

OSHTEMO CHARTER TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION

MINUTES OF A MEETING HELD AUGUST 12, 2010

---

**Agenda**

**LA RUE – SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE APPROVAL – OPERATE SMOKER AND TO-GO FOOD SALES OUTDOORS – 6375 STADIUM DRIVE – (PARCEL NO. 3905-26-465-075)**

**MASTER LAND USE PLAN – DRAFT TWO OF FUTURE LAND USE PLAN AND MAP CHAPTER**

---

A meeting of the Oshtemo Charter Township Planning Commission was held on Thursday, August 12, 2010, commencing at approximately 7:00 p.m. at the Oshtemo Charter Township Hall.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Terry Schley, Chairman  
Deborah Everett  
Bob Anderson  
Kitty Gelling  
Carl Benson  
Fred Gould

MEMBER ABSENT: Richard Skalski

Also present were Jodi Stefforia, Planning Director; Chris West, Associate Planner; James Porter, Township Attorney, and 11 other interested persons.

**Call to Order and Pledge of Allegiance**

At approximately 7:00 p.m., the meeting was called to order, and the “Pledge of Allegiance” was recited by the Commissioners.

**Agenda**

The Chairman asked if there were any changes or additions to the Agenda. Hearing none, he called for a motion to approve the Agenda. Mr. Gould made a motion to approve the Agenda, as submitted, and Mr. Anderson seconded the motion. The Chairman called for a vote on the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

## **Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items**

Ronald Lance introduced himself to the Planning Commission. He said he lived on 4<sup>th</sup> Street and that he and his wife are considering raising chickens, but given the setback restrictions, the only place they could locate them would be in their garage. He asked that the Commission review the restrictions, particularly with regard to the 150-foot setback from off-site residences for small animals, and see if a change could be made to allow the raising of chickens. He said it was a development happening across the country for people to be closer to the land and to promote sustainable living.

## **Minutes**

The Chairman asked the members of the Planning Commission if they had a chance to review the July 22, 2010 minutes and asked if they had any changes. Hearing none, he said he had a few technical comments regarding the minutes. The Chairman said, on page 3, in the third full paragraph, the reference in the fourth line to “they” should read “Planning Commissioners.” On page 4, he also asked that the word “be” be added to the fourth line from the bottom of fifth full paragraph, right before the word “added.”

The Chairman then took issue with the accuracy of the minutes with regard to the comments he made at the last meeting. He suggested that he come in and review the tape. Ms. Stefforia said she would be happy to revisit the tapes of the meeting as well.

Mr. Gould suggested that the July 22, 2010 minutes not be approved until that was done. Attorney Porter concurred. With that, the Chairman called for a motion to table adoption of the minutes until the next meeting. Mr. Benson made a motion to table approval of the minutes of July 22, 2010, until the Planning Commissioners’ next meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Gould. The Chairman called for a vote on the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

## **LA RUE – SPECIAL EXCEPTION USE APPROVAL – OPERATE SMOKER AND TO-GO FOOD SALES OUTDOORS – 6375 STADIUM DRIVE – (PARCEL NO. 3905-26-465-075)**

The Chairman said the next item on the Agenda was consideration of a special exception use to request approval for a seasonal smoker on LaRue’s Family Restaurant property to offer to-go food sales outdoors. He said the subject property was located at 6375 Stadium Drive, Parcel No. 3905-26-465-075. The Chairman called for a report from the Planning Department. Ms. Stefforia submitted her report to the Planning Commission dated August 12, 2010, and the same is incorporated herein by reference.

Ms. Stefforia said that the restaurant owner wanted to open a smoker to offer to-go food sales of smoked meats and related items. She said the applicant was proposing to offer to-go foods March through October, from 3 p.m. to 8 p.m. Ms. Stefforia then proceeded to present

photographs of the proposed 20-foot long trailer, which would house the smoker, as well as a refrigerator, prep area and various sinks, etc.

Ms. Stefforia suggested that perhaps the property fell under the provisions of Section 33.309, which would allow the Planning Commission to determine if this use is similar to those uses permitted in the Village Commercial District. She said if, and only if, they found the use was similar to other permitted uses, that the applicant's request be approved under the special exception use criteria.

Ms. Stefforia then proceeded to take the Commission through a review of proposal pursuant Section 60.100, Special Exception Use.

