

Bloomfield Township Wetlands and Planning Meeting February 16, 2026

158 MIN · YOUTUBE · [HTTPS://WWW.YOUTUBE.COM/WATCH?V=N2NYBTHJJN0&T=9315S](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N2NYBTHJJN0&T=9315S)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n2nyBthjJno&t=9315s>

SUMMARY

The February 16th Planning Commission meeting focused on the proposal for a banquet hall in the Bloomfield Township research park, which has raised significant concerns among local residents. The commission heard extensive public comments opposing the project, citing potential noise, traffic, and safety issues, as well as the impact on property values and community character. Ultimately, the commission decided to table the proposal for further discussion and community engagement.

- The Planning Commission serves as an advisory board to the Board of Trustees, with decisions made here subject to final approval by the trustees.*
- The meeting included a public hearing on a wetlands application related to the proposed development, which would impact local wetlands.*
- Residents expressed strong opposition to the banquet hall, citing concerns about noise, traffic, and the potential for alcohol-related disturbances.*
- The commission acknowledged the need for further dialogue between the developer and the community to address residents' concerns.*
- The commission voted to table both the text amendment for the banquet hall and the related site plan review for further consideration.*
- The annual report presented by the planning department highlighted the commission's activity over the past year, including an increase in site plan reviews and variances.*
- The commission emphasized the importance of community input in future developments and zoning amendments.*

Let's call this meeting to order, please. Uh, welcome everybody. Um, welcome to the February 16th meeting of the planning commission. >> Um, before we start board, >> I know that. Well, >> yes, got it. Before we Yes, wetland board is part of the planning commission and we will do that. But before we start, I just like to for those of you who have never been to one of these meetings or maybe look watching us uh this we're the planning commission which is also the wetlands board. Um we're appointed by the uh board of trustees, seven members, volunteers uh appointed.

We're not elected. Um, and we are a an advisory board only, meaning that whatever we decide here tonight, whatever is moved, it goes on to the board of trustees for final approval. We're just advisory. Um, so the point is that whatever you tell us tonight, when it comes time for that, we listen, we make a recommendation, but you'll have another opportunity when it goes to the board who makes the final decision. Um, so with that, we have two we have three [clears throat] things basically on tonight's agenda. It's a full agenda.

So, get ready, relax, settle in. Um, this may take a while. Uh, but we have, as I said, the wetlands board is a part of the, um, planning commission. And, um, the first item will be a wetlands board meeting. And before I go on, I just want to introduce one of our elected officials, Mike Showstack in the back, our treasurer. So, just you know that. And, well, Neil, well, he's part of our >> our board. But um so the first thing on the agenda then is to go is is the um a separate agenda is the wetlands board.

Completely separate from what we'll we'll talk about later. Um and we have a quorum so we can do business. Need four out of seven. We have f we have five and so we have a a quorum and the first thing is um we have public comment only on matters pertaining to the wetlands board and and things that are not on the agenda. Okay. uh that gives you an opportunity to say anything you want about other than what's on the agenda.

You'll have plenty of time for those items after we hear it. So, if there's I don't see anybody jumping up for the public comment, you'll have plenty of time to to make your comments. Um approval of the minutes. We had um a um the last meeting was on August Wow. August of 2025. Okay. So, we have those minutes. We have to approve them. >> Moved second. >> Moved and second. All those in favor? I. Any opposed? All right. So, what we have is a public hearing right now uh on Bloomfield Hollows. And again, it's not about the site plan. It's not about anything except the wetlands. And um so, Andrea.

>> Oh, hi. Good evening, uh board. Uh my name is Andrea Bivby. I am the director of the planning, building, and ordinance department here at Bloomfield Township. Um just a brief introduction to the presentation um that will shortly be presented um by um the township's uh wetland consultant Niswander Environmental. Um I just want to point out that the the request that you are to um hear now and to deliberate on in this portion of the wetland board meeting is you will um consider um it's actually a wetland application that has been submitted to the township. As part of that wetland application, the applicant is requesting to impact um approximately 500 square feet of an existing wetland that lies um on the property. Um and so your um your your duty now would be to consider that wetland permit. Um I just want to let you know which you are familiar with the process but to let the public know that even with if the town if the wetland board were to approve the wetland permit it certainly in no way um approves the site plan. These are separate um uh items. These are separate boards. You're wearing your wetland board hat right now and then later on you'll be wearing your site plan hat. In that case then we will discuss the the the details of the actual site plan. So, I just wanted to kind of um explain that and what the process was. And with that, I'd be happy to uh Jeffoff introduce Jeff Bridgeland. He works for Niswander Environmental on behalf of the township.

Anytime that we have a development that comes to the township in which an applicant is seeking to impact um a wetland, uh Bloomfield Township does have a wetland ordinance and oftentimes our wetland requirements actually go above and beyond the requirements at the state level in which any wetland that gets impacted in the township does require a wetland permit. So with that, I do want to uh introduce Jeff, have him come up here and he can walk you through. He has a slideshow that he's prepared and he'll be able to address um what he found out on the site and what the proposal is and then also make a um a recommendation based on his expertise.

>> Just be come on. Come on. But while you walk up, I just one housekeeping thing. If you would please turn your phones off or put them on silent. I don't want to have phones ringing all over the the meeting. Well, people speaking. Thank you. >> Hello. Um my name is Jeff Bridgland. I'm a ecologist with Nice Wanderer Environmental and we are the wetland consultant for Bloomfield Township. Uh we'll be talking about the proposed Bloomfield Hollow project. Um today I'll kind of go over um what the applicants wetland consultant found on site. Um I'll give a description of the um wetland and natural feature setback impacts and then I'll talk a little bit about the site plan review process that we went through uh with the township and with the applicant. So, um, [clears throat] the site which is shown here in yellow, oops, here we go. Um, it was delineated by ASI environmental in June 2023.

Um, we determined that all the wetlands that they flagged were accurately delineated in the field. Um, the [clears throat] main features on this property, there are eight wetlands, wetlands A through H, and an enclosed drain here. this white line. So, this figure that you're seeing is from ASI's wetland location map as part of their wetland delineation report. Um, I actually added the white um enclosed drain line that was not identified um by ASI Environmental. Um, which is not surprising. It's an enclosed drain. It doesn't show up on any of uh the typical online maps that uh wetland consultants typically use um when determining if there's uh you know, we kind of do like a desktop review prior to going into the field to see what we should be looking for. And enclosed drains don't usually show up. So, it's it's not surprising that um it was missed, but um so I added this white line on here. It's approximate. It's not exact, but these other uh wetlands here are exact. They were GPSed in the field by ASI. So there's eight wetlands. Wetlands A through H. Wetland A is down here in the southwest corner. Wetland B is this linear feature right here. A and B are both um man-made ditches and and not much more than that. Um wetlands D and E are here in the southeast corner. Uh wetland E extends offsite onto the adjacent property owners um site.

There's wetland F, which is up in here. It extends slightly offsite to the north. Wetland G, which is this very small little feature right here. This is a scrub shrub wetland. And wetland [clears throat] H, which is this larger wetland here. Um, and this is a vernal pool that extends offsite to the north as well. So, um, I'll I'll talk in depth mostly about wetlands B and C tonight. Um, but in essence, all eight wetlands total about 1.45 acres on the property.

Um, like I said, they were all accurately flagged by ASI. Um, all the on-site wetlands are regulated by the township due to the essential clause. We we determined that they're essential to the natural preservation of the natural resources uh within the township. um regarding [clears throat] whether or not they are regulated by the state by Eagle stands for um Department of Environment, Great Lakes and Energy. They're the uh state agency that um has jurisdiction over the the regulatory status of of wetlands. Um we think that Eagle will probably regulate wetlands B and C. So, typically wetlands are regulated if they're greater than 5 acres in size or if they're within 500 ft of a stream or a lake or a pond. Um, in this case, it's a little bit different because we're dealing with an enclosed drain.

And it's been our experience that um Eagle is a little inconsistent when determining regulatory status with enclosed drains. um [clears throat] based on my personal experience they tend to regulate uh wetlands that are

directly connected hydrologically to it. So that's why we feel that wetlands B and C will probably be regulated by Eagle um because there are direct hydrologic connections to to the drain via um catch basins and culverts. So um it is up to Eagle to make the their determination on whether or not they're going to take jurisdiction over it. And we've uh strongly advised the applicant to reach out to Eagle um for what they call a pre-application meeting to get their determination on the those two wetlands in particular. [snorts] Talk a little bit about the site plan here. Um this is the what we've seen as the final site plan. Um you can see there's a access driveway coming in from Franklin Road here. Uh parking in the north and a little bit down here. Um the building itself is proposed for this area and then it kind of terminates at a cul-de-sac right here. So um as far as wetland impacts go, these are pretty minor from um you know we've we've gone through a lot of uh wetland board meetings in the past and um this is a very minor impact. They're proposing to impact 414 square ft with the driveway crossing in wetland B. Um the crossing is 13.8 feet long by about 30 feet wide.

[clears throat] The actual area they're going to be crossing is it's not this exact area, but it's very close to this. This is the linear ditch. This is kind of the very southern terminus of this of this ditched feature. So the uh the impact is going to be slightly north of that. Um so but it is essentially just the ditch um that they're going to be impacting. This this feature extends from the southern property boundary to the northern property boundary. So, it's unavoidable. There's if you're going to develop anything east of this drain or of this uh ditch rather, um the wetland has to be impacted. That's it's an unavoidable uh situation. So, because this wetland impact is so minor, we're talking .009 acres, um we're not recommending mitigation. Um mitigation for a forested wetland is typically at a 2 to1 ratio. So if they were to impact an acre of wetland, they would have to replace it with two acres of wetland. Um in this situation, we'd be talking about 0.018 acres of of wetland mitigation.

And we've found [clears throat] that it's it's it just doesn't work when you when you have to mitigate for something that small. It leads to a lot of issues. it's excessively um costly to the applicant. Um and this is a pretty minor impact to a pretty low quality wetland. So that's why um we've we've decided that mitigation or we're recommending that mitigation not be required for the wetland impact. Um this is the northern portion of wetland B, this photo here. So as mentioned, it's a forested wetland. Um, it is a linear ditch that kind of extends beyond just the banks of the ditch. Um, it's largely dominated by buckthornne, common buckthornne, which is a highly invasive shrub. Uh, there are some ash trees and elm trees along the edge. Uh, this portion um in the photo here is a little bit further north. This is what I would say is probably the nicer or higher quality portion of wetland B. It's dominated by sedges and and native vegetation. Um and uh as mentioned there is a direct connection to the Murphy drain here.

We'll talk [clears throat] so that's it for as far as uh wetland impacts go. Um there are natural feature setback impacts. So each wetland has a 25 foot natural feature setback that requires a variance if it's going to be impacted. So the applicant is proposing impacts to four wetlands in five locations to wetlands A B two portions of wetland C and wetland F up here. So um in total the five areas would um constitute about 6600 square ft which is about 0.15 acres. Um the photos down here are kind of um snapshots of what the habitat looks like surrounding these wetlands. It's pretty weedy. It's dominated by invasive buckthornne for the most part. There's a um some herbaceous weedy species. Um non-native grasses, golden rods, um pretty common species, raspberry, multiflora rose. Um there are a few trees that would be impacted um but nothing of major significance. So um because it's about 0.15 acres of of impact to the natural feature setback we will be requiring

mitigation for that. Um mitigation varies from project to project but it uh for this project they are proposing to um provide invasive species control um which I took to mean buckthorn control and they're proposing to um plant and seed this feature right here. This is a proposed bio retention basin adjacent to wetland sea. Um they're proposing to seed that with a native wetland seed mix. So essentially it could um end up becoming a wetland.

