

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

The October 9, 2012, meeting of the Charter Township of Oakland Board of Trustees was called to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Township Hall.

PRESENT: Joan Fogler, Supervisor
Judy Workings, Clerk
Sharon Creps, Treasurer
Michael Bailey, Trustee
Marc Edwards, Trustee
Sharon McKay, Trustee
Kathrine Thomas, Trustee
James Creech, Manager
Steve Joppich, Attorney
Larry Nix, Planning Consultant

ABSENT: None

A quorum was present.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Supervisor Fogler led the Board, staff and those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOVED BY BAILEY, SECONDED BY CREPS, to approve the minutes of the September 25, 2012, meeting with the following corrections: on page 81 under “Citizens – Blossom Ridge – Request to Place ‘On Hold,’” the first paragraph, fourth line should read, “...free of suspicion of unfairness.” Residents have identified on numerous occasions concerns of conflicts of interest, suspicions of impropriety, and lack of civility associated with the Board of Trustees and the Planning Commission. Documentation of these concerns is included in the letter. It goes on to request...” The minor typographical errors on page 82 (same heading, first paragraph, first line should read, “...he feels meetings have been conducted...” and on page 87 (“Trustee Edwards’s Report – Whims Lane Special Assessment District,” fifth line should read “...However, he as he will be leaving...” should also be corrected.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

MOTION CARRIED (Abstention: Thomas).

AMENDMENTS TO AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Clerk Workings suggested placing the Blossom Ridge item following the public comment section. Supervisor Fogler asked the Board to add an item to consider extension of Adams Road temporary easement time periods associated with compensation for the Adams Road corridor project.

Clerk Workings asked that the Board consider removal of the Closed Session from this meeting's agenda. The agenda reflects that the closed session is for the purpose of discussing labor negotiations and personnel evaluations. Manager Creech said he does not have any information to update the Board on regarding the labor negotiations. However, there is still the matter of the personnel evaluation. Clerk Workings said she feels it is inappropriate for the Board to consider this matter at this time as the contract the Board is being asked to renew does not expire until December of 2013.

Supervisor Fogler and Trustee Edwards disagreed, stating that they feel there are matters that need to be discussed this evening during the Closed Session.

MOVED BY WORKINGS, SECONDED BY BAILEY, to remove the Closed Session from this evening's agenda.

MOTION CARRIED (Nays: Fogler, Edwards).

MOVED BY BAILEY, SECONDED BY THOMAS, to additionally revise this evening's agenda by placing the Blossom Ridge application for Special Accommodation Use following the Citizens section of the agenda, and to add an item to consider extension of Adams Road temporary easement time periods associated with compensation for the Adams Road corridor project.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CITIZENS

Supervisor Fogler invited those present to comment at this time on an item that is not on this evening's agenda. Further, she stated that if someone wishes to comment on an item that is on this evening's agenda, they may do so at an appropriate time when the Board is considering that item.

Millrace

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

Jan Olson of 4190 Orion Road recalled that in September of 2011 the Board approved the Agreement Providing Permission and Consent to Enter onto Township Property to Undertake the Paint Creek Dam Removal Project. Mrs. Olson questioned if this work has been completed. Manager Creech responded that he believes there is still a minor punch list of items to be completed. Supervisor Fogler said Anne Vaara of the Clinton River Watershed Council (“CRWC”) will notify the Township when this work is complete, and Supervisor Fogler said she will have staff contact Mrs. Olson.

Mrs. Olson noted that one of the contingencies of the Board’s approval was that the Clinton River Watershed Council would pursue grant and other funding opportunities for removal of the sediment in the Mill Race. She asked if the CRWC has applied for any grants. Supervisor Fogler said that she has spoken with Ms. Vaara on other matters, but not regarding the grants. She said she would do this tomorrow. Mrs. Olson asked that Supervisor Fogler do this by written communication.

SPECIAL ACCOMMODATION USE: Blossom Ridge

The developer (Moceri/DM Investments, LLC and Four Stars, LLC) submitted a request, brought under section 16.15.00 of the Zoning Ordinance, regarding a Special Accommodation Use, for review of their plans for the proposed senior housing development known as Blossom Ridge. The development is proposed to be located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Adams Road and Dutton Road.

In order for an application to be considered under this provision of the Zoning Ordinance, an applicant must satisfy specific requirements set forth in the Ordinance. One of those requirements is that the Supervisor hold a public hearing (which was held on September 26, 2012). Following the public hearing, the Supervisor may make a recommendation to the Board.

At this time, Supervisor Fogler read her recommendation, which recommends that the Board approve the Special Accommodation Use application for Blossom Ridge.

Trustee Edwards proposed a motion. He stated that he consulted with Township Attorney Joppich, Manager Creech and Planning Consultant Larry Nix in the formulation of the motion. He said that, while he feels this matter will eventually end up in a legal battle, he feels that Blossom Ridge qualifies for review under the Special Accommodation Use provision of the Zoning Ordinance. Trustee Edwards read the motion in its entirety, and also had it projected on a screen for those in attendance to view.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

MOVED BY EDWARDS, SECONDED BY CREPS, to adopt the following resolution and addendum:

Whereas:

1. Blossom Ridge is a proposed **residential** development designed to serve the needs of the elderly and handicapped located at the Northwest corner of Adams and Dutton in Oakland Township.
2. The Developer of Blossom Ridge, Mocer/DM Investments L.L.C. and Four Stars L.L.C., has submitted an Application for Special Accommodation Under 16.15.00 of the Oakland Township Zoning Ordinance.
3. The Board has received and considered the recommendation of Supervisor Joan Fogler.
4. The Board has also reviewed (i) Developer's Application for Special Accommodation and its supporting materials, (ii) written materials submitted by the general public, both for and against Blossom Ridge, (iii) the report of the Township Planner, Williams & Works, concerning the Special Accommodation Application, (iv) the report of independent planner Paul LaBlanc concerning the Special Accommodation Application, (v) the Developer's plans, studies, reports and other materials provided to or obtained by the Township in the course of the Developer's previous request for an RM and PRRO Zoning Amendment, including the reports of outside consultants, (vi) the previous recommendation of the Township Planning Commission dated February 7, 2012, (vii) the Planned Residential Rezoning Overlay Agreement dated September 7, 2012, previously signed between the Township Supervisor and Clerk on behalf of the Township and the Developer, and (viii) the concept approval of the Blossom Ridge plans given October 2, 2012, by the Planning Commission subject to the reports submitted to the Planning Commission by the Township's planning, engineering, and environmental consultants (Williams and Works, ASTI and PEA).
5. Blossom Ridge will serve elderly residents, many of whom will require daily medical assistance, may have limited mobility, need to remain close to medical care or need assistance with daily activities, including taking medications, bathing, dressing, physical therapy, respiratory therapy, blood pressure testing, glucose testing and logging, medical consultations, and emotional and psychological counseling, and Blossom Ridge is designed and located to meet each of these needs.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

