

---

---

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF WATERFORD  
PLANNING COMMISSION REGULAR MEETING  
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 26, 2023, 6:00 P.M.**

I. Call the Meeting to Order

**Chairperson Ray** called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

II. Roll Call

Present: Matt Ray, Chair  
Scott Sintkowski, Vice Chair  
Tony Bartolotta, Commissioner  
Art Frasca, Commissioner  
Steve Printz, Commissioner

Absent: Thomas Strat, Commissioner  
Dave Kramer, Secretary

Also Present: Jeff Polkowski, Director  
Justin Daymon, Zoning Administrator  
Scott Alef, Community Development Grant Coordinator  
Amy Williams, Recording Secretary

Public Present: Approximately 30 members of the public

III. Approve the Agenda of the September 26, 2023, regular meeting of the Planning Commission as printed.

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Bartolotta*

*Supported by Frasca: Resolved to Approve the Agenda for the September 26, 2023 Planning Commission Meeting.*

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ROLL CALL VOTE**

**(Ray/yes, Sintkowski/yes, Frasca/yes, Printz/yes, Bartolotta/yes)**

**(5 - 0)**

IV. Approve the Minutes of the September 12, 2023, special meeting of the Planning Commission as printed.

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Bartolotta*

*Supported by Frasca: Resolved to **Approve** the September 12, 2023 Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes as printed.*

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ROLL CALL VOTE**  
**(Ray/yes, Frasca/yes, Printz/yes, Bartolotta/yes)**  
**(4 – 0) with Sintkowski abstaining from the vote as he was not present at this meeting.**

V. Consent Agenda – please see attached Consent Agenda

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Bartolotta*

*Supported by Frasca: Resolved to **Approve** the Planning Commission Meeting Consent Agenda.*

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ROLL CALL VOTE**  
**(Ray/yes, Sintkowski/yes, Frasca/yes, Printz/yes, Bartolotta/yes)**  
**(5 - 0)**

VI. Site Plans and Public Hearings

**1. Presentation of the Draft 2022-2023 Consolidated Annual Performance Evaluation Report (CAPER) for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program – PUBLIC HEARING**

**Mr. Alef** presented the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report as required by HUD. The presentation outlined the 2022-2023 achievements and monetary disbursement of CDBG funds.

**2. Special Approval Case No. PRSA 23-07-02 Keeping Small Domestic Livestock in a Residential District – PUBLIC HEARING**

**Parcel I.D. No.** 13-15-156-007: T3N, R9E, SEC 15 BENSON'S OLD ORCHARD SUB LOT 44

**Requesting:** The applicant is looking to keep eight chickens (no roosters) in a residential district.

**Property Location:** **2050 Briggs St**

**Property Zoned:** R1-A, Single-Family Residential

**Applicant:** Jodi Burchett

Applicant or representative present: Jodi Burchett

**Mr. Polkowski** gave a brief presentation of this case. This originated with a code enforcement complaint. Although chickens are allowed in residential lots with acreage, this lot does not meet requirements, and the structure cannot meet the minimum requirements from the property line. (50 linear ft.) If approved, the location of the structure would require variances.

**Mrs. Burchett** stated that she has had these chickens for two and a half years with no complaints until now, and no roosters. She stated that her hens are healthy and clean and the unsubstantiated claim regarding rats is not from her hens. She had animal control and pest control out to investigate her property and passed inspection. She also stated that the chickens are designated emotional support animals for her husband with severe chronic illness that keep him homebound. She also has eight letters of support from other neighbors. Her chickens are quieter than some of the dogs in the area.

During the public portion of the meeting the following spoke regarding this request.

**Debra Sullivan** of 2064 Briggs Street spoke against this request. She stated that there were no issues in the past 2 years, but most recently there have been rats, and she is concerned with the cleanliness of the pens.

**Kevin Wiscombe** of 2036 Briggs, said that he lives next door and has not seen rats and the chickens do not bother him. He stated that the walkway across Hatchery has been recently dug out and maybe the rats came from that.

**Mrs. Burchett** added to her comment as a reference that she has recently been harassed by Mr. Sullivan and has had to take out a P.P.O against him.