So as far as the site plan review comments go, I'm going to switch between this uh this slide and the previous one. Um, as I mentioned, th this this is their latest iteration of the of the uh site plan. Initially, it was much [snorts] different from the first time that I saw it in October. Um, they had the building pretty much lying on top of wetland C. They had a road crossing right through wetland A. Um, wetland B, like I mentioned, is unavoidable. So, that hasn't really changed much. But they also showed parking lot uh impacting wetland G up here and a little bit of wetland F. So there was there were some hurdles to get through with the applicant and his design team. And I I do have to say um we went through a lot of meetings and they went through a number of iterations which I'm sure were not cheap. And um they did their best to minimize and avoid the wetlands to the greatest extent possible. And from a wetlands perspective, um, I'm appreciative of that, um, and the efforts they took to do that. So, um, as I mentioned, [clears throat] they were talking about initially impacting wetlands A, B, C, and G. And what they did is, [clears throat] uh, they altered this driveway to avoid wetland A completely. They shifted the site east to avoid wetland C completely. and they um reconfigured the parking lot several times to um to miss wetlands G and F up here. So um during the site plan review process kind of later in the game um once we determined that this this iteration was pretty good in terms of minimizing and avoiding wetland impacts. Our biggest concern was with their proposed uh retention basin, bio retention basin down here. And they had an uh an outlet up here. Um both of which we were fearful was going to impact wetland C negatively. So wetland C is a forested wetland and it's a vernal pool. Um vernal pools are increasingly uncommon in Michigan, especially southeast Michigan. They provide critical habitat for um amphibians and reptiles, particularly frogs and salamanders. Um vernal pools in general have less protection um from eagle because of their just because of how they are. They're they're generally isolated features um and they're generally small. So, if they're not within 500 feet of a a wetland, lake stream, and if they're not larger than five acres, which not many of these fernal pools are, then they're not regulated by Eagle. So, um again, these are this is critical habitat for some pretty important wildlife in our estimation. Um, so with the bio retention basin initially shown as being lower than the adjacent wetland and a catch basin up here with an invert elevation lower than the wetland, we were really concerned that it was going to basically dewater wetland C, which would um essentially kill the the functions and values that it provides not only for storm water and um uh pollution control and groundwater recharge and everything else, but um also for for the wetlands or for the um amphibians and reptiles that that need vernal pools uh in order to breed. So we met with them and they essentially lowered the site. They or raised the site rather. They um made the um they redesigned the bio retention basin so it would be higher than the adjacent uh grade of the wetland and they raised the invert elevation of this catch basin so it would no longer dewater wetland. So two of our biggest concerns there were alleviated um by the design team for that. So um as mentioned we are requiring mitigation for the natural feature setback impacts um the plan again is to uh plant the bio retention basin with native wetland seed. Um and to provide invasive species control in the nature in the natural feature setbacks. Um, one thing that we did require is that they provide this plan prior to beginning construction. So, um, one other issue we had with the site plan, uh, towards the end of the review process was that, um, it their soil erosion and sediment control plan wasn't showing that it was protecting all the natural feature setbacks in wetland areas. And again, they made changes to the plans as we

asked them to do. And so all the um natural features including the wetlands are being protected now. So essentially the wetland impact area wetland B that linear ditch is a like we said kind of a a pretty low quality wetland feature. It doesn't provide much function or value. It's a man-made ditch. Um so and the impact area is is 0009 acres. So this is a very minor impact to a a fairly low quality wetland. So, um it's our opinion that the project is in the public interest and because of the low impacts and because it is in the project uh public interest because they've done a good job of minimizing and avoiding wetlands to the greatest extent possible. Um Nice WER Environmental is recommending uh that the wetland board approve this project from a wetlands perspective. Um, and it should be noted that um the the applicant needs to um deal with wetlands B and C um with Eagle to determine if Eagle's going to regulate those. And if they do regulate wetlands B and C, the applicant is also going to need a permit from uh the state of Michigan. So that's about all I have. Um if anybody has any questions, >> we'll bring it here. We'll get to that.

>> Sure. Anybody on the mission you have any questions? >> I I have one. >> Sure. >> Um is there a difference between you have you you you show that the one two three four five impacts but one only [clears throat] one is really a disruption where something's being built on it. The others are is there a difference in impact and disruption or I don't know what the word you want to use. >> So these are for the natural feature setback. So um I should have mentioned earlier that these these wetland lines here the interior line is the actual wetland. So where my cursor is now the perimeter line is the natural features setback boundary. So these [clears throat] five impacts are impacting the natural features the setback disruption. Okay I didn't get yeah the only I'm sorry about that the only wetland impact is right here to wetland B.

>> Okay. Okay. Any other questions? All right. What? Well, hold on. >> Um, the um applicant, do you want to have anything? Do you have anything you want to say about wetlands? That's up there. I'm sorry. No, wait. [clears throat] The applicant first. >> Yeah. My name is uh Reed Cookie with Stonefield Engineering Design here representing the applicant, Zackclar. Uh my address is 555 South Old Woodward, Sweet 12L, Birmingham, Michigan 4809. Um Jeff did a great uh presentation here really explaining kind of the the process that we've been through. Again, we initially were impacting Wetland Sea uh entirely and then work with him and the rest of the township staff pretty diligently on shifting it in order to maintain the the health of Wetland Sea. um when ensuring that not only that we were outside of the uh wetland itself but also ma ensuring that the drainage area to wetland C was going to be maintained as well as raising the site as it was mentioned to to not negatively impact and potentially dewater it from a uh subgrade perspective. So uh really do appreciate Jeff's time on that. Um the only other color I'd add is we are have started the process with Eagle. Uh we've submitted for our pre-application meeting and had a couple conversations there. uh due to the weather, it makes a little difficult to have these on-site meetings um you know to to actually do a field investigation. We've sent over the report that Jeff provided to them and they're reviewing that currently to uh try to make a determination on the uh the status of each, but as as uh Jeff said, you know, we're working with them and we're going to above and beyond what the state would require. you know, they they may require some additional detail in our final mitigation report, but um you know, we'll work with both entities um for that. Um you know, again, I think the mitigation that we're proposing right now is above what the the state would require due to the quality of the the minor wetland we're impacting. Um, but you know, obviously if they require anything separate or anything different, you know, we'll be sure to, you know, work with uh both the township staff and uh and the state to to get the the required permits here.

>> Thank you. >> If they if they do take jurisdiction over wetland B, it will require an Eagle permit to impact that even even with its small size, >> right? It might require a permit, but it wouldn't prevent the site plan or the proposal to we're impacting the the 25 ft environmental feature set back and the wetland that's being impacted in the driveway probably wouldn't even come under that jurisdiction. So, they they may require a permit, but I'm thinking they're not going to twist the site plan around. I I don't see any reason to. No, it's if this was an avoidable wetland impact, they may make them um come in from a different route or something, but this is like I said, minor and unavoidable. So, um I don't see Eagle doing that.

>> Anybody else have any questions? Okay, now now it's your turn. Um here's the ground rules. Come up to the speaker, form a line so we don't have to wait for everybody to come one at a time. Need your name, your address. You get three minutes and please again I'm going to say only about the wetlands. Forget about the site plan. We'll talk about that later. Only about wetlands. So I guess that's the that's what we need to have. Name, address, and three minutes.

>> Hi, my name is Julia Northcut. I'm a property owner at 310 North Berkshire. Jesse, I'm curious the nature of vernal pools. Do they change throughout the year? >> Yes. >> Yes. Y. >> So, as I understand it, it was evaluated in June, which is arguably one of the driest months in the state. >> Um, it was initially evaluated in June. It did have standing water in it at the time. When I was there, I I evaluated ASI's delineation in October. There's no standing water in it at that time. I would be very curious as to your evaluation if you were to visit the site in November, March or April because it is closer to a pond than a pool or mere wetland.

>> Yeah. >> And I am strongly believe that this setback in the future itself would be expanded upon if it was taken into consideration at that time of year. >> Uh you mean the size of it? >> Yes. >> No, I don't think the the size of the wetland would change. So, we don't look at at standing water when we delineate, and I don't want to speak for ASI, but um I'm familiar with their work, and we're all professional wetland scientists. Um we look at soils, we look at hydrology, and we look at vegetation. So, every plant in Michigan has a wetness rating. So, um the wettest species like cattails are given a rating of obligate. The driest species would be considered an upland species. So when we delineate um when I delineate I don't really even look at standing water. I use it as as another measurement but I'm looking at vegetation first. And I ASI most wetland scientists do as well. So the wetland boundary is kind of where the the wetland vegetation stops and the upland vegetation starts. There's always um you know a five foot difference between that roughly. Um, and it can change over time, but from from one year to the next based on rainfall, it's it's not going to change. So even if it has standing water, but it's surrounded by upland vegetation, I wouldn't call that wetland. I wouldn't go by the wet by the water boundary. I'd go more by the vegetation boundary.

>> Okay. And my understanding is further that this is all based on gravel paving, which is to the best of my knowledge a variance that has not yet been approved. What impact do you feel that asphalt paving would have upon the existing plan? >> Can you repeat that? >> My understanding is that all of this is based on a gravel road surface whereas that's yes >> wetland B. >> So how do you feel that would change if it was actually in asphalt?

>> Um I don't know enough about that to answer that. >> What about rainwater studies? You mean I mean my property is one that would be flooding as a result of these changes. So I'm curious as to what studies and actual followthrough have been done as to the impact that this site itself and proposal itself will have on not just these flat lands but my property. >> Um I don't think I can answer it. I don't know. That's three minutes.

>> Thank you for your time. >> Okay. I'm going to just say one thing I forgot to say and it's evident. >> Make your statement. Ask a question for sure. We're going to record those questions and then we will come back and answer them after the discussion. Otherwise, it'll take forever to get through this. So, I um from now on, just make your statement, ask any questions you have and we'll you or somebody will answer them after the the open um public comments. [clears throat] >> I'm sorry.

>> Oh, yeah. We're going to do it right now. >> Will it all be passed out if we can get it >> just like everybody else was noticed uh notified for everything that's going on? Just a rhetorical question. All right. Good evening. My name is Brett Northcut. Uh I live at 310 North Berkshire. Uh Jeff, thank you for your time. Um uh can you quantify how many iterations have been made with the developer so far? >> That will be answered. We'll get that answer right after you finish your comments and questions.

>> Okay. Um can you clarify what is meant by this development is in the best interest of the public which was shared in your slides. Well, I didn't say it was in the best. Again, we're gonna answer those questions. >> Yep. My comment is I don't know how somebody who's potentially not a resident at all would understand how it is in the best interest of people who are living in houses abuting this property in the neighborhood and in the township. So, I believe that part of the uh presentation should be removed. Um, what's really interesting so far with this presentation tonight is I'm hearing that there's been a significant amount of work with the township and the environmental um, uh, consultants. There's been work with Eagle, but there has been absolutely zero work with any residents in the township, with any homeowners who are abuting this property, with any neighbors in this neighborhood. I find it really, really interesting. I asked myself the question, why would somebody who's spending millions of dollars not talk to anybody who's actually going to be impacted by this? And all I can keep coming back to is that they know nobody would want this in a million years. Not in our neighborhood, not in our backyard, and not in our township.

It [snorts] is absurd that we keep hearing about how many people have been worked with except for the people that is going to impact the most. You might say that I'm frustrated, I'm irritated, I'm disappointed. I'm going to save the rest of my comments for the next part of this. Okay. >> I appreciate your time. Thank you. >> Thank you. [applause] >> Good evening. My name is John Kusniaak.

I live at 216 North Birkshshire, a lot of times referred to as the Red House. Uh, I want to shift the conversation away from parcels, permits, site plans for just a minute and back to what actually lives in the wetlands because the wetlands aren't empty space. They're home. The people that rely on them don't get to vote tonight. They don't get to be heard. Every morning there's a buck, big one, cuts through the treeine near the wetlands. Big body, slow steps, doesn't rush unless he's pushed. Watch him every morning. We call him Iron Head. He beds down near the edge of the wetlands, moves at first light, and uses the corridor as his highway.

Same path, same pattern year after year. That's not random. That's habit. There's also a group of turkeys that work the higher ground just off the wetlands. It's big Tom. He's a three-year-old. He's got a 12-in beard, big spurs. I call him Boss Tom. He struts that edge every spring and he owns he walks like he owns the place because in a way he does. Turkeys don't stay where they feel pressured. They move when habitat gets noisy, lit up or disrupted. Lose the quiet, you'll lose the turkeys.

And then there's the ducks. I love the ducks. My kids have named the ducks. We have a pair that returns every season. The residents know them by sight. Call them Fred Nethl. Sometimes they're in DC, too. By the way, when I'm there, they settle into the same pockets of water, the same reads, the same shelters from wind and predators. They come back because it works, because it's stable, because it's protected, because it hasn't been pushed out by human activity yet.

Now, it's this is what's at stake. not an abstract environmental impact, not a study. Real wildlife, real movement patterns, real dependency on exact lands. The deer, they don't get to speak here tonight. The turkeys, they don't file objections. The ducks, they don't get public comment, but they're all part of the project, and I have heard none of that addressed tonight. We are here temporarily. The wetlands are here before us. The wetlands depend on and the wildlife depends on them and they will be here after us. And if protected, they're still here for a long time.

My recommendation, protect the habitat, protect the wetlands, protect the life that's already rooted there. I vote, I pay taxes. My recommendation is vote this down. It's the wrong thing for our community. >> Thank you very much. >> [applause] >> Hi, my name is Robert Mitchell along with my family.

We own Fremont Street. My family has been there 70 years. Nobody's going to be impacted by this worse than me, [snorts] okay? But I support this. I have this this whole area has been my playground for 61 years. Listen, it's time for something to happen down there. It's time. Listen, don't know. Formerly a police officer and fireman.

Nobody keeps the vagrants out of there but me. Nobody gets the trash up from the illegal dumping but me. And I've been doing that for over 40 years myself. My father and my uncle Dan did that for the 30 years before I did it. Okay, listen. This could potentially be the best thing that that happened for this area. Something needs to happen. It's going to be good for the township.

Okay. But I've got two things I want to mention. >> I hope I hope they deal with the with the wetlands. >> Yes. >> Okay. >> Yes. >> Well, wetlands B because I've uh I've been in communication with Mr. uh his architect. um wetlands B if it is not handled properly it will flood um Fremont uh at least a third of it because the ditches come down and you called it a Murphy drain >> the Murphy drain >> that Murphy drain if that is not and I do it I've been doing it for the last 40 years I have to clean that out so it can get to that uh southern uh storm drain so it's not a ditch it's a very important ditch Okay, especially this season, okay?

Because it will flood that third of that street. Okay? And that's the only drain available for that street. Okay? Um

and I'd like to uh submit a letter from my attorney. You guys probably have a copy of it. >> Yeah, >> you do. Okay. >> For the record, >> we do. We have the record. Thank you. >> Okay, great. But uh nobody will be impacted more than me. And I think it's a great idea. Something needs to happen down there.