6. The elderly and disabled need services which cannot be provided effectively or affordably to people living far apart in large homes on large lots, and the proposed 238 unit community will contain an appropriate variety, number, size and configuration of living units to permit a concentration of residents and achieve economies of scale to serve residents appropriately and so that no resident must leave the building or travel a burdensome length of corridors to reach the dining and other communal facilities.
7. The Township currently has no land and no zoning district which is zoned to permit the development of multi-family housing. The Zoning Ordinance has a RM zoning category, but no land is designated as a district in that category, and the Township currently has no zoning category and no land zoned to permit development of housing for the elderly and handicapped within a viable multi-density, age in place community with services to the elderly and handicapped like the proposed design of Blossom Ridge.
8. While the Township Board recently adopted zoning ordinance amendments to establish RM and PRRO zoning for Blossom Ridge, those amendments have been blocked by a petition for referendum and as of the present date that rezoning is not effective, and the Township continues to have no specific ordinance provision existing and available to provide the relief sought by the Developer's Application of Special Accommodation.
9. The Board has addressed and considered the requirements of each of the subsections of Section 16.15.02 of the Township Special Accommodation Ordinance as more fully described in the Addendum attached to and submitted with this Motion, and Board finds that the proposed Blossom-Ridge Development satisfies the criteria of Sections 16.15.02 of the Township's Special Accommodation Ordinance.
10. The Board finds that the Developer has submitted to the Township the information requested under Section 16.15.03 of the Special Accommodation Ordinance.

Therefore:

- A. The Board hereby approves a special accommodation for the proposed Blossom Ridge elderly and handicapped housing development pursuant to Section 16.15.00 of the Oakland Township Ordinances on the condition that Blossom Ridge is developed substantially in accordance with the following:

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

- a. The plans recommended by the Oakland Township Planning Commission as modified, improved upon and previously approved by this Board plans approved by the Township Board in the course of the Board's approval of RM and PRRO zoning for the Blossom Ridge site.
 - b. The Planned Residential Rezoning Overlay Agreement dated September 7, 2012 heretofore signed between the Township and the Developer, specifically Paragraphs 1 through 19, inclusive, including without limitation Paragraph 3(j) of such Agreement stating that **nursing homes and memory care facilities are not permitted uses in Blossom Ridge.**
 - c. The Concept Plan which the Planning Commission approved subject to the Township planning, engineering and environmental consultants' reports submitted to the Planning Commission by Williams & Works, ASTI, and PEA, at the Planning Commission's October 2, 2012 meeting.
- B. Further, the Township Supervisor, Township Manager, Building Department and Township Engineer are authorized and directed to issue administratively the necessary permits for construction of Blossom Ridge subject to the terms and stipulations of the approval stated above and otherwise conditioned only upon fair and reasonable administrative approval of engineering and architectural plans, submission and administrative approval of a tree replacement plan under Ordinance 60, and the Developer obtaining permits from relevant State of Michigan and Oakland County agencies, and payment of the appropriate fees.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

ADDENDUM TO MOTION

A. ~~Section 16.15.02(a) reads:~~

- (a) ~~The ultimate residential user or users of the property shall be persons for whom state or federal law mandates the Township to make reasonable accommodations in connection with proposed uses of land; and,~~

~~— Blossom Ridge will provide housing in substantial part for persons defined as disabled under Federal and State fair housing laws. Developer has designed and will build, operate and market Blossom Ridge to persons fifty-five (55) years of age or older in accordance with the standards applicable to senior housing under applicable Federal law.~~

~~— Blossom Ridge will cater to elderly residents who require daily medical assistance, have limited mobility, need to remain close to medical care or need assistance with daily activities, including taking medications, bathing, dressing, physical therapy, medical consultations, and emotional and psychological counseling.~~

~~In addition to disabled persons, Blossom Ridge will include non-disabled elderly who choose Blossom Ridge because they may contemplate being disabled in the proximate future or because their spouses, siblings and significant others are disabled. Blossom Ridge will offer a "continuum of care" accommodating all of the aforementioned groups.~~

~~The Board finds that the ultimate residential user or users of Blossom Ridge will be person(s) for whom state or federal law, specifically the Federal Fair Housing Amendments Act of 1988, mandates the Township to make reasonable accommodations in connection with proposed uses of land. Ordinance 16.15.02(a).~~

B. ~~Section 16.15.12(b) reads:~~

- (b) ~~Taking into consideration the needs, facts, and circumstances which exist throughout the community, and within the population to be served by the use, including financial and other conditions, making the proposed reasonable accommodation shall be necessary to afford such persons equal~~

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

~~opportunity to the proposed use and enjoyment within the community; and,~~

~~—An age in place, continuum of care, mixed density community for the elderly and handicapped requires relatively small, close together, independent living units and an assisted living building of sufficient height and length to allow residents close and convenient indoor access to the central dining and other social and health related facilities.~~

~~The Township currently has no zoning category that would allow a nursing home or an assisted living facility and no land designated even for elderly housing or even multi-family use. Blossom Ridge will fill that void and make it possible for the elderly who need special assistance and those who may need such assistance in the proximate future to enjoy residential opportunities in Oakland Township equal to the opportunity given the younger, healthier citizens.~~

~~The services the disabled need cannot be provided effectively or affordably to people living far apart in large homes on large lots. Blossom Ridge's smaller sized homes and its density allow for the community to be economically viable to provide the services needed by the residents. Applying zoning requirements of large homes and lots or unit sizes not only potentially prevents disabled residents from being able to walk to or even go to care, it makes a community that would provide these needed services financially impractical.~~