**Board member Bartolotta** said that the reports from animal control which stated that the property was clean and chickens were healthy said a lot. He also stated that the construction of the coop was very nice, but the photos of rats on sticks were awful.

More questions were asked about the number of coops on site, and how the chickens were cared for in the winter. The applicant replied to all questions.

Board members questioned staff as to setback requirements, and how many animals are allowed per acreage. Staff replied that variance would be needed and based on the lot size, 2 chickens would be the amount allowed per acreage.

## **MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Bartolotta*

*Supported by Printz: Resolved to approve with conditions the request for special approval in this case based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance review criteria and considerations, which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.*

### **Findings:**

- A. The proposed use is in accordance with the objectives of the Master Plan and with future land use plans for the area as adopted or maintained by the Planning Commission.
- B.1 The proposed use will be compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of building and activity location, scope of activity, character, hours of operation, and compliance with the performance standards required under ARTICLE II, Division 2-2.
- B.2 The proposed use will not have an adverse effect on the environment or adjacent properties beyond the normal effects of permitted principal uses in the same zoning district.
- B.3 The proposed use will not result in an impairment, pollution, and/or destruction of air, water, natural resources and/or the public trust therein.
- C. The proposed use is not located in any Special Approval use service areas identified and adopted by the Planning Commission.
- D. The proposed use will not impose an unreasonable burden upon public services and utilities.
- E. The proposed use will be in compliance with the regulations of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be located.

### **Conclusions:**

- A.1 The proposed use is of such location, size and character as to be compatible with the orderly development of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be situated.

- A.2 The proposed use will be compatible with the orderly development or use of adjacent zoning lots.
- A.3 Pedestrian circulation will not be hindered by the proposed use.
- A.4 Outdoor operations and display in connection with the proposed use will not burden and/or disrupt uses on adjacent properties.
- A.5 The natural and surrounding environment will not be negatively impacted by the proposed use.

**Conditions:**

The conditions of this approval, which have considered the Planning Commission’s ability to impose reasonable restrictions to ensure compliance with the performance standards established in the Zoning Ordinance, are as follows:

1. The Planning Commission reserves the right to modify or revoke this special approval following complaints, safety concerns, or site plan violations.
2. No roosters are to be kept.
3. The number of hens is limited to 2.
4. The hens shall not be allowed outside of their enclosure without supervision.

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ROLL CALL VOTE  
(Ray/yes, Sintkowski/yes, Frasca/yes, Printz/yes, Bartolotta/yes)  
( 5 - 0 )***

**3. Special Approval Case No. PRSA 23-08-02 (PSP 23-1468) Special Approval for a Wireless Communication Facility – PUBLIC HEARING**

**Parcel I.D. No.**      *The S Cass Lake Rd right-of-way in front of 13-35-179-037: T3N, R9E, SEC 35 LAMBERT'S SHORE ACRES LOTS 160 TO 165 INCL*

**Requesting:**      The applicant intends to erect a utility pole featuring a small cell antenna with a total height of 38’ 3” in the S Cass Lake Rd right-of-way in front of 990 S Cass Lake Rd.

**Property Location:** *The S Cass Lake Rd right-of-way in front of **990 S Cass Lake Rd***

**Property Zoned:**    C-1, Neighbor Business

**Applicant:**        Philip Bys

Applicant was not present.

**Mr. Polkowski** gave a brief visual presentation and explained that the utility pole does not meet setback requirements without a variance and does not feel that it is compatible with its surroundings and would have an adverse effect on the business abutting the property.

He further added that just today the applicant proposed to relocate to the other side of the driveway, but he can only review on what has been submitted.

During the public portion of the meeting, the following spoke against this request.

**Jimmy Lousia**, 990 S Cass Lake Rd said he was the owner of the property where the proposed pole was to be installed and was not in favor. He had to obtain a variance to keep his existing sign in the area between the road and sidewalk. He further stated that he would be ok if the pole was located at the rear of the property.

Further comments from the board members and staff to determine the state regulations for Small Wireless Communications Facilities Deployment Act.