And I'm going to miss I've been feeding a deer for all my life. >> I have names for him too, but something needs to happen over there. >> Thank you very much. >> Thank you. >> Hi, Greg Tumo 12727 South Brookshshire. Um and I was here last week to talk a little bit and I actually had the pleasure of speaking with Mr. clar Clar earlier today and um I actually spoke with him and I asked permission to explain part of our conversation to the board as I think it is important to reiterate the conversations we're having. Uh he did give me that permission. If anytime I misrepresent anything, please please let me know. Um I was told in no uncertain terms that I was supposed to liazison with the township for any revisions to anything that the township is acting as liaison specifically Miss Bby and Jeff on the wetlands. I was specifically told that the township is who placed it 300 feet south of a previous location to put it right next to John Schaefer's address and um the north cut. So I guess that is a question I'd like to ask you is if you're requiring it to be 300 ft south from a previous location.

>> We'll we'll answer the question. >> Understood. But that's my stated question. >> Okay. >> Um another question I would have is in your wetlands delineation and your explanation which was excellent. Um, if I'm correct on the numbers, G&H are not regulated by Eagle, would only be regulated by the township. And if you're requiring the entire [clears throat] development to move south 300 feet or an entire football field to literally butt by our neighbors, are we choosing a unregulated wetland to uninterrupt in return to erupt the lives of our neighbors on Birkshshire? That's and again I understand you don't have to answer that now but that is my question is through the seven iterations that I was told that cost thousands of dollars at what point did we consider the property on Birkshshire at what point did we consider again I don't know enough about what lands to comment on what's necessary or not I think it's all important right but at some point the livelihood of the residents has to take over for an unregulated wetland that as you said is dry and full of evasive species if If I'm quoting you correct, I didn't see anywhere in there did you address how the neighbors are going to be affected by this development. And most importantly, and if I'm correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Sclar, I was told that you guys told him he had to move it 300 feet south and he would love to move it 300 feet north, which would be 300 feet away from our our property lines. that having instead that being told to me today, me conveying that to members of the township and me being here today, I would ask that you hold this vote because if I'm being told by a by a developer that the wetlands development, the wetlands board is making it so that our property line is eternally affected by a development that could move 300 feet, but for your ascent, I think this should be tabled until that is fully vetted.

>> Thank you. Thank you very much. [applause] Anybody else who'd like to speak? If you would form a line, we can move a little quicker. Uh Chris Northcross, 168 Asterwood, Pontiac, Michigan. Uh I'm just trying to connect the dots. I know there are some assumptions. Uh I think one uh person already alluded to the assumption of gravel, gravel roads, gravel uh pavement. Uh question is as we make these different changes uh what happens to uh the folks that are downstream of that flow?

>> Will we will we uh be seeing some type of uh flooding increased flooding? I think that was already one

question along what used to be First Street. Does that also mean that we see some other problems elsewhere? >> Thank you very much. [applause] >> I was hoping somebody else would ask this question. Um I'm Lyn Wy. I live at 125 North Berkshire. Looking at the diagram, the vernal pond that's there, will it not be totally surrounded by pavement and parking?

>> Yes. And how will that [laughter] that's why I was hoping somebody would ask this question >> directly to the board please. He's our consultant. >> How how the question >> well but he's the >> that's my question I guess. What the lifeline of that vernal pond that's an important water. How is that impacted being totally surrounded by pavement? >> We'll get that. We'll get you the answer. Thank you. >> I hope. >> All right. All right. I don't see anybody else running up. So, I'm going to close the public comment for this again. We'll be talking about more.

You'll have more opportunities questions that were raised. The first gentleman asked. So, you have them. I think you have them >> one at a time and see if we can answer. If not, we'll get back to them with an answer. >> But I'm sure we can get answers right now. >> Oh, yeah. You go ahead.

Okay. So, there was a question about the asphalt versus gravel uh driveway and parking lot. There was a question about rain water and runoff. >> Well, let's do one at a time. One time >> question at a time. >> Yeah. Just go ahead. Start with the first question. the difference between the asphalt versus gravel driveway and parking lot. >> Okay. >> I don't have much to comment on that >> as it as it pertains to the wetlands.

>> Right. I'm I'm not an engineer. Um I I'm tasked with looking at the wetlands. So, um you know, generally gravel is more um pvious than asphalt. So, um, but I I don't know if if they looked at an asphalt versus gravel versus, um, pvious pavements. I I don't know. So, >> and there were various questions about >> they may have.

>> Yeah, we were answering questions. Sure. You were. >> Yeah, absolutely. So, >> the answer. >> Yeah. So, regarding the uh the hydrology of it all, one of the items that we presented was the uh that we're not changing the overall uh drainage area to the wetland, which would have the dictating um calculation for the amount of volume going there. Asphalt versus gravel would really just change our time of concentration and the drainage area is uh so large that the time of concentration would be very minimal minimally impacted as well as most of the rain runoff in that area is going to the bio retention first which will allow it to have a chance to uh infiltrate into the ground before discharging into the wetland itself at a uh a standard release rate. So no, there should not be any changes regarding the material to between uh asphalt and gravel. The uh the gravel really is more for the aesthetic, more natural look that we're going for here as opposed to a you know asphalt field and it's one of the variances we're seeking and we'll get to that.

>> Next one. >> Questions related to rainwater runoff affecting neighboring properties. Well, again, all right, go ahead. But that's not all right. Go ahead. >> Yeah. Uh similar similar answer. We're maintaining the existing drainage patterns on the site to the different wetlands is especially wetland C, which is the uh the wetland of concern here with health. Um so no there should not there will not be any impacts to downstream properties as it was uh determined that wetland C and wetland B the two wetlands that are going to be uh you know the most

impacted with the development here connect directly to the Murphy drain which is a 60-inch drain 20 ft underground >> develop no because he's the one that >> I know he has the answer. No >> I'm actually just the engineer. I'm not the developer. He's got an answer. We want to hear it. If you don't like the answer, >> that's interest.

>> Okay. We'll get more on the drainage runoffs when we talk about the site with the buildings and the parking lot and all that other thing later. We're looking at just the wetlands. >> Absolutely. >> Okay. Next question. >> There was a discussion about one of the wetlands ponds and how that would be impacted by the developments. I believe it was the Vernal wetlands >> wetland sea, >> right? The that was your question I believe.

>> Ma'am, what? >> Yes. Your question about wetland sea and the vernal the vernal feature. >> I believe that it's totally surrounded by the development itself and surrounded by pavement or gravel or whatever. >> What's that lifeline of that >> pond? That's an important pond. Well, I don't know if it'll change too much because as he explained, the drainage the the surrounding drainage of it, which we call a mini watershed, is not changing. The the the um the topography of the site isn't changing too much. So, all the water is being funneled into a bio retention basin prior to being discharged into wetland sea where most of it will infiltrate through the ground system naturally over time.

Well, no, no, no, no more questions. >> Wetlands, >> please. >> Question. Next question from you. >> There are questions about processes on the township side when it came to iterations and reviews with the consultants, developer. >> Go ahead. >> I can speak to this. Um, I've been at the township for 13 years. um and never um the township um does have the right and authority to meet with property owners whether it's a commercial application, whether it's a private property. Frequently, we oftentimes meet with developers prior to making a site plan application. It's called a pre-application meeting. Every time we've ever met with the developer, we've always encouraged that developer or property owner to please meet with the adjacent neighbors.

>> No comments, please. >> I'm sorry that you don't. >> Okay. Okay. >> Sure you do. Um, so I just want to say that there has been um I believe there was two reiterations that we saw and by no means does the did the township say you need to locate the building here. Our response is going to be in regards to what's on site. Um, and the if the applicant was directed to relocate a building based on natural features or wetlands, that's certainly not uncommon.

Um we like to always encourage an applicant to avoid uh natural features impacts in in times that they can. So if the applicant had so chosen to relocate the building to be as to not impact significant wetlands um that those are decisions that are made on behalf of his team and that are then culminated into a site plan application. Once a site plan application is submitted to PL uh building in our planning building ordinance department that is a public record. It's a public information. Um and uh again that's our process. I'm sharing with you what I experienced. Um if you have any other questions I'll be happy to answer them.

>> Okay. Next question. There was a question from an individual from 127 South Burkshshire about um when was the Birkshshire property uh considered when it came to the 300 ft setback if I'm rephrasing. >> Andrea, you

want to answer that one? Um so again as part of the public process in accordance with the Michigan planning enabling act which we are what we do in the planning world is um delegated and we do have responsibilities and obligation to the Michigan zoning enabling act as part of that requirement um prior to having a public hearing which is the purpose of a public hearing is for the board to be able to take public input hear from the applicant and there could very well be reiterations or changes based on public input. That is why the planning process actually exists is that you can have the opportunity to have a public hearing. And in the according to Michigan Zoning Enabling Act, you're required to send proper notification to every property owner within 300 ft from the outermost point of every parcel involved. The townships, um, over the years I've been here, it's always been 500 feet. They go above and beyond that legal requirement. Um, so that is the township's practice. Um, notices were mailed out to every within 500 feet of the subject parcels in accordance with the with state law.

>> Okay. Next, >> next question I have is what about the project is in the best interest of the community? >> Well, that's again relating to the wetlands only, not the lighting or the the site arrangement. just the wetlands. >> Set it on the slide. >> Set it on the slide. That's a fair question. >> Okay. Yeah. If it's the wetlands, it would that's something we look at when we're determining whether or not to recommend approval of it. We we look at to see if the applicant has minimized and avoided wetlands. First and foremost, we look to see if it's in the uh public interest, which this project is. I realize that many, and by the way, I have no opinion whatsoever. I am an individual consultant. I don't live in Bloomfield Township. I'm here to look at the wetland. So, I have no opinion um if this project goes through or not. So, um but in in terms of the the you know, we're not looking for public support necessarily. We're looking is if if this has public interest, and it certainly does. Um >> no, no, it's it's it's not it's it's not really an opinion. It's it's it's not um something similar to a a landmine or a sludge field or a mulch facility, composting facility, something like that. Um this isn't something that that is naturally detrimental to the environment. So they've shown that they've reduced the impacts and minimize the impacts to the greatest extent possible, which we asked them to do. And that's why we nicewander environmental is recommending approval.

>> Whose interest is it in? >> No, no questions. No questions from the audience. >> My time was cut short. >> No, it wasn't. You got you got full three minutes. >> He spoke during most >> I know that was you asked him questions and he answered them and you have to next question, please. >> The last one pertains to addressing animal life protection. >> Okay. Um what what about it? >> Wetlands are home to creatures.

>> They are there. I mean there's there's no doubt there's a lot of wildlife on the property. I I saw the dirt the deer, the turkey. I saw a fox. I saw a coyote scat. Um there's reptiles and amphibians that are on site. Um but again in dealing with the wetlands only they're avoiding all but 0009 acres of wetland on the property. That's what I'm looking at. Okay. Are there any more questions? Okay. I do have I something came up that I wanted to ask. Um and I'm not again only pertaining to wetlands, not the rest of it. Um, with regard to wetlands, I'd like to know if the applicant met with I was said that he that you never met with him at all.

With regard to wetlands, did you meet with any of the homeowners and discuss the wetlands? >> Me? >> I'm asking him, not you. >> I'm I'm just the engineer. I did not meet with any of the res. >> Is anybody here from the from your group that can answer that question? Yes or no? >> Uh, we conducted a neighborhood again, Jeff

Clack, CregerClad Architects, 400 East Lincoln, and Royal Oak. We did conduct a neighborhood meeting. It's in my slide presentation, the exact date. I don't have it handy on me, but we did conduct a neighborhood meeting.

>> No, no. >> Okay. The question was, did you meet with homeowners with regard to the wetlands? >> Again, the neighbors were notified to the township. We received addresses. We then sent out postcards to those neighbors affected by the project. >> We conducted a Zoom call to meet with the residents to discuss this. That is what we did. >> Okay. >> We discussed how we impacted the wetlands, these various things. So yes, it was more about the project holistically versus just a wetland discussion.

>> Okay. Well, that's what we're talking about right now. Okay. So, but you contacted them, but you didn't necessarily say that you actually sat down with the group homeowners association and have a discussion. Is that correct? weeks ago. Please >> let me let him answer the question that I asked. >> Sorry, I I did not disrupt you. One second, please. Uh we had a we discussed the project in general. We introduced the project like we have tonight. We had a slideshow, a presentation where we rolled out what we were doing, how we were impacting the site, and what what we did, what the goals are for the project, what it is, and what we're doing. Simply, that's all it was. An introduction to the project. We fielded questions. We did our best to answer them. There's concerns, but again with the wetlands, we we just simply discussed how our project was going to nestle and work around those in a careful way in conjunction with our wetlands expert and the township.

>> You folks have any other comment about that part of it when it comes to the site plan. Again, you can bring that up again. >> I have one more. Okay. >> Approximately how many residents were on this Zoom call regarding the wetlands park? >> I don't know off hand. Um I don't know if >> more than five >> 15 20 give or take. >> There was 14. >> Okay. >> Well, that's pretty close. Okay. Uh the other question that I had and and maybe Andrea, maybe you can answer this one.

I'm not sure. Um the comment was made that we the township forced the project to be moved south so it wouldn't impact the wetlands. Can you can you elaborate on that? Did we actually tell them to move it or was that a choice that they made? >> It was a decision that was made by the developer based on the wetlands that were on site of based on conversations that were had between environmental engineering services based on their review internally, based on uh NISWander's review of what was on site.

