

GENOA TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION  
OCTOBER 9, 2000  
6:30 P.M.  
**MINUTES**

The work session of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Don Pobuda at 6:30 p.m. The following commission members were present constituting a quorum for transaction of business: Don Pobuda, Barbara Figurski, Jerrold Joseph, John Cahill, Gary McCririe, and Ken Burchfield. Also present was Michael Archinal, Township Manager; Jeff Purdy from Langworthy, Strader, LeBlance & Associates, Inc.; and Melissa Talley from Tetra Tech, MPS. By the end of the work session, there were a few persons in the audience.

Items scheduled for action during the regular session of the commission were discussed.

GENOA TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
PUBLIC HEARING  
7:00 P.M.  
**MINUTES**

The regular session of the planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Don Pobuda at 7:04 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**Moved** by Cahill, seconded by Joseph to approve the Agenda with the following change:

1. Open Public Hearing #2 will be changed to "Review of a **condominium site plan** and environmental impact assessment....." **The motion carried unanimously.**

The call to the public was made to discuss items not on the agenda. There was no response and the call to the public was closed at 7:05 p.m. Chairman Pobuda noted that the Board will not begin any new business after 10:00 p.m.

**OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 1**...Review of site plan application, environmental impact assessment, and site plan to construct a 2,712 square foot office building located on the south side of Grand River Avenue, between Victory Drive and Chilson Road, Sec. 8, petitioned by Professional Engineering Associates, Inc. (PC 00-36).

**Planning Commission disposition of petition**

- A. Recommendation regarding impact assessment.
- B. Disposition of site plan.

Mr. Allan Pruss, from Professional Engineering Associates, Inc. and Dennis Hull, the purchaser of the property were present to represent the petitioner. Mr. Pruss gave a brief overview of their proposal. They are proposing a 2700 square feet, single-story building. They have provided more parking than is required by the ordinance. They have worked with the Township Engineer, Planner, and staff and have met all of the necessary requirements. Mr. Pruss presented samples of the proposed building materials. They are proposing a standard red brick with a dark green roof with taupe trim and tan block. He feels this is the best layout for this site with the available space. There is an access easement through the Quality Farm and Fleet parking lot. Mr. Hull stated he would like to, at a later date, put a storage unit on the rear piece of land.

Mr. Archinal stated the applicant is combining his access with Ten Penny Furniture, which will preclude another cut into Grand River. He also stated the back and front lots should be combined because there is no access to the back lot. Mr. Hull stated there is a property easement for the back lot so the two lots should not have to be combined.

Commissioner Figurski stated the dust control measures should be added to the construction plans.

Commissioner Burchfield asked Mr. Purdy what "equitable acquired" means, as stated in Section 3.44.04. Mr. Purdy stated it means the purchasing of another lot.

Commissioner Cahill asked the petitioner to explain the deviations from the required landscaping on the west side of the property, according to the planner's report. The petitioner stated he does not know why there are any discrepancies. He will make sure their landscaping conforms to the Township ordinance.

Commissioner Cahill asked why a hedgerow is proposed instead of a berm. Mr. Purdy stated it is to provide some screening of the cars from Grand River Avenue. Mr. Purdy prefers the hedgerow to the berm.

Mr. Hull asked about the two sewer assessments that are on his two pieces of property. If the property is combined, will he get some relief? Mr. Archinal stated that he is not sure, but there may be some relief that can be made. Ms. Tally stated it depends on how the property is developed. If the property is left vacant, then it would be a Township Board decision.

Commissioner McCririe asked that if the two lots are combined as one parcel, does that preclude Mr. Hull from placing another building on the rear parcel? Mr.

Purdy answered no. It just precludes the sale of the lot to another property owner, unless they are a jointed land owner.

Mr. Purdy reviewed his letter of October 3, 2000.