~~The Board finds that the proposed accommodation is necessary to afford the elderly and handicapped an equal opportunity to the proposed use and enjoyment within the community. Ordinance 16.15.02(b).~~

~~C. Section 16.15.02(c) reads:~~

~~(e) — Approval of the proposed housing shall not require or will not likely result in a fundamental alteration in the nature of the land use district and neighborhood in which the property is situated, considering cumulative impact of one or more other uses and activities in, or likely to be in, the area, and shall not impose undue financial and administrative burden. The interests of the community shall be balanced against the need for accommodation on a case-by-case basis.~~

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

~~———— The Blossom Ridge design has been studied, discussed, reported on, revised and studied, revised and studied again and again for more than a year. The Township’s planning consultant, the Township Planning Commission, and the Township Board have all concluded, expressly or by implication, that Blossom Ridge in its proposed location away from the rural parts of the Township and with its large open space and buffers will conform to the Township master plan, will indeed be built on a site specifically designated for senior housing in the master plan, will not adversely affect natural features, infrastructure and surrounding properties, will meet the PRRO stipulation that it be less dense than would be permitted under RM zoning, will meet industry standards, will generate less of an impact on the Township per unit compared to a single family development, and will provide a public benefit by providing a locally needed housing option enabling current and senior Township residents to remain in the community after they are no longer able fully to take care of themselves and a large single family home.~~

~~———— The Board finds that the approval of Blossom Ridge will not require or likely result in a fundamental alteration in the nature and land use district in which it will be situated. Ordinance 16.15.02(e).~~

~~D. — Section 16.15.02(d) reads:~~

~~(d) — No other specific ordinance provision exists and is available to provide the relief sought.~~

~~———— The Township Zoning Ordinances contain no zoning category or district which permits mixed density multi-family zoning or otherwise accommodates the needs of the elderly or handicapped or makes possible the special health and other services they need to live on a par with other citizens. The master plan is not zoning. The possibility of PRRO zoning is not zoning.~~

~~———— The Board finds that no other specific ordinance provision exists and is available to provide the relief sought in the Application.~~

(The Board entertained discussion on this matter, including input from those present. The vote on this motion can be found on page 104, below.)

Discussion

Trustee Bailey referred to paragraph 9 of the motion, which states, “The Board has addressed and considered the requirements of each of the subsections of the Section 16.15.02 of the Township Special Accommodation Ordinance as more fully described in the Addendum attached to and submitted with this Motion, and the Board finds that the

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

proposed Blossom Ridge development satisfies the criteria...” He said he does not feel this is a true statement.

Clerk Workings pointed to paragraph 8, which refers to the petition for referendum. She stated that the petition signatures are still being verified, so it is not yet known if the petition for referendum will be valid.

Trustee Edwards commented that he is not asking the Board to approve or deny the Blossom Ridge development, as the Board has already done this. Rather, the Board needs to consider whether or not there is a protected class, and if review under the Special Accommodation Use provision is required. He said he feels that the elderly do fall within a protected class. He explained that he believes a large number of elderly people are no longer able to do things that they once could (such as take care of their homes). Therefore, he feels that Special Accommodation Use application approval is appropriate.

Trustee Thomas asked what percentage of those who would be living in Blossom Ridge could be considered handicapped in order to meet the criteria for consideration under the Special Accommodation Use provision. Trustee Edwards responded that it would be discriminating to inquire about the percentage of residents that would be handicapped versus non-handicapped. Rather, he said the Board must look at whether or not the need for this sort of housing exists in Oakland Township.

Dominic Mocerri of 3499 Mocerri Court was present along with his parents and brothers. He said his family is committed to this community. Mr. Mocerri clarified that his parents are in fact the applicants, and he is acting as their agent. He addressed Trustee Thomas’s question and stated that there is no “percentage” of protected persons to be established, as this would be in violation of the Fair Housing Act. He then referred to page 6 of the Special Accommodation Use application, which contains definitions of disabilities and impairments that qualify a person as a member of a protected class. Mr. Mocerri read the list of impairments (including orthopedic, visual, speech, hearing impairments, cancer, heart disease, diabetes), and stated that this list is from the Department of Housing and Urban Development as well as the Department of Justice.

Mr. Mocerri continued that all of the units are 100 percent ADA compliant and barrier-free, including the ranch and duet units. Residents will be able to use the transportation service to go to doctor appointments or shopping, they may go to the Blossom Park building for dining, or go to the clubhouse building for water aerobics in the pool or physical therapy. Mr. Mocerri stated that this is not a nursing home, but rather a place for health and wellness.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

He continued that it is illegal for a housing provider to determine the qualifications or degree of disability of a resident. It is also illegal for the Township to place a minimum percentage of “protected” persons to reside in the senior housing facility as this would violate the Fair Housing Act. Mr. Mocerri said he anticipates that the majority of residents will be over 65 years. He feels some confusion may stem from a provision in the Fair Housing Act that addresses a situation where there is a married couple and the elderly spouse dies leaving their spouse who is below the minimum required age for the facility. In this situation, the younger spouse is allowed to continue to reside in the housing facility. Additionally, it addresses the situation where there is a care provider (e.g., for emotional support, glucose testing, etc.), and this care provider is permitted to reside with the elderly person.

He said the Township Board had vision and wisdom when, in 1999, they adopted the Special Accommodation Use provision of the Zoning Ordinance to provide protection to its elderly residents and their families.

Frank Ferriolo of 5600 Kirkridge Trail asked for clarification regarding the use of the proposed senior housing facility. While Mr. Mocerri has indicated that this will not be a nursing home, Mr. Ferriolo pointed to paragraph 5 of Trustee Edwards’s motion, which indicates that many of the residents “...will require daily medical assistance...and Blossom Ridge is designed ...to meet each of these needs...” Trustee Edwards responded that there will not be skilled nursing care on staff at the housing facility, although residents would not be precluded from calling in skilled nursing care. Trustee Thomas explained that “skilled nursing” is a situation where a patient needs around-the-clock care.

Mr. Ferriolo also questioned paragraph 8 of Trustee Edwards’s motion, which reflects that the RM and PRRO zoning amendments recently approved by the Board have been “...blocked by a petition for referendum and as of the present date that rezoning is not effective...” Mr. Ferriolo questioned how to interpret this. He suggested that instead of approving a Special Accommodation Use application at this time, it would be better to wait for the outcome of the referendum. If the referendum fails, it will not be an issue to consider the Special Accommodation Use application. If the referendum is successful, then the Special Accommodation Use provision is available. He said this Special Accommodation Use application should not be used as a way to “get around the referendum.”