The applicant's intention to relocate that was to avoid impacts to wetlands. That's that's all I can speak of. There was um that's that's what I can speak to. That's what I'm aware of. That's the conversation I had. >> Okay. So, what you're saying is >> But we didn't say no yet. >> But you didn't say move it or you're not we're not even going to consider it. Move it there. You just said it's >> he could have kept it there, but it also would have probably resulted in a lot more wetland. Uh and the other concern was the fact that that was the verial pool which was the most highly sensitive. Um, so I would think it would be the best interest of the township and the board to have the planning staff want developers to consider thoughtfully where they're going to locate a building as to not impact natural features.

>> Um, [snorts] >> but we didn't force them. Okay, got it. Okay, now coming back to the the the we're done with the public comment for this. You'll have another to another opportunity. >> It doesn't matter. >> No, >> public comment is over. >> Next. this question. I didn't ask you a question. >> Ask my question. >> What question was that? >> I asked two questions. One, I just got an answer from Mr. B, which I appreciate. Mr. Clar's here. You don't need his his hired hands. He's here. He didn't answer questions about the phone call he was on. We had a 20minut conversation on that phone call.

Wetlands was not discussed. In fact, my entire neighborhood will confirm that. Mr. Spar will confirm that. Wetlands were not discussed. The first time I heard about my land was at >> 4:10 p.m. >> about >> So that answers my question then. >> Okay. >> Well, but unfortunately you didn't get a proper answer and it's a recorded phone call. So the the Zoom was recorded. Second, and I do think this is important is that I asked very specifically I was told by Mr.clar that our liaison for wetlands was Miss Bivby and Jeff. I need to know if that's correct.

>> Okay. Is that correct? I represent Bloomfield Township in the planning, building, and ordinance department. Just to clarify what my roles and responsibilities and duties are to the residents. I do I follow the zoning code and I work with developers on projects that they're considering developing. I have a I have a uh legal responsibility. Property owners have the legal right to pursue development on their private property. Okay. My role then as the planner is to look at our ordinance that we have on the books. I don't rewrite the ordinances. I look at the ordinances that we have on book and then I will present to the planning commission and the public how it does or does not comply with our ordinances.

That is my role and responsibility. If that makes me the liaison, I guess, but I'm not the end all beall. I am a cog in the wheel. Um, but no, I wouldn't say that I'm a liaison to foster or develop this project. I work with internal staff of the township. I work with um our consultants to culminate their reviews, have their reviews come in, and then we respond to those reviews in a manner that does or does not comply with our ordinances, and then we present it to you and how it does or does not comply. I think there's a I'm trying to make a very clear expectation of what my role is because this is not emotional for me either. I do not have any uh skin in the game, if you will. I am here to operate on behalf of the township to present you what has been presented to my department.

>> But you're the contact then you maybe and you Jeff, you're the contact from the public or the or the the developer. You're the contact at the township for the people to to that someone can talk to and and contact >> 100%. >> Okay. So, Leon% when it contact >> correct 100%. I I am the person that if you have a question about a land use development coming to the township, you contact our department. That is absolutely correct.

>> That's not my question. I just want to be clear. >> Well, Mr. Chairperson, it's very important. I was told at 4:10 p.m. that all of this done and that I'm supposed to contact these two people to, and I quote, get me the right to move my property back 300 feet north because I was told they had to move it by our property line because of the wetlands. Again, Zack, >> well, I just asked her that and she said you weren't required to that. Am >> I missing you?

>> Okay, you know what? >> This is I'm cutting it off right now. I'm cutting off. We're coming back to the commission. Anybody here have any comments? >> No. anything? I don't I've asked my questions. I got what I need. All right. So, what's your pleasure? What do you want to do? >> Well, our choices are to we have three choices. >> We we can say it's we don't want to continue it. We can say we want to we want to approve it and send it up to the board of trustees or if we want to we can table it and we can so we can either get in more information or um pursue other avenues or whatever. Those are our three choices.

>> So I mean we're dealing with just the wetland. >> Just the wetlands have nothing to do with the project. Just that one little piece. >> Okay. Yes. Just the wetlands. >> The wetland need to make that very clear. >> Sorry. Was it >> I think it's important to make that very clear that we're we're uh contemplating the impact on the wetlands on this property and you know according to our township you know consultant it's been minimized the wetland impact has been minimized >> just the wetlands >> just the wetland >> right nothing to do with the rest of that [clears throat] >> right >> okay so that got a motion >> no I would do >> I agree with you I think the uh it's it's minimal impact on the wetlands and on that property and looking at the wetlands itself as far as the what's presented to us. Um I I would recommend that we give approval for the permit just for the wetlands which is separate from the site plan uh based on the uh um based on the considerations that have been presented >> supported. Moved supported. Any comment on that motion?

>> All right, I'll call for vote. All those in favor say I. >> I. Any opposed? >> All right. So just that portion of it, just that wetlands portion, we we approve going to the board of trustees to get a permit for that. Okay. Next item on the agenda is um a text amendment to the zoning ordinance for banquet halls. Oh, what >> the wetland? >> Oh yeah, I closed the wetland. Yeah, wetlands is closed, >> right? I'll just close that portion and now we'll move on. Now we'll open up Excuse me. Sorry about that. We'll open up the um planning commission meeting and again sorry we got to go back to the meeting again. We have a we have a forum and we have minutes from the last meeting. Any any object any any comments? I I there's one that I had um Andrea's name was not on me.

>> They need to reflect uh my name on >> right we have okay >> as an absent. Okay very good. Uh so any any other >> with that addition correction I make a motion that we approve. Second. >> Moved and seconded. All those in favor? I. Any opposed? Okay. Um, now here we go again with public comment. Now we're talking about public comment >> on the on only on the amend the text amendment to the zoning or No, excuse me.

>> Sorry. I'm sorry. Now it's public comment in the planning commission for anything other than what's on the agenda. My mistake. I apologize. So, if you have something that's not on the agenda you want to talk about that deals with planning, that's >> you can you can come up. >> All right. I'm sorry. >> I'm waiting for >> for the the other Yeah. Okay. Well, then we're going to have the present. Okay. Other than what's on the agenda.

>> Okay. >> Okay. Go ahead. >> Uh my name is Charles Renfro. I live at 243 Crestwood and Pontiac. And I was curious as how close is that proposed project to Pontiac Line? I know there's a street called Asterwood that's undeveloped and my property butts up against that. >> Okay. Well, we'll answer that question when we get to the site plan and all that. Again, if it's I want to hear any public comments for something that's not on the agenda.

>> All right. I don't see anybody coming to the podium, so we'll move on. The first item then on our agenda is a text amendment to the zoning ordinance for banquet halls in the research park and B3 zoning uh districts. Andrea. >> Hi, good evening. Um I am here to uh present to the planning commission a proposal for a uh text amendment to our current research park district. Um highlighted on your screen here, you can see where our research park district is located. Um it is north of Square Lake Road. um and it is highlighted in that shade of purple um which is blown up there to your left hand side. So anytime we look at um a uh a text amendment um to our ordinance, we want to look at um what provisions uh we currently we we take look at our current ordinance as well as um take a a consideration of what the potential impact would be for a text amendment to the zoning ordinance. Um, interesting enough, um, within our zoning ordinance, we actually have, um, criteria under 42-4.29 as it relates to banquet halls. However, within our zoning ordinance itself, the only, uh, zoning classification, if you will, in which a banquet hall is noted to be permitted as a special land use is actually within our B4 classification.

Uh, B4 is a zoning classification that essentially covers all of Telegraph Road. It doesn't identify particular parcels. It just um it indicates that along the Telegraph Road corridor would be a suitable location for that type of use. Um other than that, there's no other zoning districts that um have banquet halls specifically called out as a use. Um so what we did um when this uh was first um brought to um our attention is we reached out to uh Geles Webster who is our planning consultant um and they are they took a look at our zoning ordinance and one thing that we're going to look at when we look at any text amendment or zoning amendment is what is the current use of that district currently. And by introducing this new use, in this instance, the suggested new use under the special land use category on the right hand side would be um a banquet facility. Um looking at the current uses that are already proposed and these have been within our zoning ordinance again as long as you know for for many many years of these uses. So these are not newly introduced uses allowed in research park. um they may not be have come into fruition or maybe there's not a development under these uses, but just pointing out that currently on your screen is the way that our research park district reads. So within the research park district under special land use classification and just so um the the uh the members of the public and the board understands the difference between the left hand side which is permitted by right um there is the right-hand category which is a special land use. special land uses require um are uses that have like a higher level of review um and are um categorized um to be a little bit more sensitive if you will to the adjoining neighbors. So that's why we would we would recommend that if the board were to consider adopting banquet halls as a use within research park that it would be under that category of a special land use. That gives the board um the ability to add on uh specific conditions related to that use. Um so just pointing out that the current uses already within the special land use. So again, these may not currently occur, but these are uses that would be permitted if a property became available. Um, if a developer was interested and owned a property and wanted to develop, they would be able to consider a number one, it's a restaurant. Um, a restaurant or other places serving food or beverage, except those having the character of an open front or drive-in and which would be kind of like a um uh a what's the drive-thru? uh Sonic, that's what we would consider an open-ended restaurant.

So already within the special land use category, the research park would allow for a restaurant. I think we're all familiar with what a restaurant is. Oftentimes, um we you know, we have them throughout the township. I think we all know what a what a restaurant is. Um a new car uh sales agency, um a fully enclosed industrial operation, um a medical office, therapy or health facility. And the the next one is really the one that um in the

recommendation for or the the review by Gifles Webster, which everybody has a copy within their packet, um has the closest relation to the use of a banquet hall in the sense where it says under a special land use within research park, it would be recreational uses including but not limited to sports facilities, clubs, recreational and community center buildings and dance and exercise studios. So those are so the our in our research and in looking at the existing uses permitted um in our in GFS Webster professional opinion they feel that a banquet hall in terms of use impact possible hours of operation things like that would be similar to some of the uses that are again this is a special land use in which the reason there are special land use is because there'll be careful consideration and possibly conditions that could be placed on this by the township board and planning commission. Okay. Um so those are uses that are currently permitted and um my in our review um research park as I stated currently in that area we do have it actually has become um uh quite a um um there's lots of uses up there that are not your 9 to 5 office uses. Um very recently there was an indoor uh pickle ball facility that was approved. Um there was there's also the Detroit Skate Club um and the Bloomfield Tennis. Those are sports facilities that occur. Um and we also have um there's other dance halls. Uh there's a dog daycare in that area. And so we do have a uh a group of uses um that currently exists within the research park district. Um we also do do um have the B3 general business um classification which the consideration or mentioned um in the GLS Webster memo would be that whether or not the planning commission was so inclined to also consider um that a banquet hall would be appropriate within the B3. Um but most of the discussion as you know up until now has been the impact of that research park district specifically.

Um, so with that, I just want to um state again that any application that we would receive for banquet hall would still um have to adhere to the criteria that is listed currently within our ordinance. This is not new language. Um, and in re in regards to uh banquet halls particularly, um there is a list of criteria that um would be and is considered as part of the special land use review. Um and and with that, I'm happy to answer any questions. I know that was a rather um quick overview. Um but I'm more than happy to answer any questions that you may have and hear from the public.

>> From the commission now. >> Any questions from the commission? >> Correct. >> Anybody have anything? >> Just an opinion. >> Um I would be willing to support a text amendment because I actually have some properties. I'm not involved in this property that was subject to the discussion of the wetlands, but I do have property in the research park. I know the many uses that are there and I think it would be a good idea to have to have a to adopt this text amendment to allow the banquet use. At this point in time, I probably wouldn't support having that use in the B3. Maybe maybe after we see how it works in research park district, we might want to consider the B3 later. That's just my opinion. The other thing is um I don't want to look at one single proposal that we're going to look at maybe after this one. Sure.

>> I want to think about the uh the designation in general. and I have been paying attention and and there and there's some new entities not in our community obviously because we don't have the uh ability yet where they have banquet halls but they're of a smaller scale and I I think and this is again my opinion I don't know if my other uh planning commission members agree or not but I think you know successful in cooking in their basement decided I I don't think that's in the best interest of the township. I agree and I I I thank you for that because you're absolutely right. Anytime you're looking at a zoning ordinance amendment, you're looking and should be thinking about the potential impact to that entire district. Um and I guess if I guess I will be curious to

hear from the other board members regarding size.

>> Okay. But that's my opinion. >> I have I have a question. Um >> why do you think >> according to this is one of the one of the special land use one of the permitted uses of course it's under special land use it needs a special land use permit um restaurants now that there they are that would mean that they would have to abide by all the other requirements of a restaurant hours of operation permits for outdoor dining um any anything that other restaurants so if someone wanted to do this they'd have to adhere to all those other things. Is that correct?

>> Correct. Our ordinance still has requirements in place that each site plan has to adhere to a variety of site standards. >> Okay. So the So then it looks to me I'm asking going to ask it looks to me like whatever would be done unless I'm missing something. Whatever would be done at a banquet facility the function not the name the function whatever is done is already listed in here as a permitted use under special land use. In other words, there's got to be get permits every for every it's not by right. They have to get permits for it.

>> Well, every single >> dining, music, >> every single applic every single list of use here would require a public hearing before the planning commission and ultimately the township board. That's the way the township's ordinance is created. >> Anything done at a banquet hall not fall into one of these categories? >> I don't know. If you're asking me my professional opinion based on the land use that's being proposed, I would say that it falls in line with some of the existing uses and the the hours and impacts would be could be similar to a community center building or things like that. So I do think that there is a nexus between the existing language and the proposed use.