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Frasca*

*Supported by Bartolotta: Resolved to deny the request for special approval in this case based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance review criteria and considerations, which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.*

**Findings:**

- A. The proposed use is not in accordance with the objectives of the Master Plan and with future land use plans for the area as adopted or maintained by the Planning Commission.
- B.1 The proposed use will not be compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of building and activity location, scope of activity, character, hours of operation, and compliance with the performance standards required under ARTICLE II, Division 2-2.
- B.2 The proposed use will have an adverse effect on the environment or adjacent properties beyond the normal effects of permitted principal uses in the same zoning district.
- B.3 The proposed use will result in an impairment, pollution, and/or destruction of air, water, natural resources and/or the public trust therein.
- C. The proposed use is located in any Special Approval use service areas identified and adopted by the Planning Commission.
- D. The proposed use will impose an unreasonable burden upon public services and utilities.
- E. The proposed use will not be in compliance with the regulations of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be located.

**Conclusions:**

- A.1 The proposed use is not of such location, size and character as to be compatible with the orderly development of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be situated.
- A.2 The proposed use will not be compatible with the orderly development or use of adjacent zoning lots.
- A.3 Pedestrian circulation will be hindered by the proposed use.
- A.4 Outdoor operations and display in connection with the proposed use will burden and/or disrupt uses on adjacent properties.
- A.5 The natural and surrounding environment will be negatively impacted by the proposed.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ROLL CALL VOTE**

*(Ray/yes, Sintkowski/yes, Frasca/yes, Printz/yes, Bartolotta/yes)  
(5 - 0)*

**4. Special Approval Case No. PRSA 23-08-03 Special Approval for a Restaurant with Drive-Thru Facilities – PUBLIC HEARING**

**Parcel I.D. No.** 13-25-404-038: T3N, R9E, SEC 25 AMENDED PLAT OF LOTS 3-23, 36, 43 & VAC 20 FT ALLEY SUPERVISOR'S PLAT NO 7 LOTS 7 TO 15 INCL 9-28-22 FR 034 & 035

**Requesting:** The applicant is seeking the required Special Approval to operate a restaurant with drive-thru facilities on the property.

**Property Location:** 2299 Elizabeth Lake Rd

**Property Zoned:** C-2, Small Business

**Applicant:** John and Lilian Property, LLC

Applicant or representative present: John and Lilian Property LLC

**Mr. Polkowski** gave a brief history and description of the request. The property has been vacant since 2014 and new ordinance requires special approval to have a drive-thru for a restaurant in the C-2 zoning district.

**Mr. Zhu** of 2839 Chestnut Run Dr. purchased this property at auction to find that it was in terrible shape. His plan is to renovate and market this for a drive through restaurant.

During the public portion of the meeting, no one spoke regarding this request.

### **MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Frasca*

*Supported by Bartolotta: Resolved to approve with conditions the request for special approval in this case based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance review criteria and considerations, which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.*

### **Findings:**

- A. The proposed use is in accordance with the objectives of the Master Plan and with future land use plans for the area as adopted or maintained by the Planning Commission.
- B.1 The proposed use will be compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of building and activity location, scope of activity, character, hours of operation, and compliance with the performance standards required under ARTICLE II, Division 2-2.
- B.2 The proposed use will not have an adverse effect on the environment or adjacent properties beyond the normal effects of permitted principal uses in the same zoning district.
- B.3 The proposed use will not result in an impairment, pollution, and/or destruction of air, water, natural resources and/or the public trust therein.
- C. The proposed use is not located in any Special Approval use service areas identified and adopted by the Planning Commission.
- D. The proposed use will not impose an unreasonable burden upon public services and utilities.
- E. The proposed use will be in compliance with the regulations of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be located.

### **Conclusions:**

- A.1 The proposed use is of such location, size and character as to be compatible with the orderly development of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be situated.
- A.2 The proposed use will be compatible with the orderly development or use of adjacent zoning lots.
- A.3 Pedestrian circulation will not be hindered by the proposed use.
- A.4 Outdoor operations and display in connection with the proposed use will not burden and/or disrupt uses on adjacent properties.
- A.5 The natural and surrounding environment will not be negatively impacted by the proposed use.
- B. The proposed use will be within the capacity limitations of the existing or proposed public services and facilities which serve its proposed location.

