

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
0  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
0  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
0  
1  
2  
3  
4

## 3

## 5

7  
80  
1  
2  
3  
4

6

8  
9

## 1

2

## 4

5  
6

## 8

90

## 2

3

## 5

6

## 8

9  
0

2  
3  
4

on site plans for phase 3, which brings them south into the O Ave parcel and buys their interest in this rezoning request. He noted they do not wish to create any conflict with the Abbey Farms development, so it may be in the best interest of all to consider leaving the land to the west of the rail in the current zoning ordinance and looking to rezone the land to the east of the rail only.

Scott Knowlton, representative for Abbey 42 and Abbey Farm Development Company. He noted Abbey Farm Development Company owns 145 acres to the north of what is currently being constructed as Abbey 42. He stated they do not have any objection to the rezoning to that which is east of the railroad tracks. He is also requesting the triangle piece, west of the rail and adjacent to Abbey 42, is to be left in the current zoning ordinance, as it serves as an appropriate buffer. Additionally, the land east of the rail would have truck access via N Ave, removing the concern for truck access on O Ave.

Greg Dilone stated since this is one parcel now, if consideration is made to rezone only part of the single parcel, legal language and the parcel split may need to occur. He questioned whether some type of conditional administrative approval could be completed today so that they may continue to put their best effort towards survey, etc., that need to be completed on their parcel.

Motion by Frizzo with support by VanDoren to close public hearing; motion passed.

Thall noted that the Planning Commission may make a recommendation to the Township Board to scale-back the rezoning request by removing the piece west of the railroad tracks from the request. It is not unusual to have split-zone parcels. There does not necessarily need to be a land division. In this case the railroad tracks make an easy divisible feature.

Chris Hamilton addressed the Planning Commission. She noted split-zone parcels are not usually desirable; however, in this situation there is a definitive dividing line by the railroad tracks, and therefore she does not see a problem with the split-zone request for this parcel.

Roberts noted that this split-parcel request would lead to an A-1 zone in the middle of two industrial zones. Thall noted the township can always elect to do something different with that triangle piece as well.

Thall noted that the Planning Commission received and discussed the re-zoning review notes by Jodi Stefforia, Planning Consultant, during the last meeting. Discussion incurred as to whether the request is in compliance with the Master Plan for future land use. Revision of the Master Plan can be updated every five years and changes can be made at that time. Road access was also a concern on O Ave. The applicant should advise on how they plan to access that parcel. This should be a consideration of the rezoning request and is better suited to be a point of discussion at this time.

Frizzo stated traffic on O Ave is his main concern with the request and asked if the plan is for the flow of traffic to be toward N Ave. Dilone responded that they acknowledge that over the road trucks is the biggest concern. He noted that southern access point from O Ave needs to be in their site plan. Capturing some of the current infrastructure, such as water access that is already in place, is beneficial moving development toward O Ave. Additionally, there is the need for fire or emergency services access from the south. Pedestrian traffic exiting there is also more desirable for their development plan. This exit point would obviously also entail adding

89 crossing signaling. Thall stated this can be reviewed at site plan review and suggested an option includes  
90 limiting the O Ave exit to employee vehicles. Dilone states the intention of this exit is not for truck traffic.  
91 Roberts stated O Ave will likely need to be redone in the future anyway due to the volume of new apartment  
92 development. Dilone states the year 2026 would likely be the earliest timeframe the road would extend down  
93 to O Ave.

94  
95 Roberts asked Dilone if the Road Commission has been contacted about traffic moving either way. Dilone  
96 stated yes, however the Road Commission had questions about volume expectations and with a speculative  
97 development, Industrial Partners USA, could not provide an answer at this time. Dilone also stated they are in  
98 contact with the railway.

99  
100 Frizzo noted concern about industrial zoning all the way to O Ave and stated R-5 continuation may be a better  
101 option all the way across the parcel as both a buffer and to keep industrial traffic off O Ave. Dilone noted he  
102 was unsure if there would be any benefit to having this zoned as residential vs industrial, as a road could still be  
103 carried through. Strzalkowski noted this would put restrictions on buildings, etc. that could be placed on that  
104 piece of land. Dilone stated that the largest benefit for them is to have the drive for emergency services. Thall  
105 stated they have already stated they are going to preserve the buffer and it would also be difficult for anyone  
106 to funnel industrial traffic across an A-1 property.

107  
108 Frizzo proposed moving forward with leaving the triangle property west of the rail as a buffer and as A-1  
109 zoning. Motion by Frizzo supported Northup by to make a recommendation to the Township Board to rezone  
110 the portion of the parcel northeast of the railroad tracks to I-2 and leave the portion of the parcel southwest of  
111 the railroad track as A-1; motion passed.

### 112 113 **Other Business**

114  
115 Election of 2024 Planning Commission offices.

116 Motion by Roberts supported by Frizzo to elect Northup as Chair; motion passed.

117 Motion by Roberts supported by Strzalkowski to elect Frizzo as Vice-Chair; motion passed.

118 Motion by Roberts supported by Northup to elect VanDoren as Secretary; motion passed.

119  
120 Roberts noted that with the new battery energy storage code, and availability of solar shingles, the Planning  
121 Commission may need to review for future use or impact. Thall stated with the new renewable energy  
122 legislation the Planning Commission may have to see how this impacts our current ordinances. The regulations  
123 do not go into effect until November 2024. There are opportunities to review the new legislation and  
124 determine if changes are warranted.

125  
126 Strzalkowski noted the Annual Report summary will be completed and emailed to the Planning Commission  
127 prior to the February Township Board meeting.

128  
129 Northup stated that Jodi Stefforia mentioned at the last meeting that she would create a plan to prioritize  
130 meeting topics for 2024. Plan to touch base on this at the next meeting. Thall noted the Master Plan will need  
131 to be reviewed this year.

132

133    **Adjournment**

134    The meeting was adjourned at 7:47 p.m.

135

136    Prepared by: Cori VanDoren

137    Minutes prepared: January 21, 2024

138    Minutes approved: \_\_\_\_\_, 2024