1. An aerial photograph of the site must be provided.
2. He feels the building materials presented this evening are a nice addition to the Grand River Corridor.
3. A shared access agreement needs to be provided for the driveway. Mr. Hull stated he has spoken to the owner of Ten Penny Furniture but he does not want to grant the easement until Mr. Hull is "actually" the owner of the property.
4. Mr. Purdy feels the western-most parking spaces should be removed to provide an area for vehicle turn around. The petitioner will comply with this request. There was a discussion regarding this. Commissioner McCririe would prefer to have more parking instead of eliminating parking spaces to accommodate one or two spaces. Mr. Purdy feels if someone is in a large vehicle in one of those spots, they will have a hard time getting out. Commissioners Cahill and Joseph have no opinion on this. Commissioner Figurski and Burchfield agree with Commissioner McCririe.
5. If the site to the west is ever developed, the Planning Commission can require a service drive be put in. The petitioner will comply with this request.
6. Twelve canopies, 12 evergreens or 48 shrubs are required along the eastern and western property lines. Commissioner McCririe stated since trees can not be planted on the east due to the driveway, he feels all of that landscaping on the west side will be too cramped. Mr. Purdy suggested one canopy on the west and more landscaping to the rear. All commissioners agreed. The petitioner will comply with this decision.
7. The location of tree protection fencing must be shown on the grading plan. The petitioner will comply.
8. The bike path must be relocated within the road right-of-way. The petitioner will comply.
9. An inclined approach must be provided at the driveway curbs and bike path. The petitioner will comply.
10. Mr. Purdy stated the Planning Commission can require sign detail for site plan review or can leave it to be handled administratively. All commissioners agreed to let administration handle the signage.
11. All mechanical equipment must be completely screened. The petitioner will comply.
12. A permit is required from the Michigan Department of Transportation. The petitioner will comply.

Ms. Tally reviewed her letter of October 3, 2000.

1. She believes there is a typo on the low spot elevation of the parking lot for the water pond. It states 97.25, she believes it should state 97.30, which would allow a minimum of 1% slope for the catch basin.
2. This site as been assessed one REU. The fees for sanitary sewer and water are \$3,500 and \$3,000 respectively per REU.
3. A water softener is not required, but if the petitioner chooses to use a water softener, the discharge cannot be connected to the sanitary sewer and a potassium based regenerate should be used.

The call to the public was made at 7:38 p/.m. with no response.

**Moved** by Figurski, seconded by Burchfield, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment dated September 26, 2000 for a 2,712 square foot office building located on the south side of Grand River Avenue, between Victory Drive and Chilson Road, Sec. 8, petitioned by Professional Engineering Associates, Inc. (PC 00-36).

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**Moved** by McCririe, seconded by Figurski, to approve of the site plan of a 2,712 square foot office building located on the south side of Grand River Avenue, between Victory Drive and Chilson Road, Sec. 8, petitioned by Professional Engineering Associates, Inc. (PC 00-36) with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as recommended by motion this evening.
2. Township Engineer review and approval of all plans.
3. Building materials, as presented this evening, are satisfactory and shall be presented to the Township Board.
4. The petitioner shall record a shared access agreement for the driveway and provide a service drive easement to the west of the property.
5. The petitioner shall provide one additional canopy tree on the west side of the building and one additional tree every 20 feet on the east side and back of the rear parking lot.
6. A bike path shall be placed to the road right-of-way and have inclined approaches.
7. The petitioner shall acquire all necessary MDOT permits.
8. The petitioner is aware and acknowledges the petitioner will be assessed one REU for sewer and water, subject to final review by the Township Engineer.
9. If the petitioner chooses to use a water softener, the discharge cannot be connected to the sanitary sewer and a potassium based regenerate should be used.
10. The signage approval shall be deferred to the Township staff.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 2...** Review of a condominium site plan and environmental impact assessment, for twenty-two multiple family buildings, east of Latson, between Grand River and Golf Club, adjacent to Lakewood Knoll, Sec. 4, Petitioned by The Selective Group. (PC 00-24)

**Planning Commission disposition of petition**

- A. Recommendation regarding impact assessment.
- B. Recommendation regarding site plan.

Mr. Dave LeClair from Boss Engineering was there to represent the petitioner. They are asking for final site plan approval. Their plans consists of 257 attached condominium units. It will be developed on two phases. The first phase is west of the power line and the second phase is east of the power line. The plan is the same as what was approved by the Township Board in August. There will be a pool and clubhouse, hard walking path, and a tot lot on Phase II. They will be connected to the public water and sanitary sewer systems. They have received approval From the fire department, drain office, and road commission. They have notified the school district and reserved their street names. They have submitted the Edison easement agreement as well as the correspondence from Detroit Edison with their intent to follow through with the agreement. They presented building materials, colored elevation drawings, and floor plans. These are the same as what was submitted in July and August to the Planning Commission and the Township Board.