C. The proposed use will be conducive to fulfilling a gap in the geographic coverage of such services to Township residents.

**Conditions:**

The conditions of this approval, which have considered the Planning Commission's ability to impose reasonable restrictions to ensure compliance with the performance standards established in the Zoning Ordinance, are as follows:

1. All comments will be addressed to the satisfaction of staff prior to final approval.
2. The Planning Commission reserves the right to modify or revoke this special approval following complaints, safety concerns, or site plan violations.

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ROLL CALL VOTE  
(Ray/yes, Sintkowski/yes, Frasca/yes, Printz/yes, Bartolotta/yes)  
(5 - 0)***

**5. Special Approval Case No. PRSA 23-08-05 (PCR 23-026) Special Approval for a Short-Term Dwelling – PUBLIC HEARING**

**Parcel I.D. No.** 13-08-306-003: T3N, R9E, SEC 8 WILLIAMS LAKE PARK LOT 3  
**Requesting:** Special Approval to operate a short-term dwelling in a single-family residential district.  
**Property Location:** 2970 Orange Grove Rd  
**Property Zoned:** R-1C, Single-Family Residential  
**Applicant:** Ken Burns & Becky Harris-Burns

Applicant or representative present: Ken and Becky Burns

**Mr. Polkowski** gave a brief overview of this request. He said that the owners live next door and purchased this property to possibly move their parents into it or to downsize and move into it themselves in the near future. But in the interim, rent it out to family and friends on a short-term basis.

**Mrs. Burns**, of 2964 Orange Grove gave a brief history of why they purchased the property. They did not originally intend to rent it out, but hoped to help offset the taxes by allowing family and friends to rent it out until they decide to either move their parents or themselves into it.

During the public portion of the meeting, the following spoke against this request.

**Paula Rowland** of 6774 Desmond said that in the past they have not had a particularly good run-on Airbnb. She is not in favor of this request.

**Lila Ball** of 62 Edgelake said that she has an Airbnb next door and every weekend they wake up next to strangers. This has been a problem. In Roscommon, MI the whole area is taken up by Airbnb and the tenants like to have wild parties. People are not what they used to be, there are no sidewalks or adequate parking and the area is not equipped for this.

**Ann Cramer** of 7026 Hatchery questioned if they would be allowed boats. Would boats be provided, or would they be allowed to bring their own. This is a private lake and it is not accessible to renters.

**Allan Zelinski** of 2989 Lansdowne said that he has experienced a nightmare with guests in the past. They are loud, and as soon as we allow one Airbnb, there will be more.

**Brenda Winowiecki** of 2844 Orange Grove agrees that there should be no boats available as it is a safety concern. The potential renters do not know the rules of the lake.

**Board member Bartolotta** questioned the applicant on how they would find renters. And the applicant said mostly by word of mouth. They do not intend to advertise and only rent once in a while to friends and family mostly.

There was further discussion on when the property would be rented, and how they would screen potential renters. The whole reason the Township came up with this ordinance is to put restrictions on it, so it does not get out of hand.

### **MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Sintkowski*

*Supported by Frasca: Resolved to approve with conditions the request for special approval in this case based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance review criteria and considerations, which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.*

### **Findings:**

- A. The proposed use is in accordance with the objectives of the Master Plan and with future land use plans for the area as adopted or maintained by the Planning Commission.
- B.1 The proposed use will be compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of building and activity location, scope of activity, character, hours of operation, and compliance with the performance standards required under ARTICLE II, Division 2-2.
- B.2 The proposed use will not have an adverse effect on the environment or adjacent properties beyond the normal effects of permitted principal uses in the same zoning district.
- B.3 The proposed use will not result in an impairment, pollution, and/or destruction of air, water, natural resources and/or the public trust therein.
- C. The proposed use is not located in any Special Approval use service areas identified and adopted by the Planning Commission.
- D. The proposed use will not impose an unreasonable burden upon public services and utilities.
- E. The proposed use will be in compliance with the regulations of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be located.