>> Okay. Okay. So, what we're just saying is you want to just add a word to a word to govern what a banquet hall is, but it's already in here without having a name for it. >> But yeah, of course that is categorically incorrect. >> No, I object to the fact that you're trying to do that. >> Okay. I'm going to ask say one more time. I have a a police officer back here. If you disrupt the meeting, I'm going to ask him to ask you to leave.

You have an opportunity to say what you want under comments. I have asked a question. I'd like to get an answer. That's all. >> Okay. >> I'm sorry. >> That's okay. >> Um, so I You're asking me if the actual use and function of a restaurant could be similar to that of a banquet hall. I would I would say yes. However, we all know that a banquet hall facility at the end of the day could potentially have different uses times. They may have um a singular people arriving at the same time leaving. So there's probably some some differences. Yes. In all fairness, which is why we're asking to have this amended appropriately and be called what it is, which is a banquet hall.

>> That's what I wanted to get the answer to. Thank you. >> Anybody else? Okay. Then let's now we're going to open up again to public comment on the language of this. Again, name and address, three minutes. Um, questions will be answered after we finish just like we did before. >> Have them speak to the board >> and and speak to us. >> Speak to the board. >> Speak to us, not the audience. Speak to us.

>> What? >> Oh, Tom. >> Tom. Turn the timer. >> Okay, hold on one second. I want to get that timer up. Mr. Chair. >> Okay, there we go. Thank you. Okay, thank you. Please. >> Good evening. My name is Jonathan

Martone. I'm an attorney at law and I stand here representing Brett and Julia Northcut who are owners and residents on Burkshshire Drive. Uh for purposes of the public record, I'm going to adopt and incorporate the correspondences written by my colleague Stefan Bagy that were tendered to the commission and should be reviewed including the discussion regarding some of the procedural concerns regarding the notice and the manner in which these are going forward. Uh I intend to address predominantly the issue with respect to proposed text amendment. to respond to a point raised by member ATO. Uh I do agree that these types of decisions should be bifurcated that this text amendment really is the genesis is because of a specific use instance and that the decision of the township uh should review this in a vacuum. whether or not it should even permit this sort of amendment to its zoning, not with respect to whether it would make sense and whether this change to the zoning would then allow this special use permit to then occur. This proposal though is in congruous with the master plan. Uh the township has and in considering this proposal, it has largely disregarded and distorted the master plan. If you look at the master plan, it it puts a premier emphasis on the residential component and nature of Bloomfield Township. In fact, in the preamble, it talks about uh that the desire of the master plan is to be a premier residential community and it closes uh that uh that it is to be a desirable community in which to live.

Placing a banquet hall or permitting for banquet halls of this nature to be placed 80 ft from the residential uh rear line rear line of these homes is anything but consistent with preserving a community in which it's desirable and and proper to live in. This the the research tech park intended use is for community research technical office service training uses and related facilities. Now while there may be some contemplated other uses that's the pred predominant intent. If you want to amend the master plan to describe different uses that's what the proper process should be. It shouldn't be to amend the zoning ordinance in this this manner.

Restaurants in the contemplated uses are auxiliary and would support those office uses. It is not a banquet hall that contemplates serving up to a thousand people. And I will address this when it comes to the special use, but the thousand people exiting at 1:00 a.m. in the morning, a thousand people that have attended a venue uh that largely and very well might have an open bar that are intoxicated, that are making noise. None of the sound mitigation, light mitigation, or even safety concerns or or processes that are addressed in the application would adequately and guarantee that this wouldn't have an adverse impact on the residents in uh in that area. The GIS Webster report speaks in conclusory statements. It doesn't actually do the analysis. It states there's no adverse impact on the value of the homes. It doesn't show that. And I think it's a far stretch to imagine that a venue of this size and magnitude this close to residences wouldn't have some adverse impact on the property values. Thank you.

>> Thank you very much. >> Good evening again. Brett Northcut 310 North Berkshire. If you haven't guessed, I'm strongly opposed to the proposed development of 350 Fremont. I'm strongly opposed to any and all variances of the proposed development of 350 Fremont Street. I'm strongly opposed to any text changes to the zoning ordinance to allow for banquet halls and RP zoning. Again, earlier I mentioned I'm frustrated, we're irritated, I'm disappointed. Um, those are adjectives and nouns that I could use to describe this development, but let's hear from the developer himself. Specific verbiage recently in cranes. It's an event venue in the woods, not a banquet hall in the woods.

Our Detroit 650 seats available. Space for 1,000 strolling guests. Oakland County's premier largescale event space. Didn't say larges scale banquet hall. We'll have two floors including a sunken amphitheater and indooroutdoor transitional space. Yet to see any indooroutdoor transitional space in any banquet hall I've been to. In D business on the website, 30,000 square foot venue large enough to host notable events. a jewel box for Bloomfield Township with reach far beyond its borders. I think from what you've seen tonight, it definitely is going to reach beyond its borders. It's going to reach every single neighbor, homeowner, and resident within probably 3/4 of a mile. I don't think though that's what uh they meant by this, but that's actually what's going to happen. There isn't much in our backyards to accommodate 600 to 700 people for a sit-down dinner outside of a hotel ballroom. Yeah, you're freaking right. But you know what's going to happen? 600, 700 people are actually gonna be in my backyard, Julia's backyard, Kim and John's backyard. That is not what Bloomfield Township stands for.

In the January 7th design meeting, uh Mr. stated the amphitheater is going to be sick. And I agree. But for me, sick stands for fact that it is going to be a significant safety risk. Not just to my four kids in my house that are less than a 100 yards from a thousand drunk people, but for the entire neighborhood. How on earth do we expect anybody at this event center to corral a thousand people in the dark on 31 acres? It's absurd to assume that that will ever be able to happen.

um I it's going to um negatively impact our home value and there's zero analysis been done to refute that. Simply a statement saying no home values will be impacted. Would you like to put this behind your \$ 1.52 million home? Probably not. But beyond all this, it is extremely frustrating how quickly this is all moving. We found out just over three weeks ago. Again, as I said earlier, nobody has reached out. Nobody's trying to work with us. This needs to stop today.

>> Thank you. >> Hi, my name is Mike Vanhoff at 3:30 North Birkshshire. So, I would be very close to this uh proposed event space. And speaking specifically about the zoning proposal that's uh on the table now, um I would ask that the township uh must consider first of course the master plan and it's listed right in our vision statement that Bloomfield is a premier residential community and I definitely feel that this would negatively impact our specific community and it would fall far below what I would consider premier.

Um, adding a banquet hall is not appropriate for a research park zoning district and I'll explain why. Um, it is a significant part departure from the from what my experience is with a research park. I my back of my lot backs up to the research park uh in a different area but but close by where you're talking about. Um, and they've been great great neighbors. Um, no problems. They're busy. you know, the activity is Monday through Friday from maybe 8:00 a.m. until 6:00 p.m. and then nothing on the weekends, nothing uh in the evenings. And and the proposal that we're talking about here today is essentially the complete opposite in the activity level of what that is. So that is a clear differentiation for what would be typically a research park. We bought our property knowing it was a research park and it should stay a research park.

Um the what has been discussed as far as the negative impact on the home values I would ask as a clear question where is the evidence that it will have no impact. Okay, we need a study of some sort. Nothing has been

provided except for maybe a one-s sentence statement in the uh proposal from the planning commission. That's not enough. That's not appropriate even for you guys to make a decision. That's not appropriate. Um so at um at a minimum also what I would ask is that the definition of banquet hall is [snorts] set up for other re or other zoning districts. So we really need to look at tailoring any language you may consider for adding the research park in in order to accommodate what is being discussed here today. You know, I know that it's been discussed about, oh, there could be restaurants. There could be this that. We're not talking about restaurants. We're talking about this proposal. This proposal is directly adjacent to our neighborhood. That has to be the focus according to the master plan. Also referenced about, you know, the skating venue and the tennis clubs and other pickle ball, this and that.

That's not next to our neighborhood. That you have to consider this proposal only because you're adding it specifically for this development proposal. Thank you. >> Thank you very much >> again. Greg Utuma 127. Again, I I want to respect all quorum, but Mr. Ado, how do you take the position that you own property in IP and that you're in support of this because it might benefit you later. I honestly I'm I'm befuddled that you said that. And then Mr.

Schultz, like how do you Banquet Hall is defined in the zoning ordinance. You don't need Miss Bby on the record to tell you it's like a restaurant. It's like you guys are spot zoning this. And Mr. Ado, you literally said, "I want to make them bigger. I don't know what size he wants, but I'm sure it's with what I'm thinking." I mean, this is like this is getting outrageous. I've never seen anything like this before. Your banquet hall is defined in the orders. Mr. Ado, you said we can't have small banquet halls because they're not currently allowed. They are just on Telegraph Road where there's no homes. You said in your opening question that we don't allow banquet halls, but you do, right, Miss Bby on Telegraph Road in the curtain zoning ordinance. You just don't allow it in our backyards right now. And you're saying you own IP and you want to encourage this development because it might be better for you later. And you know, banquet hall is defined. You know what a banquet hall is. I can read it to you out of your own zoning ordinance.

It's not a restaurant. It's a use which provides rental space for such functions but not limited to wedding parties, conferences, service club meetings and other similar gatherings along with the catering of food services off premise for the purpose of this chapter be beer, wine, and spirit shall also be permitted. You tell me one expert that says that's the same as a pickle ball court. This is insanity what I'm hearing. I didn't even come here that upset, but this is making me upset.

You're telling me a basketball venue, a pickle ball venue is the same as a thousand person venue in our backyard, drinking alcohol, dancing, getting married in the woods, right, Mr. Sclar? It's what you told me. There's going to be outdoor weddings, but just not the music. That'll be inside. But the weddings, that's outdoors. And the strolling, that's outdoors. I guess I don't even know. Like, I don't even know what to respond to anymore. I'm hearing we need a spot zone a certain size that fits his. We don't currently allow it, but we do allow it on Telegraph where there's no homes. But I want to allow it on Franklin Road so that it can affect all these neighbors.

But I want to make sure the size requirement I'm asking for fits his fits his proposal. Right? I didn't misrepresent what you guys just said. I'm in shock. We're in shock. And then you get mad at us when we get upset. These are our homes. Our we built our families here. You go home to your home without a banquet hall in the backyard. He goes to Birmingham without a banquet hall in his backyard. But we, if you guys do this, go home to a banquet hall, not a pickle ball court, not a basketball court, drinking Thursday, Friday, Saturday, Sunday till midnight, 2 a.m. drunks, just running around because that's what bank halls do. You've been to a bank, you've been to a wedding, you've been to an open bar, and and your expert is comparing it to a pickle ball court. This is insanity.

>> [applause] [applause] >> Tough act to follow. Again, my [clears throat] name is John Schaefer. I live at 300 North Berkshire. My property is the one they reference 80 ft from the building. Right. So, I'm going to take a little different tact here. I want to talk about special plan uses for a research park as opposed to the zone B3 general business classification.

So when I look at the special land uses available for research park, you know, you've got your restaurants, your car agency, your sports shoes, accessories. There's a couple words that are missing from every single one of those that is in several of the special land uses of the B3 classification. And that word is alcohol. Nowhere in the research park, special land use, special land uses mentions anything about alcohol.

You want to put a restaurant in there without alcohol, I don't think it's going to be anywhere near as big of a problem. If you look at the special land uses in the B3, you have several places that restaurants possessing class C and/or tavern licenses, cinemas with class C and tavern licenses. And what I'm saying to you is by the omission of that in the research park that it should not be allowed. You can't just add that in. The reason that there's no alcohol in the research park is because it stays quieter because this is a bedroom community. Because this is right next to us. The pickle ball court you guys are talking about, I know where it is.

It's silent. It's all interior. If they stay open to midnight, I don't care. This is going to be 80 ft from my property. A thousand people three week three weekend day. I'm sorry, so nervous. Spring to fall every weekend. Alcohol, people roaming around. We talked about having a line of trees between me and that. That's not enough. 80 feet is not enough.

the purpose of the special land uses and the reason that alcohol isn't in it for research park. There's a reason and it's to keep things quiet for the neighbors. Thank you. >> Thank you very much. [applause] >> Hi, my name is Kim Schaefer. I'm John's wife. I live at 300 North Berkshire. I'm not nearly as eloquent as any of them, but um I came to the last meeting. Um I met with Zach. He met with us like two weeks after uh like a week after that meeting. [snorts] The residents of Fremont Street were contacted six months ago, which I appreciate. I would have liked the same.

I would have feel a little more we'd have more information. We had very little time to react or it just felt like it was going behind our back. Um I liked him. I frequent his restaurants. I no problem with that. My problem, which I would disagree completely with Mr. Ael, the just the giant enormous size of it. It's 80 ft from my

property. I understand equally. I have friends who are developers. It's your private property. You should be able to develop it. But I don't need people trying to what? Pee on my garage. I I don't like people are going to have alcohol. We've all been to giant weddings and I completely agree. I I think the size and the scale of it is the troublesome thing to to me being 80 feet from it and a line of trees isn't enough. And I appreciate that you get to develop your property. I But I feel like you guys just like the first meeting I watched with you. Your minds are made up. I don't I I don't feel like you're hearing us. I don't feel like we're respected. I watched pick people get buriences for pickle ball courts, people having to move their their generators because of sound, but this is okay. I I know I'm emotional and I I I just think the size and the scale of it or at least something to block people from wandering into our neighborhood. I and I equally I I that's all I've got to say. I guess I've I've spoke here before and you know how I feel and thank you for your time. Thank you.