The Chairman asked the Planning Commission members if they had any questions of Ms. Stefforia. Mr. Benson commented that the location on the drawings might be a bit off since the location as shown in their packet contained a utility pole.

The Chairman, hearing no other questions or comments, asked to hear from the applicant.

Mr. Dave LaRue introduced himself to the Planning Commission. He said the economy has been extremely poor, which had led to the closing of his restaurant in the evenings. He said he thought he could use this to-go food sales as a means of providing revenue for his restaurant but with much less overhead expense than operating the restaurant in the evening. Mr. LaRue explained all the improvements which he had made to his restaurant, but he said, given the tough economy, he needed another means of trying to make a reasonable profit.

The Chairman asked if there were any questions.

Ms. Gelling asked why he could not reopen his restaurant. Mr. LaRue explained that the overhead outweighed the benefit, and adding a smoker would be a new avenue for income.

The Chairman asked if Mr. LaRue's operation would be done by consignment. Mr. LaRue said no; he would be in control, but he did have a partner. The Chairman then asked if the employees would be employees of LaRue's and whether LaRue's Restaurant would run the operation. Mr. LaRue said all of them would be his employees and would be operated under his food license.

The Chairman asked if the restaurant building would be open to the public during smoker operation. Mr. LaRue said he did not believe so, but it would be open to staff. The Chairman asked if, public sanitation was needed, if he could make his building available. Mr. LaRue said he thought he could do that.

Mr. Gould asked if the supplies would be kept in the trailer or in the restaurant. Mr. LaRue said the supplies would be stored in the restaurant and brought out to the unit at the beginning of the operating day.

Mr. Benson asked about the length of the smoking process and how much smoke was created by this type of smoker. Mr. LaRue said he brought a gentleman who operates the same type of system he is proposing to purchase to explain the operations of it to the Commission.

Mr. Brad Wilcox introduced himself to the Commission. He explained the smoking process. He said that the logs were wet and fired with a propane tank. Therefore, there is minimal smoke from the operation. He said the proposed smoker was not anything like you see in these large oil drums; they actually produce less smoke than a grill might produce in the restaurant.

Mr. Anderson asked again if the smoker would use gas. Mr. Wilcox said that it did. He explained that they use propane to create the heat, and therefore, used a very small amount of wood in the day's cooking.

Mr. Anderson asked if there would be other items sold with the food. Mr. LaRue said they would also sell side dishes such as beans, coleslaw, and potato salad, but there would be a very limited fare.

Ms. Everett asked, if it took three to eight hours to slow-cook some meats, when the smoker would be started. Mr. LaRue said the smoker would have to be started at 10 a.m. or 11 a.m. in order to open at 3 p.m.

Ms. Gelling asked if they would be hiring new employees, and Mr. LaRue said he thought they could use some of their existing staff.

Ms. Stefforia asked about clean-up and disposal of ash from the smoker. Mr. Wilcox said, even after a week, the small amount of ash which is produced can be left to cool and scraped into a small tin garbage can. He noted that there was not a lot of waste produced by this type of operation.

Ms. Everett asked if the smoker operation would be seven days a week. Mr. LaRue said he thought it would be, but that he might close Mondays, depending upon traffic flow.

The Chairman called for public comment, and asked that the audience adhere to the Commission's guidelines on the back of the agenda.

Mrs. Judy Borden introduced herself to the Planning Commission. She said she lived on Parkview and had some concerns, which she wished to express. Mrs. Borden expressed concern over the location due to the topography, as well as creating a distraction or hazard in pulling out onto Parkview. She also expressed concern about a loss of greenspace. In addition, she did not see how such a large trailer would fit into the present zoning. She questioned whether it would be screened or fenced, and asked where the trailer might go during the off-season. She also

asked what would happen if the restaurant owner wanted to change the times and the hours of operation and wondered if he would have to get permission from the Planning Commission.

The Chairman thanked Mrs. Borden for her comments.

The Chairman asked if there were any further comments. Hearing none, he closed the public portion of the meeting.