Chairman Pobuda asked about parking. Mr. LeClair stated there are several areas of overflow parking. There are two spaces per unit and then one additional parking space per unit for a total of 652 spaces; 514 are required.

Commissioner Figurski stated the dust control measures should be added to the construction plan. The petitioner will comply.

Commissioner Figurski asked the height of the light poles. They are 10 or 12 foot poles. These are the same poles as used throughout the original PUD.

Commissioner Cahill asked about the decel lane on Latson Road. Fifty feet is the Road Commission standard. Commissioner Cahill asked if it could be made longer. The petitioner will check with the Road Commission to see if it can be lengthened and will provide a longer decel lane if necessary.

Mr. Archinal stated they will provided a connection to the Adler Project to the east and the number of units is appropriate for this PUD.

Mr. Purdy reviewed his letter of October 2, 2000.

1. There is no sidewalk provided between Units 17 through 22. He would like to see the sidewalk have a continuous link, similar to what is at Units 18 and 19. The petitioner will comply with this request.

2. There was a discussion regarding the buffer 54 trees required along the north side of the property. Mr. Purdy suggested a mixture of evergreens and canopies in lieu of the required 54 canopy trees. All of the commissioners agreed with the mixture of trees.
3. The detention pond must have gradual enough slopes to not require fencing and needs to be adjusted to not impact the existing adjacent tree line and the petitioner needs to provide a tree survey. The petitioner stated they have done a preliminary grading survey and the trees on the other side of the wetlands will be untouched. All commissioners agreed.

Chairman Pobuda asked about the entrance sign. The petitioner stated it will be a standard entrance sign. The entrance road width will be 26 feet back to back with a sign and landscaping on both sides. There will be light fixtures at the entrance.

Ms. Talley reviewed her letter of October 3, 2000.

1. The REU calculations need to be determined based on the use of the clubhouse as well as the pool. The fees are \$3,500 and \$3,000 for sanitary sewer and water respectively.
2. No water softener is required, but if the petitioner chooses to use a water softener, the discharge cannot be connected to the sanitary sewer and a potassium based regenerate should be used.
3. Ms. Talley stated the easement for sanitary sewer and water widths can be determined at the construction phase of the project.

The call to the public was made at 8:05 p.m. with no response.

**Moved** by Figurski, seconded by Burchfield, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment dated September 24, 2000 for twenty-two multiple family buildings, east of Latson, between Grand River and Golf Club, adjacent to Lakewood Knoll, Sec. 4, Petitioned by The Selective Group. (PC 00-24). **The motion carried unanimously.**

**Moved** by McCririe, seconded by Burchfield, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the final site plan for twenty-two multiple family buildings, east of Latson, between Grand River and Golf Club, adjacent to Lakewood Knoll, Sec. 4, Petitioned by The Selective Group. (PC 00-24) with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as recommended by motion this evening.
2. Township Engineer review and approval of all plans.
3. All lighting within the development shall match the lighting already in the Lorensen PUD.
4. The petitioner shall provide a sidewalk in front of Unit #22, similar to that which is shown in front of Unit #18.

5. The petitioner shall examine the possibility of providing a longer decel lane entering into the complex and provide such information to the Township Board.
6. The final ERU calculations shall be determined by the Township Engineer and staff.
7. The petitioner and Township acknowledges the REU's as specified in the Deljudice PUD, Section 2.4.
8. No water softener is required, but if the petitioner chooses to use a water softener, the discharge cannot be connected to the sanitary sewer and a potassium based regenerate should be used.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 3...** Review of a PUD site plan, and environmental impact assessment, for proposed Auto Mall and Car Wash located in the Genoa Square PUD, for property located on the south side of Grand River at the I-96 Lake Chemung interchange, Sec. 9, petitioned by Weiss Properties. (PC 00-20)

**Planning Commission disposition of petition**

- A. Recommendation regarding impact assessment.
- B. Recommendation regarding site plan.