[applause] >> Good evening. Kelly Forester, 179 North Birkshshire, representing my parents, Adam and Nancy Forester, who could not be here for medical reasons tonight. They've been residents of the neighborhood since 1977. It's a nice, quiet, safe neighborhood. Was a beautiful place to grow up. We now have an extended um neighbor neighborhood with many many young children, young families who've invested a lot. And under your banquet halls, the number one thing such uses are subject to the following. Compatibility with adjacent existing proposed residential properties shall be a primary concern.

That should be your primary concern. Speak to us please. >> That should be the primary concern. Well, this is the person who's in charge of planning too. So that you need to take that into consideration. This is safety issue. Small children in the neighborhood. This banquet hall is supposed to be operating seven days a week from 8:00 a.m. to midnight or beyond serving alcohol. This is a big big factor to think about in a neighborhood like ours that people have invested so much in, so much time and money in to live.

So, my parents wanted to make sure they're on record. Thank you. >> Thank you. >> Good evening. My name is Elizabeth Brower. I live in 213 Nor Road. Um, I moved to Bloomfield with my family around eight, nine years ago. We have two little children that they're live there happily. They actually hang out with some of the children's are neighbors there. They go alone back and forth and we feel so relaxed because it's a very quiet neighborhood, very safe. Our concern is what is going to happen? how we're gonna I'm personally will not feel safe with my kids going around in their bicycles walking around as you mentioned when there is people drinking and this banquet which by the way I'm uh I have a [clears throat] question because um I would like to the board to clarify is this a banquet called banquet center hall but it also will have an amphitheater being constructed on that property rather than a so But then it will be an outdoor music entertainment place on top of that. So not only a banquet also an entertainment. So how will you feel if you will live there where you invested?

We you invested your time. We pay taxes. We put money on these houses. We as we heard we turn this neighborhood into a big neighborhood. They start and everyone is concerned. Yeah. property revalue that's a big one but the biggest one is safety and drunk people going around so what there's going to go what is going to happen how we going to ensure that that is not going to happen right so I totally opposed to this development and I I will not support this thank you >> thank you >> [applause] >> John Kusniaak 216 North Birkshshire. I got to echo what Greg said. I was appalled earlier on we talked wetlands.

You guys all had your opinions made up. You didn't talk about one thing that any resident said anything about. You voted the way you were going to vote before any of us got up here. And Mr. Otto, I mean really, you have a vested interest. You should recuse yourself right now. I will give you the opportunity to recuse yourself from this vote. you won't do it. Banquet holes are wrong for this spot. And by the way, I my property connects directly to the development. Not one person in the developer ever came and talked to me. Not one. And I and I attached directly to the property. They had a Zoom call at noon on a weekday.

Are you kidding me? You guys have it in the evening so that we can attend. We have jobs. Noon on a weekday. And you call that connecting with the community. Unbelievable. And it's been said more times than not. Uh banquet halls are about noise, alcohol, late hours, traffic, lighting. These guys better be plan to come to my house many times because I'll call it in every single time because apparently zoning doesn't matter anymore. I'm going to put two giant speakers out the back of my house blurring the most violent music in the world and don't come talking to me about zoning because it doesn't matter.

If you have enough money in this in this community, you're a developer with millions of dollars, you can have whatever you want. You'll change the zoning for them because they've already bought and paid for it. It's unbelievable. You know, we're told to wait for the study. I'd love to see the study. I've never gotten to see the study. M1 Concourse did a study. I had my own study. Did I get to see theirs? No, I didn't. They wouldn't put it on the table. I'm intelligent enough to read a study. I have one from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Sensible city planning, 5,000 pages. It says this is a bad idea. I'll show it to them. I'll show it to you as soon as they put theirs on the table. Now, here's the thing. We got burned once with M1 Concourse. Glad to see the people from Pontiac here, right? Because we weren't invited. M1 Concourse. Bloomfield doesn't care. I I God bless them. I call these guys. They come out. They don't care because it's coming from Pontiac. Pontiac doesn't care because I'm not a citizen of Pontiac. And the local county sheriff, they direct their damn traffic. They get paid to do it.

They're bought and paid for. Are we upset? Yes, we are. Very upset. every single one of us. And this has got to stop here. I'll end this way. I pay taxes. I vote. Honor your zoning. You already have it there. Honor your zoning. Protect the residents that are already there. Do your job. Vote no. [applause] Hi, I'm Ellen Reed. I live at 255 North Birkshire Road. I bought my home 15 years ago. I have renovated on my own.

I'm a single person. I'm raising my seven-year-old granddaughter on my own. Now, I bring that up primarily because she is in the school district at Wei. She is connected not only with the other kids in the neighborhood, but every adult here knows who she is. Okay? And the point is, you're putting all this emphasis on what's going on the other side of the street or behind us. I look right out my front windows. I'm the postmodern ranch there. I see in clear daylight exactly what's going to go in front of me, not behind me. And even though that would make a difference as well, but in front of me. So, and I'm just across the street through the woods. I don't even have a house across the street from me.

And the first notice I received was this postcard. This postcard, which everybody should have received a few

weeks ago, followed up by a new meeting coming soon. I know you guys have seen this. If you read the front and the back of it and you look at the pictures in the plan, the first thing you think about is coming soon when I didn't know anything about this. blindsided completely by the board, by the township.

Where are the notices that we were supposed to receive? I have not gotten a notice prior to this and I've been there 15 years. >> What's your address? >> 255. >> I totally support every neighbor that has stood up here. Every person that has stood up here. I have not been to all the meetings because PRA, you know, I I have a seven-year-old I'm watching right now and raising. I can't be here. But I do want you to know that this is architecturally beautiful.

I don't I work at a company, Flur Detroit. You probably know much about us or right down the street. I am very familiar with big events. I'm very familiar with the cost of them and what it brings to the table and what it puts in my boss's pocketbook. I get where you're going with it. I don't get that you don't talk to us, that you don't communicate and you have people up here, oh, state what you want to say, turn it all off, we'll answer you in a minute. Totally lose the continuity of the question and the answer or that they even go together.

Totally controlling every aspect of the meeting. I don't appreciate that as a resident. If you volunteered for your position, great. Thanks. Okay. If you're getting paid for whatever position in the township, great. However, you are still obligated to us as residents. I have renovated my house, put a lot of money into it. I keep my property up and I expect a return and not a diminished return, a solid return on my property.

And will it come up? >> We're at three minutes. Thank you. [applause] >> Hello. [clears throat] Hello. Good evening. Um, thank you for the time. My name is Philip Kofka. I'm speaking in three capacities. One is a resident of Bloomfield Township. Um, I'm not a neighbor of the property. I want to state that. I don't have as much skin in the game there, but I am a resident of the township. Um, I'm a developer in the city of Detroit and I've been fortunate enough to develop quite a bit of land there. Uh, that has had had resistance at first, but everybody's been thankful that it happened. And, um, sorry, >> your address for the record.

>> Oh, 5530 Shadow Lane. And I'm also a professor of architecture. When I first saw the press about this project, I was excited about the pro about the product. And I know that we drive around our world and we're often underwhelmed. Um, and this is a good example of why. It's so hard to get good work done. I'm here today not in adamant uh favor of the project and not against the project. I'm here to try to push our community to allow for good work to happen. We have some good ingredients here. We have a developer that seems to have amazing taste and has been connected to community for a long time. I'm speaking as a developer here. I know what can happen when you push back against good projects. You get worse projects. And yes, it might not happen tomorrow or the day after, but it can happen in two or three years from now. Right now, I think the township I I don't know exactly legally what what can be done in terms of a negotiation, but it seems like we have the ingredients for a great project. And inevitably, when there is a reward, there's always going to be risk.

And I and I totally resonate with the risk that the neighbors of this property have. But I'd like to push everybody to kind of think we have I I'm very familiar with the architect Isaac Mihan and the landscape landscape architect

Landform. These are worldclass designers and architects and it would be a shame for us to miss the opportunity to try to make a project where everybody can win because I know as a developer that actually can happen if conversations happen. Um but we have the ingredients for a great project here and I'd like to push the township and the community I understand and the developer. I understand all your interests and all your concerns to try to make something great happen because I'm tired of seeing a world that is boring, unattractive, and continues to be uninspiring. I think this project has the potential to be great. I understand the risks and I'd like to push everybody, our community, our township, and our developer here to try to make this work because I think there's a reward and inevitably there is a risk and we should try to mitigate that as much as possible. Thank you very much.

>> Thank you. Hello, my name is Lesie Kais. I live at 2208 Somerset Road, Bloomfield Township. I'm here on behalf of my mother. She lives at 135 Bloomfield Boulevard, Bloomfield Township, and her property is 340 Fremont, right adjacent to this development. And I want you to know for the record, she was never ever contacted once. The first time we ever heard about this project was in the Detroit Free Press on January 25th, 2026. And so I for the record just want to say that we're very disappointed that no one ever contacted us. Now after the article came out, we all of a sudden got letters about this public hearing. But the actual free press article is the first time we ever heard about this and her property is right next to this development. We we have concerns. Even though the property is vacant, it's still been in our family for a couple generations and we want to make sure that it's not negatively impacted in terms of flooding. We notice on the site plan that there's a retention pond, a large one, right next to her property and so we have concerns about that. I did send a certified letter because I, as you can tell by my nervousness, I do not like public speaking. But we did put this in the record. We sent it by email and by certified mail. So hopefully in the future there will be more communication.

>> They have a copy of this letter and they should. >> Yes. >> I'll share it with them. >> Yes. >> I think we have >> make sure. >> Yeah. I just want to make sure. >> Make sure. >> Okay. So, thank you. [applause] >> Thank you very much. Sorry. >> Can we please restart the clock?

>> Thank you. Uh, as I stated before, my name is Julia Northcut. I am a property owner at 310 North Berkshire. Um, I'm not going to address the proposal right now. I'm going to specific to the zoning singularly. Uh, there seem to be a lot of debates and connections being made as to what a banquet hall is most similar to. Is it similar to the current allowed special use categories? Is it not? The good news is we don't need to ask that question. It is answered by the Michigan Building Code, which classifies banquet halls in Assembly Group A2.

What else is in Assembly Group A2? Restaurants with liquor licenses, bars, nightclubs, taverns, and casinos. All of which are currently prohibited in research park zoning. Furthermore, I've done an exhaustive search on municipal code in the state of Michigan. There is not a single municipality with a comparable research park zoning that currently allows banquet halls either as a land right or special use permission. It is simply not done. And the fact that this council is trying to allow that as a loophole and as way out of a reasonzoning process completely mitigates and annihilates the purpose of zoning. We did our diligence when we bought our property. We knew what we were building next to. We understood what it was allowed and what was not. We knew that we could live with that. As another of my neighbors said, we currently back to a research park.

They're fantastic neighbors. We don't see, hear, nothing. They create less disturbance than our actual neighbors do. No problems. And it is my children, four children that I am raising that I'm not going to be able to let play in our backyard anymore with a thousand drug people running around on our property line. It is unconscionable that this is even a question that is being put or considered before the township and I uncatagorically object to this proposal. It is your responsibility as representatives, as the township residents, to reject this outright and end it right now.

>> Thank you. >> Thank you. [applause] >> Hello. Uh my name is Na Brawl. I live at 320 North Bergkshire. I bought my house uh in this most recent summer. Uh it's a beautiful neighborhood and the property that we're talking about is also very beautiful. Uh, and I appreciate the designs that this developer is bringing forward, but um, on my concerns, you know, I I have many. Uh, one, we've already talked at Nauseium about the research park and the zoning and the like, and I I stand with uh, my fellow neighbors. Um, more so have questions about the commission. I feel like uh, and maybe I have a couple questions I would like to have in the record that you can ask afterward. One, have you guys actually visited the the park and the boundary? Um, are there any specific decibel limits? I think there's outdoor events that are consistently going to be happening. Um, what about amplified music? Outdoor events, you're always going to have amplified music. Even indoor events, you know, late night parties, people like to go outside, have a smoke, take a break. It gets hot when you're around people. Doors are going to be opening and closing all the time. Um, you know, I live three houses down from the property. I never received any postcard or notice or anything. Um, so all of this is coming very quickly. So, I'm very concerned if there's a chance that this is going to be approved uh or voted on further today. Um I also have concerns about even how the question and answer system happened in the wetlands.

It sort of seemed like people had a very specific question and uh whoever's handing the questions wasn't put in a great position, but he's like, "Oh, it's a question about parking." You know, I don't think we're really getting our voices heard. Uh I also have concerns about Mr. ado with what he's talking about his own interest financially. I don't I'm not going to speak on what that is or not, but I have a concern that he's bringing it up openly in front of people. Not just about being openly, but he might have a different interest if that's what he's talking about. Um I have concerns about uh talking about the research park where yes, all those things are indoor. This is outdoor. I've been to large weddings and I love them and I think that'd be a beautiful place, but not next to all these houses where you're having amplified music. Um, how do you handle there's questions on how do you even handle traffic? You know, moving in and out, all people moving all at one time. People are loud when they leave these events, especially if you're drunk, right? Um, so concerns about alcohol, too. I have, you know, a child and one on the way. And these are very concerns when you're growing a family and you know you want them to be able to go out in the neighborhood.