The Chairman asked Mr. LaRue to return to the lectern. The Chairman asked Mr. LaRue where the smoker would be parked during the off-season. Mr. LaRue said it would be shrink-wrapped and stored off-site in a storage facility. The Chairman asked how the smoker would receive electricity. Mr. LaRue said an electrical cord would be plugged into an appropriate receptacle. The Chairman asked if there would be any additional lighting. Mr. LaRue indicated there would not. The Chairman asked Mr. LaRue if he understood he was making a commitment to the Commission with regard to the hours, the duration of the operation and the limited nature of the retail sales. Mr. LaRue said he understood that he was making such a commitment.

The Chairman called for Planning Commissioner deliberations. The Chairman asked how the Planning Commission should proceed. Ms. Stefforia suggested that the Commission initially focus on Section 33.309 to determine whether the applicant's request is similar to uses permitted in Section 33.200 or Section 33.250 and whether they should even consider this special use permit.

The Chairman said that the Planning Commission needed to stay focused on whether or not this was appropriate land use, and not whether or not to support the applicant in his endeavors. He said, when he went back and read the Zoning Ordinance and looked at the intent outlined in the Village Commercial District provisions, he did not see how this request could meet the provisions of Sections 33.200 or 33.250. He said he based his analysis on whether the smoker itself would meet the definition of a building or structure. If it was a building or structure, then it could not meet the provisions of Section 33.200, since it would not be outdoor sales but sales within a structure. He also noted that accessory buildings were not allowed in the Village Commercial Area. Therefore, it could not be allowed under that provision of the Zoning Ordinance.

The Chairman also noted that the administrative review provisions of Section 33.250 would not apply, and therefore, he did not see any way to permit the applicant's request under Section 33.309. The Chairman said it was his opinion that the building in essence was an accessory building for a principal use, and given the overlay standards provided for in the Village Commercial Area, it simply does not meet the Township's standards for a special use.

Ms. Everett thanked the Chairman for his thoughtful analysis.

Ms. Gelling said she had to agree and said she did not believe this would achieve what they were trying to develop within the Village Core.

Mr. Benson said, given the analysis of the Chairman, he did not see how they could approve the proposed use.

Mr. Anderson commented that the request was not in character with what they are trying to achieve in the Village Commercial Area.

The Chairman said, if they approved this request, he thought it would set a bad precedent and was concerned about other types of retail sales on wheels in places such as the Harding's parking lot or other areas within the Village Commercial. He said he simply did not think it was consistent with the character and what they were trying to develop. He stated, while he tried to avoid looking at the appearance alone, he thought the smoker was ruled out based on his prior analysis so they do not even need to get into the overlay standards.

Ms. Everett indicated that she thought the Chairman was correct.

Mr. Gould asked if Big Moe's barbeque could operate within the Village Commercial Area. The Chairman said he was not sure whether that would be the same and referenced a couple of other very limited uses which were approved as a temporary use, such as the fundraiser at Texas Corral, but it was not approving a building, and it was for a very limited event. Ms. Stefforia suggested that if a Big Moe's barbeque made a request, they would treat the request like any other outdoor temporary event.

Mr. Gould asked if that would be available to Mr. LaRue. Ms. Stefforia said she would have to think about it, but she did not believe it would be approved for any extended length of time and doubted that Mr. LaRue would want to invest \$20,000 for a temporary outdoor event.

Mr. Gould asked about LaRue's providing this type of service within the restaurant. The Chairman said he was not predisposed against smoked meat, but he thought if Mr. LaRue wanted to have a drive-up window, it would create a problem, since drive-up windows are not permitted within the Village Commercial zone. He noted that Rykse's sold baked goods, and that was permitted because it was contained within a fully-enclosed building.

The Chairman asked if there was any further discussion, and hearing none, said he would entertain a motion. Mr. Benson made a motion to deny the special exception use, since it did not fall within the parameters of Section 33.309 of the Zoning Ordinance per the Chairman's analysis. The motion was seconded by Ms. Gelling. The Chairman called for a vote on the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

## **MASTER LAND USE PLAN – DRAFT TWO OF FUTURE LAND USE PLAN AND MAP CHAPTER**

The Chairman said the next item up for discussion was a review of Draft Two of the Future Land Use Plan and Map chapter. The Chairman called for a report from the Planning

Department. Ms. Stefforia submitted her memo with the revisions to the Future Land Use Plan Draft Two, along with a revised Master Land Use Plan map. Ms. Stefforia then proceeded to take the Commissioners through a review of the more significant changes in Draft Two of the Future Land Use Plan and Map chapter.