Mr. Ferriolo objected to the fact that the proposed main building is larger than is permitted under the Township’s ordinances, and said that many of the residents who signed the petition for referendum are concerned about this. Residents want Oakland Township to stay rural.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

Trustee Edwards responded to Mr. Ferriolo's question regarding paragraph 8. He said that the Special Accommodation Use provision has always been available to the applicant, but Mr. Mocerri instead decided to go through the Planning Commission review process. Had the developer used the Special Accommodation Use provision initially, the plans would have been approved administratively and would never have gone to the Planning Commission.

Attorney Joppich also responded to Mr. Ferriolo's concerns regarding the ordinance standards and paragraph 8 of Trustee Edwards's motion. First, he clarified that Trustee Edwards consulted with him regarding aspects of the motion, but that Attorney Joppich did not draft any part of the motion that was presented this evening. He then stated that paragraph 8 addresses the standards for approval that are set forth in the Zoning Ordinance at section 16.15.02. Subsection (d) requires that no other specific ordinance provision exists or is available to provide the relief sought. This section of Trustee Edwards's motion comes to the conclusion that, because the PRRO-RM rezoning ordinance that was adopted by this Board is under review for a referendum vote and has therefore not become effective, there is no other relief available under the ordinance. Residents have argued that the PRRO section of the ordinance exists, the developer sought relief under that section, and is still going through that process, so therefore relief under this section is still available. Attorney Joppich said it is ultimately up to the Board to evaluate this and decide if this standard has been satisfied.

Attorney Joppich continued that Trustee Thomas expressed concerns about Section 16.15.02(a), regarding whether this is for the purpose of providing housing for individuals who are entitled to reasonable accommodation under Federal law. The developer has present arguments to demonstrate why the residents are entitled to special accommodation. However, it is up to the Board to evaluate this and decide if this standard has been satisfied.

Jan Gamble of 5890 Westchester Court asked if custodial care (which, she explained, is helping to feed people, assisting people with memory loss, caring for people who need diapering, etc.) will be provided, noting that this is not considered "skilled nursing." Supervisor Fogler said this type of care will not be permitted, and referenced the proposed motion on page 2 under "Therefore" at paragraph A(b), which states that "nursing homes and memory care facilities are not permitted uses in Blossom Ridge." Attorney Joppich added that this is a restriction that the applicant himself requested. Mr. Mocerri noted that this restriction was included in the PRRO Agreement at paragraph 3(j). Attorney Joppich stated that the PRRO Agreement was negotiated by both parties and was voluntarily entered into. Mr. Mocerri concurred.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

Trustee Edwards commented that his proposed motion, if approved, would bind the applicant to the plans and specifics that were developed through many months of study at the Planning Commission, and that were then included in the PRRO Agreement.

Joan Buser spoke next. Mrs. Buser is a former Oakland Township resident, and served as Oakland Township Supervisor for many years. She stated that she feels the Township has thoroughly reviewed the proposed Blossom Ridge development, addressed the concerns of the residents, and approved the PRRO rezoning. Approval of the Special Accommodation Use application would carry with it all the restrictions of the PRRO. While the Master Plan shows two other areas in the Township for this use, they are not practical sites as they are not serviced by sanitary sewer. If the Board denies this development, and if there is no other reasonable accommodation for senior housing (and seniors are a protected class), then it would potentially leave the Township unprotected from federal sanctions.

John Giannangeli of 5846 Murfield Drive questioned if the Special Accommodation Use application presents a new plan, or if this is the same plan that the Board approved through the PRRO provision. Mr. Giannangeli said that if this is a new plan, he has concerns about an evacuation plan – particularly for residents on the third floor. He wondered if the Township has done its due diligence in considering safety plans for a facility that is proposed to house disabled residents. Finally, he stated that he does not believe that the federal law requires a structure of the dimensions proposed in order to accommodate a protected class. Trustee Edwards responded that the plan submitted under the Special Accommodation Use application is the same as was previously submitted.

George Googasian of 3750 Orion Road was present. He said he moved to Oakland Township approximately 40 years ago with three young children, whom he raised in the Township. As an attorney, he has spent most of his professional life representing the elderly, disabled, disadvantaged and those “without a voice.” He said he intends to continue to support those people in his own community, and said he feels approval of the developer’s plan is the correct and appropriate thing to do.

Mr. Googasian continued that the Township’s Special Accommodation Use provision of the Zoning Ordinance allows the Township to legally “grant a particular favor” when there is something needed. He said the Fair Housing Act considers seniors and disabled people to be a protected class. He believes that no one should be denied the opportunity, because of a disability, to live where they want to live. Blossom Ridge will allow those who are seniors and/or disabled – those who need “special accommodations” – to live in Oakland Township.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

In his opinion, if the Township were to deny the developer's application, it would have the effect of denying this protected class of people the opportunity to live in Oakland Township. As such, it would violate state and federal laws, equal protection, and the due process clause of the Constitution. Therefore, Mr. Googasian said he feels that approval of the developer's plan is the correct action.

Craig Blust of 2222 W. Gunn Road said that even if the Board chooses to review this plan under the Special Accommodation Use provision, it does not meet the requirement of minimum intensity to meet the accommodation. Next, he questioned how approval of the motion presented this evening would tie the developer to the restrictions included in the PRRO Agreement. Mr. Blust noted that the Board has not had much time to consider this matter, and suggested that the Board table any action to allow them to become more familiar with the issues. Alternately, it may be better to table a decision on this until after the referendum. He does not want the Board to rush through this decision.

Jan Olson of 4190 Orion Road recalled that Mr. Mocerri has repeatedly stated that there are numerous houses in Oakland Township that are three stories tall. She said she believes he is referring to the back sides of houses with a walk-out basement. In contrast, the main building proposed for Blossom Ridge is a full three stories tall (no walk-out). She does not feel it is fair to compare these. Mrs. Olson said she is also concerned about whether or not Oakland Township would have the ability to respond to an emergency on the third floor of the senior housing facility as Oakland Township does not own equipment that can reach to this height.