Um probably just in closing my concerns is that I feel like the commission uh isn't really compassionate or hearing the people. You listen to us for our three minutes but it seems like we very quickly get shoved away and things get moved forward. So thank you for your time. >> Thank you. >> [applause] >> Good evening. My name is Beth Kuzniaak and I live at 216 North Berkshire Road, directly adjacent to the parcel proposed to be rezoned and I strongly oppose this request. The existing research park, they are indeed quiet neighbors with predictable traffic and minimal disruption to any surrounding properties. A banquet hall, especially this one as designed, is not not comparable use at all. It is not even comparable to any of the special uses that's currently in the thing. All

of which would have to come before this commission and all of us would be here to shoot those down as well and to ask please for you to do the same. This is a highintensity event-based commercial operation that concentrates large numbers of guests, vehicles, lighting, amplified sound, particularly during weekend and evening hours. Banquet halls generate a huge amount of traffic with surges of vehicles arrivals and departures and headlights shining into our neighborhood properties. Noise is an even more serious concern, one that is impossible to mitigate based on the design itself and based on the use.

Beyond vehicle noise, the property has an amphitheater, outdoor gathering areas with the operator publicly stating there will be amplified music, high attendance outdoor events, and late night celebrations. He said that here and he said that in the news. Even with imposed conditions, enforcement is reactive and not effective once the facility is operational. We have already experienced the township's inability to shield nearby residents from the impacts associated with the M1 development in Pontiac. Township residents have raised concerns only to be told by the township staff and the supervisor directly that the township cannot control the M1 effects and noise because it is not in the township. Well, you know what? Now you can. You can control the effects of this piece of property on the residents by not allowing rezoning for a banquet hall with builtin outdoor entertainment areas. Further, under the aforementioned Michigan Zoning Enabling Act, a banquet hall is not a demonstrated need.

Introducing highintensity entertainment into a research park is not consistent. It will inherently and unreasonably interfere with our quiet enjoyment of our properties. Approving a rezoning that clearly and foreseeably creates these impacts exposes both the operator and the township to ongoing disputes and litigation. I relied on the existing research park zoning when purchasing and investing in my property. If this proceeds, despite its clear incompatibility and foreseeable impacts, I along with everybody else are going to pursue under law actions related to nuisance, reduction in property value, or any other remedies. We will have no choice. You've told us before that if you had the power to mitigate the noise and the impact, you would. I respectfully ask that you do that. that you deny the rezoning and protect our property owners from harm.

>> Thank you. [applause] >> Hi, my name is Doug Weroughby. I'm at 71 South Birkshshire. We've lived there since 1968, off and on. You know, it was in between, but basically we've been there forever. You know, I didn't plan on speaking getting up and speaking. I completely oppose this proposal, but honestly, everything's been said. Well, I'm concerned though that perhaps it's been ignored. I came here today uh more as an education for myself. This whole [snorts] proposal doesn't pass the reasonable man uh theory. I mean, it smells bad from a perspective of everyone on this board to consider a banquet hall as a legitimate uh special purpose for a research park. These people, especially the ones close to it, including me, we've, you know, we we're close enough that we're going to hear all the noise. Also, assumed that it would be a research park that would go in there. And that's a reasonable assumption. Any reasonable man would come to that conclusion, right? When you think of research park, you don't think about a thousand drunk people and loud music and and all the rest that goes along with an outdoor indoor wedding venue.

So, this has really been very educational for me to be sitting here and watching and listening and watching the looks on the faces the chair push person who spends more time looking at the clock than the person who's

talking to him. [applause] The man who has a vested interest, this is called conflict of interest. You would if if you were in a publicly held company, you would be up by everybody, every stockholder. You would be on line for it. And I would contend really the only currency that you have is the trust of the people in the township. you vote yes on this, you've lost that currency. This whole board becomes this whole uh whole process becomes a joke because we don't believe you. Nothing I mean I've heard nothing reasonable. This is absurd to use uh uh Greg's uh position. I I am I am livid. I came in here with kind of just a, you know, hey, you know, let's find out a little bit more about how something like this could happen. And I'm at the point where I will campaign against every board member on the board of trustees if this goes through. I don't know how you got your I'm okay.

Anyway, obviously I'm upset. I wasn't upset till I till I saw your attitudes candidly and conflict. Well, at least you disclosed it. I mean, bravo for being upfront about that. I mean, what are we doing here? Sorry. Thank you very much for your time. Thank you. [applause] >> I'm going to be short and sweet on this. Well, maybe not sweet. My name is Stanley Ralph Wendeller. I live at 194 North Birkshire with my wife Judy. We've been there since the middle of 1977.

I have gone around the world, six of the seven continents. I've visited other people, other places, and I've had those people come to our place. And 2011, every one of the my guests from other places have said, "You live in a park. What a great place to live." And I said, "Yeah, it has been great, but I was surprised about three weeks ago when I found out how stupidly run this place could actually be.

I didn't know that there was going to be any consideration of a research park change in my backyard effectively. I didn't know it. Nobody has come to visit us. This is not the way that a government should be treating its residents. You are there to serve. You are there to come through with a good plan coming through in an orderly fashion. And this is backwards.

Absolutely backwards. You have come for comment and we have not had any comment opportunity until now. And now is the time that you want to have a decision made. That's stupid. And I expect you to rectify that tonight. [applause] >> Good evening. My name is Arlene Puret and I live at 210 South Birkshshire Road. I'm here to record my strong opposition [clears throat] specifically to the Bloomfield hollow site and also the proposed zoning amendment. Both represent a fundamental departure from the charter township of Bloomfield Bloomfield's master plan and our established zoning ordinances. The research park district was codified for a specific purpose. Low intensity professional daytime activity. By design, it's meant to be harmonious with the surrounding residential community.

The research park district is one of the many districts, and there are other ones, B3, B4, many of those would be more accommodating than research park for something like a banquet hall. Approving this amendment for RP zone feels like an isolated use to benefit a developer rather than the community. It feels like we're trying to fit a square peg into a round hole that's going to have lots of cash coming. And frankly, once we erode the definition of research park, I'm afraid we're going to lose the future standing to protect any future neighborhoods from additional commercial enforcement.

I want to be clear, I'm very familiar with banquet halls. I have been a bridesmaid more than I can count. I love the celebration, time with friends, with family. So, I'm not opposed to banquet halls, but I am the way that this is being organized and in my backyard. At the end of the day, I know the operational realities with a banquet hall. Amplified music, crowd noise, high-intensity lighting, alcohol-related activity. And honestly, these are not one-time events. It's going to be day after night after weekend after week, 365 days a year. It really fundamentally reduces the livability of our residences. This project creates a direct conflict with the peace and quality of life that my family and these neighbors and the value of our homes is absolutely going to go down after this.

Because who's going to want to buy a house right behind a banquet hall? probably nobody. So, I also think it's highly questionable that we're hosting hearings for site plans and variances, whether for wetlands or for design, for a development that's not yet legally permitted in this district. Everything is backwards and it doesn't make sense. And that's why people are angry and they're frustrated. And I don't feel that you guys have adequately communicated with the residents of this neighborhood. The people who are going to bear this burden is everybody here.

So honestly, I urge the board to reject this amendment. Please do not trade the long-term character of what you describe as a premier residential community for a commercial project that simply does not fit. [applause] >> Good evening. My name is Val Murray. I live on Balentree Road for the past 40 years. I do not live in this subdivision. I'm here on behalf of just speaking to the residents. The residents have been reaching out. They're upset and I get it. If you look back at our master plan and our updated strategic plan, what do the residents want? All the residents want more green space, less development, parks. This would make a great park. Has that even been considered? Uh, if I'm not mistaken, I believe this was zoned residential before it was made research park. So now we're going to take another step. Um, and would any of us really want a banquet hall with a thousand people regularly in our backyards?

There's so many other uses. And in terms of getting questions answered, the developer talked about an amphitheater repeatedly. Then we're told there's no amphitheater, but they keep saying amphitheater. That says outdoor noise. I've also heard the developer talk about phases two and three. What are phases two and three? Oh, I don't know. You need to know this before you make the decision. This is not something to take lightly.

Um, you know, on top of it, when I saw the plan, the building is right on top of the houses. and and the special uh nature feature with the water. Why are we building right around and on top of it? Why aren't they considering the northeast side of that lot further away from the residence if that's where you really want to go with this? I just I think it's all wrong. And um I didn't really plan on speaking tonight, but I I feel strongly. So, I hope you just think carefully.

>> Yeah. >> For uh for all the residents because I don't think this community wants to see this in anybody's backyard because, you know, we've stopped doing uh sports courts in backyards because everybody's doing them and some of them are right on top of neighbors and that's gotten to be a negative situation. So, those have been halted for now. But, uh I thank you for your time. Thank you very much. [applause] >> Hello, my name is

Dr. Adel Rashi. I own one of the biggest properties on Bloom on Burkshshire. I live on 50 North Burkshshire. [clears throat] Um, I'm against this project because it's like it's the wrong place for a banquet hall and um, we also have a lot of noise issues because this is where Woodward and Telegraph kind of converge.

Um, it's just not the right place for a bank at all. >> Thank you. >> Thank you very much. [applause] >> Hi, my name's Brian Diadzio. I live in Bluefield Township. Uh the proposal that uh is in play right now doesn't immediately would impact me. I am south of Square Lake. Um, kind of what I'm shocked is at this point we're discussing a proposal from a developer where at least I haven't seen a comprehensive plan to address most of these folks concerns which they've brought up repeatedly which would I would think from a developer standpoint from a township standpoint would have been vetted out before we even got to this point, which is noise. How are we going to handle it?

Alcohol techniques and alcohol management. What are we going to do on our property? What are we going to do to confine it? What are we going to do? Bloomfield Township has told us repeatedly in my neighborhood. They have no control over the roads. Well, what are we doing with the traffic at that point from these it's all egress. I've worked with the public for years and it's always in short bursts. people coming in, people getting out, so forth and so on. And what do we do with that?

Are we who's paying for that? Is the township police department, are they getting an increased budget from that? And I would think from a you know, I'm not slamming the developer, but I would think from at least my perspective that's worked in the marketing position when you go in and you need to convince I don't think they need to convince you. I think they need to convince them folks there what they're going to do and how they're going to go about it and have that all worked out before you even come to a public forum. Mr. Saltz, before you even come here to air it out in public because when and I'll tell you, I've been here from Bloomfield Park which nobody was for and got forced down our throats. When Target came in, Target came to my neighborhood and several other neighborhoods, sat down with as a group, laid out exactly what they're going to do, how they were going to do it, and they said, "What do you think?" And we made suggestions about, well, you know, they wanted to have a exit on the Square Lake. We go, "We don't think that's a good idea. We don't want to do that.

It's going to be spilling people unnelessly at all hours into our neighborhood." Guess what? They closed it up. They took suggestions and implemented those suggestions. By having us as residents have some input, we felt we had ownership over that project and felt better about it. Has it been perfect? No. None of it's going to be perfect. Just as much as when at the corner of Square Lake and Telegraph, a developer who's well entrenched in this community, Archa Jonah, took a property, took a zoning, and migrated it to a whole another thing and then put in a strip mall there against our neighbors.

Our neighborhood, our Forest Lake objection because what is it going to do? more traffic, more speeding, more garbage, more theft coming through the neighborhood. We were shot down. So, I would suggest to these folks here that have skin in the game as they go forward, you may not be able to stop it, but fight it to help shape it to get it as best as you can. Because I think what I'm hearing from what I'm hearing is it's kind of like well it's going to be like Silven Table so for and so well Silven Table is a different property.

It's got a big green space buffer zone between the residents the property and things that they're doing here. And from what I I haven't seen that I saw a little plant up here and to this young lady I have nothing against her but she's referring to banquet hall. She's talking about telegraph and Roma Hall in the 1980s when this was a a fly spec out in the middle of nowhere. And by the way, where Bloomfield Park at, there was a drive-in theater there.

>> Sir, your time is up. >> Your time is up, sir. >> Oh, okay. Sorry. >> Sorry to run on. >> It's not It's not fair to you and we cut this woman off. >> I appreciate you bringing that to my attention, Mr. Solid. >> I appreciate Appreciate Have A GREAT DAY. >> [applause] >> GOOD EVENING. I'M Rosalyn Northcross. I came initially because I'm from Pontiac and I was concerned about potential of flooding um from this project, but since I've been listening here, I'm also concerned about the noise. I've been in my home in Pontiac for over 50 years, and Pontiac has ignored residents requests about M1. In fact, Pontiac entered into an agreement which will increase the noise levels up to 110 dB from auto events this summer.

So, between the proposed banquet development and M1, it might get loud. Unfortunately, Pontiac people didn't anticipate that the car condos in the test track would morph into what has become today. I applaud the homeowners here for speaking up and speaking out on this issue because once it's done, additional phases will only make the situation worse. Thank you. [applause] >> All right, let's bring it back here.

Anybody have anything to say? >> Sorry to close the public. Yeah, it's closed. Close the public hearing. Okay, go ahead. >> You know, this board works, we work really hard to accommodate not only the residents, yet also the property owner and the criticism, some of it is just completely wrong and it's not right. It's it's when I say not right, it's not truthful. So, um, we're trying to follow the, uh, proper order of an orderly meeting so that you do have the opportunity to hear we can hear your voice and that we can actually collaborate as a board and make decisions. That's it. And that's I only say that because people are criticizing some of the way things are happening up here. Um, regarding what was said and what is up here, I I have some reservations.