Ms. Stefforia pointed out the changes on page 5, specifically taking note of the fact that, while utilities have been extended into the rural residential areas, they were done for environmental purposes, not to facilitate development. She also noted on page 6 that, at the request of neighborhood residents, they were providing examples of things to consider to protect existing neighborhoods such as buffers, setbacks, berms, landscaping, green space, etc.

Ms. Stefforia then proceeded to review the text boxes on pages 8 and 9 of the draft chapter. She said the first text box references a case study of Country Club Village and how concerns raised by residents of all existing neighborhoods could be better addressed, as well the success story of Whitegate Farms and the value of connectivity in avoiding sprawl and creating a harmonious blend of land uses. Ms. Stefforia concluded her review of the renamed Enterprise future land use designation as set forth on page 16 of the draft chapter.

The Chairman asked if there were other changes in the Enterprise zone, to which Ms. Stefforia indicated that there were, but she thought she hit the most significant changes since the Commission last considered the draft.

The Chairman said he was curious and did not understand why it was necessary to add the text boxes regarding Country Club Village. Ms. Stefforia said that Country Club Village was simply used as a case study, but that the results of the study would be applied to all the neighborhoods in the Township. The Chairman said he did not read the case study as limiting access requirements but wondered why references to smart connectivity needed to be inserted in this portion of the Land Use Plan. Ms. Stefforia said that the Consultant the Township is working with suggested this at the end of the meeting as a means of giving residents of existing neighborhoods some comfort regarding the use of outlots in their neighborhood. The Chairman said he did not believe that the text box would prohibit neighborhoods from being subject to connectivity. Ms. Stefforia said the text box was not meant to say that the outlots would not be used, but that they would be looked at and used judiciously or as appropriate.

Ms. Gelling asked if the reference could be more generalized and not specifically refer to Country Club Village. She said she did not believe they needed a case study to cite the concerns referenced by the Country Club Village residents, since a lot of other residents lived in existing neighborhoods and had similar concerns.

The Chairman said he did not think the text on page 8 provided much of an opportunity for an exception to the rule. Ms. Stefforia asked if the Chairman was looking for more flexibility in this section, to which the Chairman indicated that he was.

Ms. Gelling said if they were going to have a reference in this section, it should refer to older neighborhoods. She again noted that a lot of people live in neighborhoods, and she did not want it to appear that there was some kind of preference being given to Country Club Village by direct reference in the Master Land Use Plan.

Mr. Gould said he read it to mean the Commission should focus on all neighborhoods with the warning not to damage the quality of life in a neighborhood, while at the same time, promoting connectivity in a responsible manner.

Ms. Stefforia asked for clarification and asked if the Commission was looking for more flexibility which would allow them to consider not requiring use of all the outlots and have more discretion. The Chairman reiterated that was exactly what he was looking for, and that he wanted it made clear in the Land Use Plan as to what was intended so that it would not be misconstrued by Planning Commissioners in the future.

Mr. Benson said he thought that the case study reference to Country Club Village should be removed. He also said he was concerned about the appearance of a bias in favor of one neighborhood versus all older neighborhoods in the community. The Chairman asked if the case study should be generalized, and it was the consensus of the Planning Commission members that it should.

Ms. Gelling asked about a reference on page 14, in the second paragraph under “Local Commercial.” She said she asked that “automobile oriented” be removed from the paragraph at the last meeting. Ms. Stefforia said that Greg Milliken of McKenna Associates had clarified that by adding additional defining language. Ms. Gelling said she thought it was the consensus that the reference be taken out, and the Chairman concurred. Mr. Benson offered an alternative, which was to reword the sentence as follows: “These uses are not high-volume / high-traffic uses with a significant number of cars coming and going, drive-through service, and/or automobile service.” It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to accept that proposed change.

The Chairman then asked that the Planning Commission discuss the Enterprise future land use designation as set forth on pages 16 and 17 of the draft chapter. He said, in the first paragraph of the Enterprise section, there is a direct reference made to the importance of retaining this area as an employment center for the Township. He said he was not sure why that phrase was added, since it is not provided for in the Industrial zone classification. He said he thought it was odd to see it here. He said he was also concerned about the reference to heavy commercial being added to this proposed area, and did not think it fit within the previous definition of the “I-R” classification.