Francis Hughes of 3842 N. Ellamae Road said that the Zoning Ordinance requires a minimum unit size of 800 square feet. However, the Blossom Ridge plans include units that are 650 square feet. Mr. Hughes said handicapped people often have two wheelchairs and other pieces of equipment, and need an open area for doing exercises. He does not feel this need is being adequately addressed by the small unit sizes. Mr. Hughes continued that he is opposed to a three-story building. In his opinion, the main building should be limited to two stories with 168 units, each unit a minimum of 800 square feet.

Gregory Need, an attorney with the firm of Adkinson, Need & Allen in Bloomfield Hills stated that he was appearing on behalf of several concerned residents. He said he takes issue with paragraph 8 of Trustee Edwards's motion. He feels there are other provisions of the Zoning Ordinance that are available for relief (namely the PRRO rezoning process). Until the final decision is made on that application, the Special Accommodation Use application is premature, should not be considered and should be tabled until the referendum process is complete. He referred to the letter dated October 7,

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

2012, from Robin Buxar, et al to the Board and stated that this letter enumerates a number of other defects in the Special Accommodation use application.

He continued that his clients are not opposed to senior housing as a concept, but rather are opposed to the density and design of this project as set forth in their letters. Regarding discrimination, Mr. Need said the federal government requires reasonable accommodation for the disabled and those protected under the Fair Housing Act and the Americans with Disabilities Act. However, it does not require that any particular density or design be approved.

Mr. Need concluded by stating that if the Board approves the Special Accommodations Use application this evening, he feels this action would be illegal. In this case, his clients have directed him to file suit in Oakland County Circuit Court against the Township and possibly any Board member who votes in favor of the Special Accommodation Use. He again urged the Board to table this matter until the referendum process is complete, and added that the Board could consider the Special Accommodation Use application at that time.

Joe Langlois of 490 W. Snell Road reiterated what many others have said this evening, namely that he is not against senior citizens, senior housing, the disabled or housing for the disabled.

He recalled that a year ago he stood before this Board regarding the proposed removal of the Paint Creek dam. He felt that the Board was not adequately informed to make a decision at that time. However, Trustee Edwards proposed a motion, and enough of the Board voted in favor of the motion that the motion passed and the project moved forward. The removal of the dam has been a “disaster,” in his opinion.

Mr. Langlois pointed to the parallels in the Blossom Ridge matter and said he would like to avoid another “disaster.” He cautioned that the motion being offered this evening by Trustee Edwards was drafted by him and not by the Township’s attorney. He said it does not appear that the Board has experience dealing with this section of the Zoning Ordinance, and said it is important that the Board fully understand it before they take action. He referred to Section 16.15.02(d), which he said reflects that the Special Accommodation Use provision is only available if there is no other relief available. However, relief *is* available under the PRRO process. For this reason, Mr. Langlois said he feels the Board needs to wait until the referendum process is complete before they may consider the Special Accommodation Use application.

Mr. Langlois asked Attorney Joppich regarding section 16.15.07 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding effective approval, which reflects that approval of a Special Accommodation

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

Use shall be *solely* for the benefit of the particular class of users who are the basis for requiring the Township to make a reasonable accommodation under applicable state and/or federal law and not for the benefit of any other persons. Attorney Joppich explained that this provision of the ordinance deals with the effect of the approval, and is also somewhat reiterated in the other sections that identify the standards to be applied by the Board in making its decisions. One of those is 16.15.02(a), regarding the beneficiaries of the approval. He noted that he commented on this in his privileged legal opinion to the Board, and it is referenced in the motion that is on the floor. Attorney Joppich said the Board will have to decide if they agree with the conclusions as set forth in the proposed motion. Attorney Joppich observed that Trustee Thomas raised the issue of how many of the people to be housed in this development will be handicapped and entitled to reasonable accommodations or otherwise.

Trustee Edwards stated that he has worked on the Blossom Ridge plan for close to two years. While he feels the Special Accommodation Use option was always available to the developer, he also feels the developer handled the matter correctly by taking the plan through the traditional Planning Commission review process. Trustee Edwards said he feels the developer deserves a decision this evening.

Don Buser is a former Oakland Township resident. He said he has only attended two of the meetings where Blossom Ridge was addressed, but he has observed that there is a “vocal group” that is opposed to a senior housing community in Oakland Township. The residents have objected to the size of the building, but Mr. Buser said it is no larger than many other buildings in the Township. Mr. Buser continued that he feels the developer has proposed this design to meet the needs of the residents (including that they will not have to go outside in the bad weather in order to reach dining and other facilities), and noted that the Mocerri developments are, in his opinion, the most beautiful in the Township.

Mr. Buser continued that, by moving forward with the Blossom Ridge senior housing development, Oakland Township will provide for the welfare and comfort of a group of citizens that needs special consideration. He feels that Blossom Ridge will be an enhancement to the community and that one day many of those present this evening will be happy that a community like Blossom Ridge exists.

Marty McQuade of 5605 Murfield Drive said that the issue is not whether or not anyone likes the design of Blossom Ridge. Rather, it is a matter of law, and he feels that the application does not meet the requirements set forth for approval of a Special Accommodation Use application as set forth in the Zoning Ordinance.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

Mr. McQuade added that Trustee Edwards continues to state that the applicant could have applied at any time to use the Special Accommodation Use process. Mr. McQuade feels this is incorrect because it would not have met the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance (i.e., the PRRO process was available). Attorney Joppich commented that it is up to the Board to decide if this requirement has been met. He has shared his opinions with the Board in his privileged attorney-client communication.

Carolyn Phelps said that she and her husband have lived on Collins Road for 56 years, they raised their children here, and she has lived in the Township for 70 of her 77 years. She served as Clerk for 28 years, and as such is aware of the detailed and thorough reviews that are required by the Township. Over the years, she has seen growth and change in the Township. She is grateful to have been able to contribute to the development of the Township's ordinances so that they will allow for the inevitable growth that is orderly, reasonable, compassionate and environmentally concerned. However, the ordinances also must reflect state and federal law.

She applauded the Planning Commission and Board of Trustees for approving Blossom Ridge after holding numerous public hearings and reviews over more than 18 months.