Mr. Kevin Coles was present to represent Mr. Harvey Weiss of Weiss Properties. Mr. Weiss was unable to attend the public hearing and sent his apologies to the Planning Commission. Ms. Jeannie Jones, Owner of Brighton Honda; Mr. David Beschke of Equinox, the landscape engineer; Mr. Doug Hamborsky, the building architect; and Mr. Al Blume, the construction manager, were present.

Mr. Beschke stated the site has remained the same but the details have been worked out based on the comments from the staff meetings. They are in agreement with most of the comments from the review letters from the engineer and planner.

Mr. Archinal stated the PUD has been approved by the Township Board. We will be discussing the details of the site plan this evening.

Mr. Purdy reviewed his letter of October 5, 2000.

1. The building materials presented have been approved by the Planning Commission. Commissioner McCririe advised the petitioner to have a sample board of the materials to present to the Township Board.
2. A copy of the access easement, which provides for shared access and maintenance by all occupants of the shopping center needs to be submitted for review. Mr. Coles stated they will prepare this agreement and submit it to the Township Attorney.
3. Concrete curbing is required around all sides of the parking lots and driveways for all commercial sites. Mr. Beschke does not feel that curbing around the perimeter of the site is necessary. They have curbing around all interior islands of the parking lots. Commissioner

Joseph feels the curbing should be installed. It handles traffic and water better. It also requires the auto mall to keep on the pavement, and not on the grass. All commissioners agreed. Ms. Jones stated she will comply with this request.

4. Landscaping at the entrance should be enhanced and details should be provided. Mr. Purdy feels there should be symmetrical landscaping on both sides of the entrance. Mr. Coles feels the landscaping should be completed when that out lot is developed. Commissioner McCririe agreed with this. Commissioner Joseph and Figurski feel the landscaping should be included now. This is the entrance to the Township and they feel it should be as beautiful as possible.
5. The location of snow fencing for tree preservation must be shown on the landscape and grading plans. The petitioner will comply.
6. The hedge row across the front needs to have plantings no more than three feet on center. Mr. Beschke stated he has picked plants that required five feet on center. Mr. Purdy stated the Planning Commission can decide. After a brief discussion, it was decided that the plants shall be three feet on center and Mr. Beschke will have to choose new plants.
7. All deciduous trees are required to be at least 2 ½" caliper. All evergreen trees are required to be at least 6 feet tall. The petitioner will comply with this request.
8. A planting strip should be provided along the base of the auto wash building adjacent to the parking. The petitioner will comply with this request.
9. There was a discussion regarding the foot candles, light pole heights, what the lighting will be after 10:00 p.m., what type of lighting will be on the building, and what lighting will be on the car pods in the front of the site. Commissioner McCririe asked Ms. Jones what is needed for them to properly run their business. Ms. Jones stated they are proposing one-half of the intensity of what is currently at Champion Chevrolet and the lights will be reduced to safety levels after 10:00 p.m. Commissioner Figurski wants to ensure the petitioner will keep the intensity of the lights low. She feels the lighting is very important. She also feel the petitioner should have had the photometric grid presented this evening. Commissioner Joseph and Cahill feel the proposed lighting is fine. Commissioner Cahill asked how high the light poles are. The highest is 28.6 feet, which is within the allowable range. There will be no spotlights on the car pods in the front of the site. All building lights will be shoebox fixtures and there will be no floodlight on the front of the site. All light fixtures must be full cut-off fixtures. After 10:00 p.m., the lights will be turned down to 7 foot candles.

Ms. Talley stated the petitioner aggress with all of her comments from her September 19, 2000 letter.



Ms. Tally will review the plan again at the construction phase. She needs to determine the REU's based on the square footage of the buildings, which has not been provided to her.

She also stated a water softener is not required, but if the petitioner chooses to use a water softener, the discharge cannot be connected to the sanitary sewer and a potassium based regenerate should be used. It was decided the lighting for the auto wash will be handled and approved administratively.

Commissioner Cahill stated he would like to see a mulch area around the planted trees. He asked how far out from the trunk the petitioner was planning on going. Mr. Beschke stated they will be going out three feet. Commissioner Cahill suggested going out four feet. After a discussion, the petitioner agreed with Commissioner Cahill's suggestion of four feet.