The Chairman said he thought that a special reference made to the design and layout of uses adjacent to the Form-Based Code Overlay in the second paragraph was odd, since the proposed Enterprise District could not function the same way as the Village Form Based Code Overlay District.

The Chairman concluded by saying the need to use planned unit development technique to ensure consistent comprehensive development should only be applied to larger parcels, not to small parcels. Ms. Stefforia asked if the Chairman was asking that the bullet-point specifically address only the larger parcels within the described District. The Chairman indicated yes.

Mr. Gould said he had a question about the reference to low density residential development on page 7 of the draft chapter. He said there were references on page 7 to maintaining safe neighborhoods and avoiding high-speed bypass or convenient short-cuts, and he was not certain how the Township should deal with these issues. He said he thought it would be a difficult matter to police. The Chairman said the focus of that section was on the design and development of the low-density residential so as to avoid those types of adverse effects. Attorney Porter noted that it was not a matter of policing, but more a matter of using the planning techniques available to the Commission to make sure that these adverse effects do not take place.

The Chairman asked if there were any other comments on Draft Two, to which he received no reply. At that point, the Chairman opened up the meeting on this issue to public comment.

Mr. Dan Thompson introduced himself to the Planning Commission. He said he was concerned about the definition of low density within the Plan document itself. He said, on page 6, it references low density, and yet says that low density is predominantly one and two-family dwellings. He said he did not believe that was low density.

Mr. Thompson also said he thought the case studies on Whitegate and Country Club Village were informative and instructive. He said that the Whitegate analysis was very instructive as to why connectivity into Country Club Village would not work. He said, in Whitegate, people are going from smaller roads to larger roads; whereas, the reverse would be true if connectivity were allowed into Country Club Village, since the traffic would be coming from wider streets onto narrower streets and would not be conducive to good traffic management.

Ms. Margaret Masuzawa introduced herself to the Planning Commission. She directed the Commission to page 7 of the draft chapter, and asked why the reference to interconnected street network was called “critical.” She also asked what a “connectivity index” was and took exception to the statement that interconnectivity would always promote safety. She said she believed emptying newer neighborhoods into older neighborhoods with narrower streets was not safer.

Ms. Stefforia asked the Planning Commission members what they would like to do with regard to the definition of low density residential. She said that duplexes are presently allowed in the “R-2” zone, and that is why there is a reference to one and two-family dwellings in that area. She said, however, if they want to take the zoning in a new direction, they could further

restrict the definition of low density to single-family residential. Ms. Everett said she thought they should take out the reference to duplexes. The Chairman asked if there was a consensus of the Commission to do that, and the Commissioners concurred.

The Chairman said that there was another item which needed to be addressed which was raised in a memo from the Planning Director regarding the Public Input Survey. Ms. Stefforia said perhaps she misunderstood some of the comments of the Chairman at the last meeting, and because of those comments, she was looking for some direction from the Planning Commission. The Chairman said he thought it was important that they talk about what the Public Input Survey did and did not indicate.

Ms. Everett asked if the question raised in Ms. Stefforia's memo was, what the intent was with regard to commercial development on 9<sup>th</sup> Street, south of West Main Street. The Chairman said he thought that was the question.

The Chairman said that perhaps they would find out what the question was which he had raised at the last meeting, when they reviewed the tapes. He said he thought the real issue was, how people interpreted the question which was presented to them. He said he did not think anyone could be absolutely sure of what the public's interpretation of the various questions was because of the generic nature of the questions. He said he thought a person would have to take these individual questions and interpret them in the context of the whole Plan. The Chairman said he did not know what the Planning Commissioners' thoughts were with regard to 9<sup>th</sup> Street, south of West Main Street, but he stated that two-thirds of the people surveyed ~~were of the opinion that more commercial should be added on 9<sup>th</sup> Street, south of West Main Street.~~ **suggested new industrial development be located near the BTR Park.** He said given that, and the fact that the Enterprise zone has been revised to only call for industrial uses, when two-thirds of the people thought that the industrial development should be located near the BTR Park, raised questions in his mind. He said he thought that was more significant than the more limited response from some that industrial should be located near 9<sup>th</sup> Street and N Avenue.