Mrs. Phelps stated that the concerns of the residents have been addressed. Traffic studies reflect that the traffic generated by this development at peak times will be less than the amount of traffic generated by a regular subdivision at this site. The height and width of the main building is compatible with the surrounding area based on the plain view of several houses on Adams Road that are taller and wider than any building proposed in Blossom Ridge. The approved berming plan will screen all buildings from view both on Adams Road and Dutton Road. The number of units has been significantly reduced by the developer to accommodate residents' concerns. She noted that Oakland Township does not currently offer senior housing, but that federal law has specifically carved out a housing opportunity to assist elderly persons. Finally, she encouraged the Board to approve the Special Accommodation Use application for Blossom Ridge. She said she is a senior citizen and she is in support of the development.

Dean Watson of 5763 Wellwood Drive asked Supervisor Fogler if she would want to live in Blossom Ridge. Mrs. Fogler responded that she would, and that she may even put her house on the market once the Blossom Ridge development starts.

Beth Markle of 245 Birch Hill Drive said that she is adamantly opposed to Blossom Ridge because the plans seek to gain permission to do things that are beyond the parameters of "what Oakland Township is all about." She said she and her husband moved here 10 years ago because Oakland Township was rural and charming, but these qualities are being lost. She once enjoyed the Paint Creek Cider Mill, millrace and water wheel, but since the Board permitted the dam to be removed, the millrace and wheel are

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

“dead.” Mrs. Markle said Blossom Ridge is yet another example of a plan being “rammed through” the approval process. She suggested that the Board listen to the voices of the 1,904 residents who signed the petition seeking a referendum vote on this matter.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

Vote on Motion

At this time, Supervisor Fogler called for a vote on the motion (which appears starting on page 91.)

AYES: Fogler, Creps, Edwards
NAYS: Workings, Bailey, McKay, Thomas
ABSENT: None
MOTION FAILS.

Trustee Thomas said that the PRRO rezoning of the property will allow senior citizen housing, and the Township is in need of this. However, she feels it is premature for the Board to take any action on the Special Accommodation Use application while the referendum is still pending. She wants to let the electorate decide if they are in favor of or opposed to the PRRO rezoning for Blossom Ridge. Therefore, she recommended that the Board table consideration of the Special Accommodation Use application until after the referendum to see if this is even necessary.

MOVED BY THOMAS, SECONDED BY WORKINGS, that the Board determines that the Township will postpone consideration of the Blossom Ridge development under the Special Accommodations Use provision of the Zoning Ordinance, with the understanding that such consideration will only occur if the approval of the development granted by the PRRO rezoning is invalidated by the electorate of Oakland Township, thus removing the other recognized ordinance provision available to approve the development without needing to use the Special Accommodations Use provision. *The postponement of this matter shall be until the referendum on the PRRO rezoning is exhausted, at which time the Board will again consider the Special Accommodations Use application.*

Discussion

In response to a question from Trustee Edwards, Attorney Joppich stated that at this time the Board has not made any findings of fact or determinations regarding any denial of consideration of the developer's request to use the Special Accommodation Use provision of the Zoning Ordinance, or regarding which provisions have not been satisfied. Trustee Thomas confirmed that her motion does address the requirement found at subsection 16.15.02(d) of the Zoning Ordinance, which refers to other existing provisions of the Zoning Ordinance for plan approval, and that she is looking for a resolution under the referendum before the Board considers the Special Accommodation Use application.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

Attorney Joppich suggested that Trustee Thomas postpone consideration of the Special Accommodations Use application until a date certain. Trustee Thomas said she intended that the Board not address the Special Accommodation Use application until the referendum on the PRRO rezoning is resolved, and agreed to amend her motion to clarify it in that regard. Clerk Workings concurred with the revision to the motion (see above, last sentence, in italics).

Vote on Motion

AYES: Fogler, Workings, Creps, Bailey, ~~Edwards~~, McKay, Thomas

NAYS: ~~None~~ Edwards

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC HEARING: 2013 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT

Each year, participating communities may apply to Oakland County to receive Community Development Block Grant (hereinafter “CDBG”) funds for the upcoming program year. Funds may be used for approved purposes only, but such purposes include services or capital improvements that will help low to moderate income residents, as well as handicapped persons. In past years, Oakland Township has allocated CDBG funds to organizations such as HAVEN, Rochester Area Neighborhood House, and Oakland Livingston Human Services Agency (“OLHSA” provides minor repairs to mobile homes). Oakland Township has also used CDBG funds to make ADA accessibility improvements, and to purchase a van for the Rochester Area Neighborhood House.

It is estimated that Oakland Township will receive approximately \$18,436 (down slightly from last year’s \$18,930) in CDBG funds for the 2013 project year. Manager Creech stated that in the past Oakland Township has split these funds between two or three recipients. Last year, the public service percentage was not sufficient to allow for a second recipient for this category, so Oakland Township chose to allocate monies from the General Fund to a second entity. He said the final percentages for the public service recipients will be made available shortly.

Supervisor Fogler called the public hearing to order at 8:45 p.m. for the purpose of receiving comments and input on proposed uses for the 2013 program year Community Development Block Grant allocation.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

David Sobol was present on behalf of HAVEN. He stated that he has worked as a volunteer for HAVEN for six years. HAVEN maintains a 24-hour shelter; offers counseling, education and crisis intervention; manages a Personal Protection Order office for victims; and provides other services to victims of domestic violence and sexual assault. Mr. Sobol explained that these services are funded in part by private donations, and in part by public funds. Last year, HAVEN helped 30 Oakland Township residents (including five crisis situations). He asked the Board to consider HAVEN for the 2013 CDBG program year.

Linda Riggs was present on behalf of the Rochester Area Neighborhood House. She said that the needs of the community have risen over the last years. She explained that Neighborhood House maintains a food pantry and clothes closet. They also have a transportation program, which provides transportation services to low to moderate income citizens, the elderly and the disabled in Oakland Township and surrounding communities. She noted that Neighborhood House collaborates and coordinates with other area service providers to make sure that their services are not being duplicated and that all needs are met. Ms. Riggs asked that the Board consider Neighborhood House for the 2013 CDBG program year.

Manager Creech said that he has not heard from a representative from OLHSA, but in the past Oakland Township has allocated funds to their program.