>> That's it. I mean, it seems like it may not be quite the case. >> Something I really need to to say. >> Please do. >> I've been accused of having my mind made up. I've been cut off when I ask questions. I've been told I'm watching the clock. Well, I have to because I have to keep order. >> I've been told I'm not paying attention, not listening to you. And I I would argue it is you who've made up your minds about us.

>> Before you even sat down, you knew what we were thinking. That's not true. Because you know what? When I came in, I had [clears throat] I came in this morning, I had a meeting with the township to go over all this because I'm chair I have to look at it. And I got I went home and I thought about it a lot. I went over to to see the property. Someone said I didn't we didn't even go over and look. I did. Um and I have to say I have a lot of reservations about not only the the banquet part of it, putting it changing the zoning, but the project itself as well. And so I'm going to tell you who all made up your mind about me and accuse me of doing all these bad things. I am not going to support changing the ordinance to put in the the word banquet into that ordinance because I think No, no, no. I don't want that. I don't want that. I don't think that the the project Well, we'll talk about the project later. That's not what we're talking we're talking just the language in there. I just don't think to

spot zone is the correct thing to do.

And so I I'm just telling you I I don't think my I don't know if anybody else here agree with me, but I don't think that I can support changing and adding that in it. So I just want to let you know that. So don't prejudge us. >> Is there verbiage that you would support? Excuse me. Is there verbiage that you would support? And before we get maybe to that discussion, I do have a couple questions. Um are there other locations in the township with banquet halls?

>> Yes. Well, we the well to know. >> Yeah, we I would say yes. Um I mean we have the Irakcoy club and then in terms of the I mean >> it's not a it's a >> I know that one but aside from that >> an actual banquet hall. I mean we have private country clubs but obviously that's not considered the same thing. However, they operate >> in the sense where they do have weddings but no they're not defined as a banquet hall. are identified separately in our ordinance as a country club >> and they're wonderful. They've been great neighbors.

>> Well, you asked me if there was any verbiage that I would put in and I'm going to just say I I I don't think so. I don't think so. You know, I I took a course at Michigan State before I did this about land use, about planning, and it was pretty specific about looking at the zoning and looking at what's written and how it's interpreted. And it was very much against spot zoning. That was in Michigan State. Um, so I don't know that there's any language. I And and they talked about people here talk about the master plan. Well, yeah, that's a good point. The master plan is coming up. The new master plan is going to be worked on next year. A whole the whole thing. I worked on that one that's there. My name is right on it. And it'll be on the next one, too.

>> All of us are. >> And sorry. >> All of ours are. >> Sorry. >> We all of us are. >> Well, back when it was written. Okay. Yeah, we all are. That's correct. it. We'll be working on a new one and maybe we have to look at that as well, but I there's no No, I I just don't think so. I just don't hear your opinion. >> So, again, I don't know if you'll agree or not agree, but I'm just telling you what I think.

>> I was having it. I mean, that's a that's a stretch for me. >> Any other comments, Neil? Anything? >> No. I mean, I get concerned. I mean, we've been very respectful to the to the neighbors as we should be. We want to listen to you and at the same time you need to respect us. We're doing our jobs and we have not come in with any pre pre-ordained ideas as far as uh what we're going to do. We got accused at the last board meeting that this was all made up. We've already decided there's been violations of the Open Meetings Act. Well, that's insulting as hell. I got to tell you, I've been on the board for 23 years. Never heard that one before.

We listen to every plan as it's presented. Um it's every one of us have seen the have seen the property. Everyone has seen your neighborhood and every one of us has heard you. Uh so don't insult us please because we've been very respectful to you as we should be. You're our residents. You are some of our neighbors. But at the same time, please give us the benefit of the doubt because we know what we're doing. We've done this before and we're not going to just come in and withh saying, "Okay, this is a done deal." It doesn't work that way. It never has. [snorts] >> Okay. Anybody? Okay. What do you want to do?

>> I I just like to say the same thing. I've been on the board for uh 15 years. Uh this is probably the most contentious meeting I've ever attended. And it seems that all of you have walked in here thinking that we've all made up our minds already. like like we're getting paid on the side or or something. And that's that's not what we [snorts] swore an oath to do. We're here to represent the township, but we also are here to see progress in our township. And our job is to weigh the pros and the cons and make the best decision for the township and the developer.

So to come in here with the preconceived idea that we've been paid and and we're we're as somebody pointed out or something, I don't know. It's ridiculous and it's an insult to us for the time and energy that we put forth to represent you and the township and to make proper decisions. So that's all I have to say. >> Well, we have a choice again, three choices. approve it, not approve it, or table it till we can get more information or perhaps more meetings with the developer with property own whatever. Those are the three choices.

So, okay, one of the two we have >> I like to discuss that. Um, since well, I'm not going to be as snarky as some people have been. Um, I will just say that I think the best approach for right now is as with a a previous contentious issue which worked out to be pretty good for everybody is that the developer the the developers consultants really need to spend more time with the neighbors and really need to work with them. It's not to say it's a it's a yes or no. It may not it still may go through at some point, but obviously there's a lot of push back and there needs to be some considerations. There needs to be listening and some changes and mitigation of in addressing the concerns of the neighbors. And at that point, I think it should if that happens, then bring it back to the planning commission and let's look at it again. But at this time, I I we certainly hear you and I think the developer needs to work with you more and to try again whether it's putting moving the property um putting a wall in whatever it may be. Uh the the point is if it ever comes back to the planning commission if if that were to happen where it's not passed um there's always going to be many conditions that are going to be part of uh an approval process if we get there. So with that said, I think it's pro it's in the best interest of everyone at this time that we table this, look at it, have the really implore uh the developer and his team to work with the residents as much as possible to try and address as many of your realistic concerns as as as they can.

>> Support. >> Okay. Discussion. >> I just like to make one one uh comment. Somebody brought up uh the Target situation and I can share with you that I controlled that property. I used to own Hillside Furniture and that property was purchased by me with total control as to what went next door to me. Honestly and truthfully, it was done because I didn't want our van moving next door to me. So, I wanted to control what was there. And I got a phone call from the developer that Target was interested in the property. A wonderful company. And I will agree with I forget who made that comment about Target, but they when they originally designed their building, their garbage was facing my door, okay? That where they put their garbage. I simply called the the folks who were in charge. They completely changed the plan. So people do listen, okay? We're here to listen. And I think the right move is to table this. That was my decision 30 minutes into this conversation. you know, when we get all of our we're here to represent you, but again to represent the developers as well. But when we see that there's so much anger and misinformation or whatever, that's the reason for tableabling this is to bring it so everybody sits down and gets all the right information. I just want to make one clarification though. We're talking about the banquet hall, changing the zoning, adding that the banquet hall, not the project itself. Okay? So that's one step at a time. Now, we could well, we can't join it because we have to have have to do the proper

order. So, right now, we're just tableabbling >> the the question, the text amendment.

>> Okay. >> Is that correct? >> Yes. Correct. Okay. That was the motion. Just tableabbling that. >> Okay. >> And I had supported it. >> And you support that. Okay. So, I'll call for a vote. All those in favor of tableabbling say I. I. I. Any opposed? >> Okay. The next thing now, now the question is >> since that's changed, we have the next item is the light the site plan. table. >> I think our attorney had would let me make >> I'm sorry. Go ahead.

>> Sure. So, just because item 4 A was tabled, we necessarily need to uh table 4B because it was reviewing a special land use that would be required. >> Okay. Well, that's what I was getting. >> Thank you. >> So, we need a motion to do that. >> Thanks, Sony. And I will make the motion uh that we table the site plan review at this time since it really is uh connected to uh the text amendment.

>> Support has been moved to support. Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see that. My >> apologize. >> Uh, any discussion on that part of the motion? >> Then all those in favor say I. I. Any opposed? >> Okay. >> And I would just like to say on top of that, the planning, building, and ordinance department is open for residents, always open to have conversations. >> So, I guess without more communication, without adjusting some of these, I mean, if it's that has to happen before this it comes back to us. So >> at this point it's not not approved is what it is. So >> it's just table, >> right?

>> Okay. Um this thank you. Thank you all for coming and voicing your opinions. >> And we did listen obviously. >> All right. Next. >> So continue. >> Are you >> all right? Uh >> let's just take two minutes. >> I guess it depends maybe. Um but definitely now that we have the last >> Thank you though. I appreciate it.

I think I think right Now you want to add to the bank.

>> [laughter] >> Oh, you're Kelly. >> Oh my god. Let's get the back. This doesn't take that long.

You know, knowledge every once in a while 10 minutes from last Yeah, I know.

>> I'm used to it. Like, let's plow through this thing and finish it. >> I would Oh, he's being interviewed by Channel 7. All right. >> All right. >> But we have to have everybody back in. >> You don't have to have everybody. You just have to have quorum. I know. >> I'm I'm headset against this project. >> But you know what? I can't say that now. >> I can say it to you. We're not done yet. We're in the middle of the meeting. Actually, >> we're in the middle of the meeting.

>> Shall we reconvene? >> Let's go. >> All right. >> We do. Why don't you uh started, >> Cy? >> I think I just >> Let's continue with this meeting. Um >> the only other thing we have is items not on the agenda. Anybody have anything? >> Thank you. >> Well, is I I just >> annual report, right? >> What? Oh, the annual report. >> Come on. Let's get the general business going. Yes. I would like to [laughter] >> Let's continue.

>> Oh, I'm looking at the wetlands thing. Sorry. >> You know what? What do they do? >> Okay, chair. We're We're start our meeting, right? Okay. I know. >> Okay. Okay. >> So then the the next item on your agenda is our annual presentation of the annual report. [laughter] >> Every year um our planning division uh prepares a annual report of to identify the various projects site plan and all the hard work that has been put in by our various boards. Um so I have presented you you have a copy within your packet. Um I would um want to highlight that in 2025 um we had approximately 16 site plan reviews the planning commission which is up four from 2024. So we had a very busy year last year. Um so um this is just an um opportunity for us to share with the with the board what um >> close the doors. I think they're closing. I think it's >> We can >> Do you want me to?

>> Yeah, >> I'll do. That'd be great. >> Okay, thank you. I I will I will make this brief. Uh however, I will am here to answer any questions, but I um we do have you guys have your planning commission bylaws and as part of those bylaws, it does state that every second meeting in February that the planning division pro uh provides you with a annual report highlighting um the various um uh decisions that were made by the bodies throughout the um years.

And we also um provide a historical record so you can see the trajectory of the progress that we've been making. Um so with that I can I would ask that the township consider um making a motion to accept the town the um planning staff report or uh annual report. I just want to note that Kelly Jacobson and our department works very hard um to tally and put together this report and does a beautiful job every year. Um and so I would ask for you to take a look and see that the planning commission um saw 99 not 100 99 variances last year and then as I stated planning commission was much more active in 2025 and I anticipate that we'll continue to track um site plans throughout 2026 as we do have some that are currently in the queue right now.

>> Yeah and if you could thank her for the work she did on the compliment it really she did a great job. >> I appreciate that because she really does spend a lot of time as you can imagine. So, please spend some time, read through the report, um, see all the hard work and all the items that go before our zoning board and planning commission. And I appreciate that and I will share that with her. >> I want somebody want to move to to accept this.

>> I just have a quick question. Did did the uh >> amendments to the ordinance help reduce the number of ZBA cases? Remember you had a >> Yes, that is our goal. Um so, um we are actually I'm actually considering um some new amendments. Uh I'm not really necessarily prepared to address what those are, but we are under that umbrella of looking at what currently goes to the ZBA frequently, what frequently gets approved. I would say that there is an opportunity that I would like to look at in 2026.

>> I would agree. >> Is there any please share if there's anything in particular? >> Please do. Please do too because we also want to look for guidance from our >> I think it's great that um the work that you did and and the adjustments to the texts helped reduce the load on the ZBA for things that just keep getting approved over and over again. >> Thank you for that. We will continue to monitor that and be be aware of that because it it doesn't make sense to continue to bring back things that are going to be continually approved or have less

impact on neighbors.

>> So with that, we would need a motion to accept the annual report. >> So moved. Second. >> Moved and seconded. All those in favor? >> I >> Okay. I just one thing I want to say ask you. Um I'm happy that the board of trustees put a moratorium on sports courts. >> Yes. >> And I'm hoping that we'll be we'll have an opportunity to put input into the language of the whatever ordinance, however it's changed that it'll that this is going to come. Absolutely. I have very specific things I'd like to put in and I hopefully we get a chance to look at.

>> Oh, absolutely. I would imagine there'd be a study session involved. We definitely need and want input. Um uh so we will be reaching out to the public um to get input related to that and absolutely we want to hear from you. >> Okay, great. >> Because that's really the task at hand is developing an ordinance that would help alleviate some of the concerns that have been presented to date. >> Yeah. I also I want to add I'd like to add to that is that impervious services looking at how we calculate over the whole property. That's another subject.

Okay. I just want to make sure we get a chance. >> And that was brought up at the board meeting as you recall. >> I think I recall that. Yes, I know. But were you listening? Did you listen to us? >> I do listen. [laughter] I do listen, Jeff. >> Okay. Thanks. >> I'm a good listener. >> Okay. Anything else? >> Then we need a motion to adjourn. >> So move. >> So move. >> And [laughter] we're adjourned. Thank you. Thank you very much, Jeeoff. Thanks for running the meeting. That was not an easy one. Wasn't an easy one.