### **Conclusions:**

- A.1 The proposed use is of such location, size and character as to be compatible with the orderly development of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be situated.
- A.2 The proposed use will be compatible with the orderly development or use of adjacent zoning lots.
- A.3 Pedestrian circulation will not be hindered by the proposed use.
- A.4 Outdoor operations and display in connection with the proposed use will not burden and/or disrupt uses on adjacent properties.
- A.5 The natural and surrounding environment will not be negatively impacted by the proposed use.
- B. The proposed use will be within the capacity limitations of the existing or proposed public services and facilities which serve its proposed location.



C. The proposed use will be conducive to fulfilling a gap in the geographic coverage of such services to Township residents.

**Conditions:** The conditions of this approval, which have considered the Planning Commission's ability to impose reasonable restrictions to ensure compliance with the performance standards established in the Zoning Ordinance, are as follows:

1. The Planning Commission reserves the right to modify or revoke this special approval following complaints, safety concerns, or site plan violations.
2. This approval is limited to the current owner's of the property.
3. This approval is conditional upon the applicant's continuing inhabitation of the neighboring Property, and that the property cannot be rented if the applicant is not home.
4. The property and dwelling are to be made available to no more than seven people at a time.
5. Boats are not to be made accessible to the renters, and not allowed to be brought by the renters.
6. This property will not be marketed on any websites such as AirBB and Vrbo.

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ROLL CALL VOTE  
(Ray/yes, Sintkowski/yes, Frasca/yes, Printz/yes, Bartolotta/yes)  
( 5 - 0 )***

**6. Special Approval Case No. PRSA 23-09-01 (PSP 23-1469) Special Approval for a Waste Processing Facility – PUBLIC HEARING**

**Parcel I.D. No.** 13-09-226-001: T3N, R9E, SEC 9 W 1/2 OF NE 1/4 LYING NLY OF DGH&M RR R/W 11 A W137

**Requesting:** Special Approval to operate a waste processing facility where construction material is sorted to be recycled or disposed of off-site.

**Property Location:** 5351 Williams Lake Rd

**Property Zoned:** M-2, General Industrial

**Applicant:** Adam Christensen

Applicant or representative present: Adam Christensen

**Mr. Polkowski** gave a brief presentation with visual aides. The applicant is seeking to build and operate a waste processing facility. The applicant is also seeking to utilize outdoor storage as an accessory use to store dumpsters on site.

**Mr. Christensen** of 4836 White Lake Rd said that he has worked in the roll off dumpster business for 30 years and has now evolved to accept waste from construction sites to haul to the landfills. This process allows small and medium vehicles to transport to the waste sites in large quantities. This would be mostly construction debris, not household trash. They would come in off Williams Lake Rd, to the scale, to the transfer building where waste is sorted for recycle then back to the weigh station. This allows for less traffic to the landfills.

During the public portion of the meeting, the following spoke against this request.

**John Wolf**, stated that he was representing Rite Aid, the owners of 5400 Perry Drive. They have concerns with noise, potential fumes and debris from this operation. Waste could attract rodents. Asbestos, treated wood, lead and other harmful items should not be in close proximity to food and other goods. He feels that this will only cause destruction to the roads and there are better uses for this site.

There was further discussion with board members and applicant on how they would handle it if hazardous materials were brought into this site.

## **MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Bartolotta*

*Supported by Frasca: Resolved to approve with conditions the request for special approval in this case based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance review criteria and considerations, which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.*

### **Findings:**

- A. The proposed use is in accordance with the objectives of the Master Plan and with future land use plans for the area as adopted or maintained by the Planning Commission.
- B.1 The proposed use will be compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of building and activity location, scope of activity, character, hours of operation, and compliance with the performance standards required under ARTICLE II, Division 2-2.
- B.2 The proposed use will not have an adverse effect on the environment or adjacent properties beyond the normal effects of permitted principal uses in the same zoning district.
- B.3 The proposed use will not result in an impairment, pollution, and/or destruction of air, water, natural resources and/or the public trust therein.
- C. The proposed use is not located in any Special Approval use service areas identified and adopted by the Planning Commission.
- D. The proposed use will not impose an unreasonable burden upon public services and utilities.
- E. The proposed use will be in compliance with the regulations of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be located.