There being no further comments or questions, Supervisor Fogler closed the public hearing at 8:52 p.m. The Board will make a decision regarding allocation of CDBG funds at a future meeting.

OAKLAND COUNTY SHERIFF'S CONTRACT

The Board reviewed the proposed Oakland County Sheriff's Office 2013-2015 Law Enforcement Services Agreement with the Charter Township of Oakland. The current contract expires on December 31, 2012 (after the new Board is seated). Manager Creech recalled that the previous three years were only one-year contracts. However, the contract being considered this evening will be a three-year contract.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

Trustee Bailey questioned how the cost of services compares with what other municipalities are paying. Manager Creech responded that he compared the costs with Macomb County and found that the Oakland County prices are less.

In response to a question from Trustee Thomas, Attorney Joppich said that there are still some provisions in the standardized Oakland County agreement that he is not happy with, but said he will again raise these issues in anticipation of the next contract renewal.

MOVED BY BAILEY, SECONDED BY McKAY, to approve the Oakland County Sheriff's Office 2013-2015 Law Enforcement Services Agreement with the Charter Township of Oakland as presented, with the understanding that this contract will remain in effect until December 31, 2015.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ORDINANCE NO. 37-A: HISTORIC DISTRICT ORDINANCE

The Board held the second reading of the proposed amendments to Ordinance No. 37-A, the Historic District Ordinance. The proposed amendments would allow the Historic District Commission to (within the limits of their budget) "...organize, manage, advertise, and hold events and activities in the Township for the purpose of promoting and educating the public regarding the existence and preservation of historic resources located in the Township..."

MOVED BY BAILEY, SECONDED BY WORKINGS, to hold the second reading of and approve Ordinance No. 37-A, the Historic District Ordinance, as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Josi Whitson, Chairperson of the Historic District Commission ("HDC"), and Barbara Barber, Administrative Assistant to the HDC, thanked the Board for their work in achieving the ordinance revisions.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

GOODISON PLAN

Planning Consultant Nix stated that the Planning Commission approved the draft Goodison Sub Area Plan, and it is now before the Board for their review and approval to distribute to adjacent communities and regional entities as required under the Planning Enabling Act. The sub area plan will be an amendment to the Township Master Plan and is subject to the same review standards as the Master Plan. The Planning Enabling Act stipulates that those reviewing entities have a 63 day period to review the draft and provide comments to the Planning Commission. Upon expiration of that period, the plan comes back to the Planning Commission for a public hearing, and then returns to the Board for final adoption.

Trustee Bailey said he thinks it is super that this project is finally coming to fruition. He continued that the Paint Creek Cider Mill has been dormant too long – he would like to see the millrace restored, the wheel working, and a lively restaurant like there once was. He asked that the Paint Creek Cider Mill be included in the Goodison Plan.

Jan Olson of 4190 Orion Road concurred with Trustee Edwards. She inquired about where the established boundaries of Goodison lie. Planning Consultant Nix said there are no formal boundaries. However, Supervisor Fogler commented that it is the intent of the Township to install “welcome signs” as the four boundaries to Goodison. Mrs. Olson pointed out that two of the “Goodison” signs are now missing.

MOVED BY BAILEY, SECONDED BY THOMAS, to authorize distribution of the Goodison Plan as outlined by Planning Consultant Nix.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ORDINANCE NO. 16-2012A: ZONING ORDINANCE

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

Supervisor Fogler said that the Board was waiting to adopt the revised Zoning Ordinance until the Goodison Plan was complete in case the Goodison Plan required changes to the Zoning Ordinance. At this time, the Goodison Plan is close to completion, and she feels it is appropriate for the Board to consider the proposed amendments to the Zoning Ordinance.

Planning Consultant Nix was present. He explained that the basic regulations contained in the current Zoning Ordinance will continue into the amended/new ordinance. However, the new ordinance has been reorganized and contains graphics, charts, tables, etc. to make it more reader-friendly.

Trustee Bailey recalled that at one time the Board had considered provisions regarding noise, etc. Planner Nix explained that, at Attorney Joppich's recommendation, these issues have been addressed under a separate ordinance.

Trustee Edwards said that the Planning Commission has spent approximately four years working on the revised Zoning Ordinance. He looks forward to the Board approving it, with the understanding that the new Board may wish to "tweak" certain sections later.

Frank Ferriolo of 5600 Kirkridge Trail questioned how the amended ordinance limits height of buildings. Upon review, he asked that the Board make sure that the amended ordinance limits height to 35 feet *and* also limits it to two stories.

Dennis Murray of 1374 Dutton Road asked how it would be handled procedurally if the Board makes changes to the proposed amended Zoning Ordinance this evening. Supervisor Fogler responded that this evening the Board is introducing the amended ordinance and holding the first reading. The Board may make changes, which will be considered at a future meeting when the Board will hold the second reading and consider adoption.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

Annalisa Hollenbeck of 2055 Aberdeen Court shared her concerns about maintaining Dutton Road as a natural beauty road, and inquired about changes to how the ultimate paved road density is figured. Planner Nix explained the history of this, noting that it was a way for the Township to help limit the impact on unpaved roads. The revised Zoning Ordinance includes a new way to address this concern which, in his opinion, will make it more difficult for a land owner to achieve a higher density.

Mrs. Hollenbeck asked how the “old” and the “new” versions of the ordinance compare. She asked how familiar the Board is with the proposed changes, and if they have been advised about the implications of the changes.

Mrs. Hollenbeck also stated that she feels there is a lot of suspicion about the Planning Commission and “deals” that may have been struck. She proposed that the Board consider a different method for voting at the Planning Commission level (possibly that membership on the Planning Commission be such that each precinct is represented; another suggestion was to require a different majority to approve a motion).

John Reilly of 2273 W. Predmore Road said he feels the Zoning Ordinance needs a lot more than “tweaking.” He feels it is antiquated and does not address many of the “realities” that currently exist. In particular, he pointed to home-based businesses, and says he feels it is important to allow these in order to promote economic growth. Mr. Reilly said he believes the Township needs to look at what currently exists and consider how the Zoning Ordinance should be revised in this regard.