The call to the public was made at 9:13 p.m. with no response.

**Moved** by Figurski, seconded by Cahill, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment dated September 13, 2000 for proposed Auto Mall and Car Wash located in the Genoa Square PUD, for property located on the south side of Grand River at the I-96 Lake Chemung interchange, Sec. 9, petitioned by Weiss Properties. (PC 00-20) with the following condition:

1. The hours of operation need to be stated in the Impact Assessment. The hours of operation are Monday and Thursday 7:00 a.m. – 9:00 p.m.; Tuesday, Wednesday, and Friday 7:00 a.m. – 6:00 p.m.; and Saturday 9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

**The motion carried (Cahill – Y; Joseph – Y; Burchfield – abstain; Figurski – N; McCririe – Y; Pobuda – Y).**

Chairman Pobuda stated the Howell Fire Department has sent a letter saying they are not approving the number of proposed fire hydrants. Mr. Beschke stated adding additional fire hydrants is not a problem.

**Moved** by McCririe, seconded by Cahill, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Site Plan for proposed Auto Mall and Car Wash located in the Genoa Square PUD, for property located on the south side of Grand River at the I-96 Lake Chemung interchange, Sec. 9, petitioned by Weiss Properties. (PC 00-20) with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as recommended by motion this evening.
2. Township Engineer review and approval of all plans.
3. The petitioner shall comply with the terms set forth in the October 3, 2000 letter from the Howell Fire Marshall calling for additional fire hydrants.
4. Building materials, as presented this evening, are satisfactory and shall be presented to the Township Board.

5. The petitioner shall provide the access easement satisfactory to the Township Attorney for this project and for the property to the west of this site.
  6. Curbing shall be required along the entire parking lot.
  7. The landscaping shall be shown at the base of the entrance sign and specifically understood that the developer of the out lot immediately adjacent shall be responsible for all additional landscaping adjacent to that sign.
  8. The tree preservation fencing shall be shown on the site plan prior to submission to the Township Board.
  9. The hedgerow shall be planted three feet on center.
  10. All landscaping shall meet the sizes required in the ordinances and have a planting bed of not less than four feet from all sides of the trunks.
  11. There shall be a planting bed provided along the base on the east side of the auto wash building and depicted on the plans prior to submission to the Township Board.
  12. The project shall maintain a maximum of one foot candle at the property lines at all times and during business hours no more than 40 foot candles in any one location or an average of 20 foot candles during that time. After 10:00 p.m., the foot candles on the site shall be reduced to a maximum of 7 and shall be shown on the photometric grid to be provided to the Township Board.
  13. The light poles shall be a maximum of 28.6 feet high and shall be full cut-off fixtures.
  14. The automobile pods shall not be lit separate of the site lighting.
  15. All building-mounted lights shall be full cut-off fixtures and specifically conform to the Township ordinances.
  16. A lighting plan and photometric grid shall be provided and approved by the Township Planner prior to submission to the Township Board.
  17. All materials of the trash enclosures shall match the building materials.
  18. The petitioner specifically acknowledges the price per REU is as defined in the PUD.
  19. If the petitioner chooses to use a water softener, the discharge cannot be connected to the sanitary sewer and a potassium based regenerate should be used.
  20. A full executed PUD agreement shall be provided prior to submission to the Township Board.
  21. Dust control measures shall be added to the plans.
  22. All traffic and parking regulatory signs must be detailed on the site plan.
- The motion carried (McCrie – Y; Figurski – N; Joseph – Y; Pobuda – Y; Cahill – Y; Burchfield – abstain).**

Chairman Pobuda called a five-minute break at 9:25 p.m.

**OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 4...** Review of a special use application, a site plan, and environmental impact assessment for two proposed commercial/retail

buildings, totaling 28,800 square feet located on the north side of Grand River Avenue between Kellogg and Euler Roads, Sec. 14, petitioned by Nielsen Development. (PC 00-34)

**Planning Commission disposition of petition**

- A. Recommendation regarding special use application.
- B. Recommendation regarding impact assessment.
- C. Recommendation regarding site plan.