Ms. Everett asked if the Chairman was asking that the Enterprise zone move to the area of Parkview and 11<sup>th</sup> Street. The Chairman said he was not necessarily saying that. He was simply saying that he thought the Enterprise zone should be more flexible. He said the character on 9<sup>th</sup> Street really is a modeled area and that it was not a traditional industrial area. He said the area was more of a potpourri of uses, which he thought was sandwiched between the development in Texas Charter Township commercial uses and the Village Commercial, and therefore, should allow for a greater mix of uses in that area.

Ms. Everett said she thought the reference in the Survey to commercial on 9<sup>th</sup> Street would cut off at KL Avenue. Mr. Gould said he agreed, and he thought it would be KL Avenue. Ms. Gelling said she thought the reference to commercial south of West Main ran all the way to N Avenue.

Ms. Stefforia said that all of the planning that has been done in this area was directed toward light industrial, not commercial development. She said when the questions were drafted, she thought everyone knew what the questions meant with regard to commercial south of West Main. To interpret it to mean all of 9<sup>th</sup> Street was inconsistent with the land use planning that had been done in the area. However, she said perhaps that is what the community wanted.

The Chairman said he thought that 67% of the people surveyed stated that more industrial should be near the BTR and that was the intent of the public, not necessarily focused on South 9<sup>th</sup> Street. The Chairman suggested that perhaps the new facts and new development should be addressed and looked at, as well as possibly reviewing what the Planning Commission's perception or the Planning Department's perception was of the Survey questions.

Ms. Stefforia asked the Planning Commission members if they were uncomfortable with what they are proposing in the Enterprise zone on 9<sup>th</sup> Street near N Avenue. The Chairman said his main concern, whatever they did, was to be cognitive of the fact that they were near residentially-zoned property and should be respectful of that.

Ms. Everett said that she recognized that what existed there was a mix of uses and apparently, what the Chairman was looking for was an "industria-mercial" zone. The Chairman said, as a business owner, he had to be pragmatic about the uses of his property, but he was more focused on what the community wanted for this area. He said he clearly did not think it was heavy commercial and thought it needed to be a broader mix than what was being proposed.

The Chairman said if the Commission did not want to look at this matter further, he would not necessarily **be** making any suggestions for changes.

Ms. Gelling said that she could tell that the Chairman was not happy with that, to which the Chairman indicated that it was not a matter of being happy; it was a matter of what he thought was appropriate for the area. Ms. Gelling responded that the Commission was a consensus body, and perhaps the Commission members needed to rethink this issue before they proceeded forward. Ms. Gelling said there was no consensus on this issue, and asked how to proceed.

Ms. Stefforia suggested that she do a Third Draft and return with all of the pertinent information which was used in developing the Second Draft and let the Commission take a fresh look at this issue. It was the consensus of the Commission to proceed in that fashion.

### **Any Other Business**

The Chairman asked if there was any other business. Ms. Stefforia suggested cancelling the August 26 meeting since there are no agenda items, and Draft Three of the Future Land Use Chapter can be considered on September 9, as there is only one item on that Agenda. Ms. Gelling made a motion to cancel the Planning Commission meeting of August 26, 2010. The

motion was seconded by Mr. Anderson. The Chairman called for a vote on the motion, and the motion passed unanimously.

### **Planning Commissioner Comments**

The Chairman called for Planning Commissioner comments.

Mr. Anderson said he thought it was a good meeting. He said, while it was difficult to make some of the decisions they had made, he thought they had done a good job.

Mr. Gould concurred. He also said he would miss the Chairman's analytical ability next year.

Mr. Benson said, in spite of the adverse decision to Mr. LaRue, he hoped people would not be embarrassed to go and continue to patronize his business.

Ms. Gelling said she very much wanted Mr. LaRue to succeed in his business, but felt the Commission members made the decision that they had to, based on the Zoning Ordinance.

Ms. Everett agreed with Ms. Gelling and said it was a tough decision.

The Chairman concluded by saying that he appreciated the Planning Commission's patience, and that while he had a personal interest in the Land Use Plan as it affected his property, he hoped that the Commission members could see that he was truly looking at what was in the Township's best interest and that his primary focus was as a planner, and not as a business owner.

Ms. Stefforia said she also hoped that the Commission members understood that what she was trying to achieve, in interpreting the information received from the public, was the will of the people.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:30 p.m.

Minutes Prepared:  
August 13, 2010

Minutes Approved:  
\_\_\_\_\_, 2010