Craig Blust of 2222 W. Buell Road agreed with Mr. Ferrolo’s suggestion to include the 35’ and two story limit on building size. He continued that he would like to see the Board move forward and approve the Zoning Ordinance; it has been under review since 2005 and is becoming obsolete. The revised ordinance will make a lot of positive changes, and the new Board may “fix” things as necessary.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

Maureen Thalmann of 3240 Lake George Road questioned if the revisions include performance standards. Planner Nix stated that this is included in a separate ordinance and is not a part of the Zoning Ordinance.

John Pastore of 222 Letts Road said that he started a business many years ago and was able to “grow” it as a home-based business. He urged the Board to include provisions for home-based businesses in the Zoning Ordinance.

Marty McQuade of 5605 Murfield Drive concurred with the suggestion this evening of limiting building height to 35 feet and two stories (he noted that the revised ordinance allows three stories). He inquired if the revised ordinance limits building length or number of units for RM zoning. After consideration, the Board agreed that they want the limiting provisions regarding height, length and maximum units, as stated in the current Zoning Ordinance, to be included in the revised ordinance.

Dennis Murray of 1374 Dutton Road observed that there appear to be a number of changes to the revised ordinance, and suggested that the Board hold an additional reading.

Beth Markel of 245 Birch Hill Drive said that the Board held a public hearing on this matter in February of 2011, but there has been no public hearing at the Board level since that time. She then read a transcript of discussion at the April 3, 2012, Planning Commission meeting where the commissioners discussed that there are some items that they feel need further review. Mrs. Markel suggested that it is premature to consider approval of the revised Zoning Ordinance until these matters are resolved.

Jim Hollenbeck of 2055 Aberdeen Court asked if there is any way to compare the current Zoning Ordinance with the proposed revised ordinance. Terry Gonser of 4200 Heron Road said it may be possible to merge two documents to see where the changes are. He added that he hopes this Board will postpone approval to allow the new Board to consider this matter. Planner Nix said that it will be more involved to prepare a comparison as the revised ordinance has been reorganized and there are numerous changes.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

Joe Langlois of 490 W. Snell Road recalled that he asked for a comparison of the current and the proposed revised Zoning Ordinance two years ago. He said this would still be a very helpful tool. At this time he also asked for a list of comments explaining the rationale for each proposed change.

Jim Chauvin of 3185 St. James Court inquired if there are any proposed changes to the zoning map. Planner Nix said that there are not, with the exception of changes due to the ultimate paved road density revisions.

Annalisa Hollenbeck of 2055 Aberdeen Court said it is the Board's responsibility to understand the implications of any changes to the Zoning Ordinance before they vote on it.

MOVED BY BAILEY, SECONDED BY EDWARDS, to introduce and to hold the first reading of Ordinance No. 16-2012A, the Zoning Ordinance, as recommended by the Planning Commission, with the understanding that the revisions will include the restrictions contained in the current Zoning Ordinance regarding RM multi-family zoning, including that the number of stories be limited to two, the length of the building shall be limited to 135 feet, and the maximum number of units per building shall be limited to 16. Additionally, prior to the next meeting, Planning Consultant Nix shall provide the Board with a comparison, line by line or at a minimum section by section, of the current Zoning Ordinance and the proposed revised Zoning Ordinance.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Ferriolo said he feels there were so many unresolved matters that this is not adequate to constitute a first reading.

**EXTENSION OF ADAMS ROAD TEMPORARY EASEMENT TIME PERIODS
AND ASSOCIATED COMPENSATION**

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

Parks and Trails Planner Milos-Dale was present. Attorney Joppich has advised that it would be prudent to extend the time period for the temporary easements that the Township will be acquiring for the Adams Road pathway project. The easements were originally written to terminate after one year and were valued as such. The revised easements are written for a two-year period. This will ensure that, regardless of when the project commences, there will be adequate time to complete the project without revising the easement documents or re-appraising their value.

Ms. Milos-Dale recalled that their September 25, 2012, meeting, the Board approved two resolutions, Resolutions 12-15 and 12-16, as well as accepted the terms and payment for another temporary easement.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

MOVED BY BAILEY, SECONDED BY EDWARDS, to amend the prior motion to amend the dollar amount for Resolution 12-15 to read as payment of \$995.00 in lieu of the previously approved payment of \$810.00.

AYES: Fogler, Workings, Creps, Bailey, Edwards, McKay, Thomas

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

MOVED BY BAILEY, SECONDED BY WORKINGS, to amend the prior motion to amend the dollar amount for Resolution 12-16 to read payment of \$770.00 in lieu of the previously approved payment of \$560.00.

AYES: Fogler, Workings, Creps, Bailey, Edwards, McKay, Thomas

NAYS: None

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

MOVED BY THOMAS, SECONDED BY BAILEY, to amend the dollar amount reflected in the Temporary Construction Easement for Mr. Grenus and Mrs. Bellamy to reflect the new dollar amount of \$3,374.00 in lieu of the previously approved payment of \$2,910.00.

AYES: Fogler, Workings, Creps, Bailey, Edwards, McKay, Thomas

NAYS: None

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED.

MANAGER'S REPORTS

Limestone on Unpaved Roads

Manager Creech stated that there is probably enough limestone to apply to another half mile of unpaved road. In this case, he would like to apply the limestone on Predmore Road from Rochester Road west to Cranberry Lake Farm. If there is not enough, he will direct the Road Commission to apply it at certain intersections.

MOVED BY WORKINGS, SECONDED BY BAILEY, to direct the Road Commission for Oakland County to apply any remaining limestone on Predmore Road, from Rochester Road west to Cranberry Lake Farm.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF OAKLAND BOARD OF TRUSTEES

APPROVED

October 9, 2012

Millrace

Manager Creech reported that he is in the process of speaking with Clinton River Watershed Council Executive Director Anne Vaara and Wade Trim engineer Jason Kenyon regarding potential grants to restore the millrace.

ATTORNEY'S REPORTS

Oil and Gas Drilling ("Fracking")

Attorney Joppich shared information on this matter with the Board and said he would be pleased to discuss it at a future meeting.

APPROVAL OF INVOICES

The Board reviewed the list of invoices.

MOVED BY EDWARDS, SECONDED BY THOMAS, to approve payment of the invoices as presented, dated October 9, 2012, in the amount of \$204,700.21.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

A copy of the lists of invoices is attached as a part of these minutes.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 10:24 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Ingrid R. Kliffel
Recording Secretary

Approved,

Judy Workings
Clerk