Anthony Pucci of BC Architectural Group, the project engineer and Neal Nielsen, the property owner were present to represent the petitioner.

Mr. Pucci gave a brief overview of their proposal. This is going to be a two phase development, with the front four acres being developed at this time. The other six acres will be used as a retention pond. There is nothing else planned for this part at this time. They have tried to develop a park-like setting. The buildings are dispersed within the parking and the landscaping. These buildings will be used for commercial purposes. There are no proposed tenants at this time, but the tenants that occupy these buildings will be within the zoning ordinance. He explained the position of the entrance to the site is based on sight distance. They are proposing four dumpsters and loading zones for each building. They are proposing 15-foot light poles with cut-off lighting. A photometric grid is included in the Commissioner's packets. He showed color building elevations and the proposed materials.

Mr. Purdy reviewed his letter of October 6, 2000.

1. A special land use permit is required by the Township because the total buildings exceed 15,000 square feet.
2. Rear doors have not been identified for the building that can be seen from Kellogg Road. Mr. Nielsen stated both he and the adjoining neighbor want to take out the tree row behind that building. He stated the building will be the same brick in the back that is in the front and does not feel that it needs to be screened. Mr. Purdy does not want a view of a blank wall. There was a discussion regarding the tree row as well as changes that could be made to the rear of this building to "break it up a little bit". Mr. Pucci stated there are changes that can be made to the back side of this building in order to "break up" the blank wall. Commissioner Figurski and Burchfield would like to keep the tree row. Commissioner McCrie feels some compromise is a good idea. He feels the straight line of trees doesn't look natural. Mr. Pucci suggested doing both – reducing the number of trees as well as changing the façade of the rear of the building. All commissioners agreed with this suggestion.
3. A loading dock needs to be provided for the small center building. Mr. Nielsen stated that building is very small and any deliveries that would be made would only be by UPS so a loading dock is not necessary. All commissioners agreed.

4. Mr. Purdy suggested the Planning Commission modify the driveway language standards to meet the sight limitations suggested by the Road Commission.
5. Traffic regulatory signs need to be indicated on the plans. The petitioner will comply with this request.
6. Tree protection measures and limits of grading need to be indicated on the grading plan. The petitioner will comply.
7. Waste receptacle enclosures should have shrub plantings around the side. The petitioner will comply.
8. Inclined approaches must be provided at the crossing of curbs and sidewalks for accessibility. The petitioner will comply.
9. Existing and proposed easements for utilities must be shown. The petitioner will comply.
10. Sign information must be submitted for review. Mr. Nielsen would like to discuss this administratively with each tenant as they arrive. Mr. Purdy suggested a masonry monument sign matching the materials of the buildings.
11. A driveway permit is required. Mr. Pucci stated they have a letter saying this is where the driveway can be, but a permit can not be issued until construction is started.

Ms. Talley reviewed her letter of October 5, 2000.

1. The retention pond sizing needs to be determined to see if it is adequate.
2. The access aisle on the southern side of the site or in the parking area on the north side of the southern most building do not meet the standards. They need to be revised to be between 1% and 5%. They are currently less than 1%. The petitioner will comply.
3. This site has been assessed 5 REU's. Four for Phase I and one for Phase II. There are none assessed at this time. When Phase II is developed, the fees will be assessed.
4. If the petitioner chooses to use a water softener, the discharge cannot be connected to the sanitary sewer and a potassium based regenerate should be used.

Commissioner McCririe advised the petitioner that the parking in this development does not accommodate a restaurant.

Commissioner Cahill stated there is no landscaping details of how the trees are being planted and how much far the mulch will be set out from the trunk of the trees. He would like four feet. Mr. Nielsen stated he will meet this request and provide the details on the plan.

Commissioner Cahill also asked about tree protection. Mr. Purdy stated there is usually insulation on the still wire that holds the trees. Mr. Nielsen will comply with this.

Chairman Pobuda notified the petitioner that the Brighton Area Fire Department would like to see the buildings equipped with an automatic fire suppression system. The petitioner will comply with this request.

The call to the public was made at 10:16 p.m.

