019 REPORT**

Motion by Mr. Brumbaugh, supported by Mr. Opalewski, to approve the minutes of the April 25<sup>th</sup>, 2019 Planning Commission meeting as submitted. Roll Call Vote: Ayes – Brumbaugh, Opalewski, Cherry, Moseley. Nays – None. Absent – DiBartolomeo, Aragona, Charron, Spatafora. Motion carried.

## **PLANNING COMMISSION SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS**

### **-- NEXT MEETING SCHEDULED FOR THURSDAY, MAY 23<sup>RD</sup>, 2019**

Mr. Thompson stated the next Planning Commission meeting is scheduled for Thursday, May 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2019. He indicated they will be considering the following three items that are anticipated to be on that agenda:

- Auto Fab Engineering, located east of Groesbeck, south of 15 Mile Road - proposed small addition on the back of the building.

- Rezoning Request for property west of Groesbeck, north of Weybridge, from I-1 Light Industrial to I-2 General Industrial for a trucking company.
- Site Development Plan for Groesbeck Hwy Transportation Center, which is for the site of the rezoning also being considered.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

---

Motion by Mr. Brumbaugh, seconded by Mr. Opalewski, to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 7:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

*Katherine Cherry*

Katherine Cherry, Secretary  
CLINTON TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION

ces:05/16/19  
ces:05/16/19  
*Approved 05/23/19*