### **Conclusions:**

- A.1 The proposed use is of such location, size and character as to be compatible with the orderly development of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be situated.
- A.2 The proposed use will be compatible with the orderly development or use of adjacent zoning lots.
- A.3 Pedestrian circulation will not be hindered by the proposed use.
- A.4 Outdoor operations and display in connection with the proposed use will not burden and/or disrupt uses on adjacent properties.
- A.5 The natural and surrounding environment will not be negatively impacted by the proposed use.
- B. The proposed use will be within the capacity limitations of the existing or proposed public services and facilities which serve its proposed location.
- C. The proposed use will be conducive to fulfilling a gap in the geographic coverage of such services to Township residents.

### **Conditions:**

The conditions of this approval, which have considered the Planning Commission's ability to impose reasonable restrictions to ensure compliance with the performance standards established in the Zoning Ordinance, are as follows:

1. All comments will be addressed to the satisfaction of staff prior to final approval.
2. Staff may coordinate and finalize site plan details.

3. The Planning Commission reserves the right to modify or revoke this special approval following complaints, safety concerns, or site plan violations.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ROLL CALL VOTE**  
**(Ray/yes, Sintkowski/yes, Frasca/yes, Printz/yes, Bartolotta/yes)**  
**(5 - 0)**

VII. Discussions

1. Discuss Secretary Kramer's proposed text amendment regarding dwellings that are out of character with the surrounding neighborhood.

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Sintkowski*

*Supported by Frasca: Resolved to move this discussion to the next meeting.*

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY BY ROLL CALL VOTE**  
**(Ray/yes, Sintkowski/yes, Frasca/yes, Printz/yes, Bartolotta/yes)**  
**(5 - 0)**

VIII. Public Comment

IX. All Else

X. Adjourn the Meeting

Chairperson Ray adjourned the meeting at 7:56 p.m.

**Planning Commission Participation Guidelines:**

Members of the public will only be able to speak during the public comment period(s) provided during the meeting, unless otherwise permitted by the Chairperson. Public comments will be limited to three minutes per speaker. To provide for orderly public participation, a person wishing to speak must first state their name and address then request to be recognized by the Chairperson of the meeting. The Chairperson will recognize all persons wishing to speak during the public comment period. Prior to the meeting, members of the public may contact the members of the Planning Division to provide input or ask questions by email or mail to the Township employee/official and at the addresses listed below. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations to be able to participate in the meeting should provide at least 24-hour advance notice to the listed Township employee by phone, email, or mail and an attempt will be made to provide reasonable accommodations.

Jeffrey M. Polkowski, AICP  
Superintendent of Planning & Zoning  
5200 Civic Center Drive, Waterford, Michigan 48329  
Email: [planning@waterfordmi.gov](mailto:planning@waterfordmi.gov) Phone: (248) 674-6238

---

---

## Site Plans Currently Under Administrative Review

### Consent Agenda

Minor Site Plans	3
------------------	---

#### Site Plans

1.) Minor Site Plan No. PSP 23-1470, The Lakes Church Addition

Location: 1450 S Hospital Rd

Zoning: C-UL, Union Lake Business District

This applicant is proposing to build an addition to the south side of an existing church along with other site and landscaping improvements.

2.) Minor Site Plan No. PSP 23-1453, Red Wood Grill Outdoor Patio

Location: 7726 Cooley Lake Rd

Zoning: C-UL, Union Lake Business District

The applicant is proposing to build an outdoor dining patio.

3.) Minor Site Plan No. PSP 23-1471, Moda Subdivision

Location: 7280 Elizabeth Lake Rd

Zoning: R-1A, Single-Family Residential

The applicant is proposing to build 25 single-family site condominiums on an 8.8 acre piece of property.