Mr. Dennis Doran of 1939 Kellogg Road in Brighton owns 10 acres north of this development. They raise thoroughbred horses. They currently have 8 horses. He does not feel that the proposed buffer is adequate for this site and his property. He showed the Planning Commission pictures of their view right now. He feels the amount of activity of the construction as well as when the development is in use would be a liability to them. Mr. Doran also stated that kids that leave Rollerama Skating Rink late at night tend to congregate on that property. He feels this might be detrimental to Mr. Nielsen's property.

Mr. Nielsen responded to Mr. Doran. He stated there is a six-acre buffer. He does not feel that anything he could do or suggest to do would ease Mr. and Mrs. Doran's concerns. He also stated he is not going to gate his property to keep the kids out.

Commissioner Burchfield feels we need to be sensitive to the adjoining land owners, but he feels that our ordinances regarding construction are satisfactory. He does not feel it is the Planning Commission's business. He feels this can be settled between Mr. Nielsen and the Dorans. He does not feel the Planning Commission can satisfy their overall concerns of raising and caring for their horses.

Commissioner Joseph also feels we need to be sensitive to the neighbors. He does not know what can be done. It is private property and will be developed within the guidelines of the ordinance.

Commissioner Cahill agrees with Commissioners Burchfield and Joseph.

Commissioner McCririe agrees. He does not feel the Planning Commission can require the petitioner to move into the Phase II portion of the site to plan to provide landscaping as a buffer for the Doran's property.

Mr. Nielsen stated there will be more trees planed along the north property line. He has just not done it yet. Commissioner Figurski feels this might help the adjacent neighbors.

Mr. Doran stated the doctor whose office is adjacent to this site, planted a four-foot berm with plantings on top of that. This helped out the Dorans a lot. Chairman Pobuda stated this might be something that Mr. Nielsen could consider.

The call to the public was closed at 10:27 p.m.

**Moved** by McCririe, seconded by Figurski, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Special Land Use for two proposed commercial/retail buildings, totaling 28,800 square feet located on the north side of Grand River Avenue between Kellogg and Euler Roads, Sec. 14, petitioned by Nielsen Development. (PC 00-34) citing the criteria in Section 12.08.02 of the Township Ordinance has been satisfied. **The motion carried unanimously.**

**Moved** by Figurski, seconded by Joseph, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment for two proposed commercial/retail buildings, totaling 28,800 square feet located on the north side of Grand River Avenue between Kellogg and Euler Roads, Sec. 14, petitioned by Nielsen Development. (PC 00-34). **The motion carried unanimously.**

**Moved** by McCririe, seconded by Figurski, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the site plan for two proposed commercial/retail buildings, totaling 28,800 square feet located on the north side of Grand River Avenue between Kellogg and Euler Roads, Sec. 14, petitioned by Nielsen Development. (PC 00-34) with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the Special Use as recommended by motion this evening.
2. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as recommended by motion this evening.
3. Township Engineer review and approval of all plans.
4. The Planning Commission has specifically reviewed the driveway location as depicted on the plans and reviewed by the Road Commission and found it satisfactory.
5. Petitioner shall provide on the plan, prior to submission to the Township Board, traffic regulatory signs as well as all tree protection and grading limits.
6. The Planning Commission has reviewed the loading zone necessity for the small building of 18,000 square feet and found it is not necessary.
7. The petitioner shall provide inclines at the sidewalk approaches throughout the development
8. The petitioner shall provide a masonry-based monument sign to match the building materials on Grand River with requisite landscaping.
9. The petitioner shall require all necessary permits from the Livingston County Road Commission for the driveway cut.
10. The petitioner is specifically aware that the parking at this site will not accommodate a restaurant.
11. Plant beds shall provide a minimum of four feet of mulch around the base of each trunk.
12. On the east and west property lines, the rows of evergreens as depicted on the plans shall be replaced with deciduous and non-deciduous trees, but will maintain the necessary buffers, specifically

- the mix shall be 1/3 canopy trees and 2/3 evergreen trees, placed 15 feet on center.
13. The rear façade of the large 13,140 square foot westerly building shall be revised to provide, through the use of materials and architectural details, a breakup of relief.
  14. The August 21, 2000 letter from the Brighton Fire Department, requested an automatic fire suppression system shall be complied with.
  15. All dust control measures shall be on the plans.
  16. If the petitioner chooses to use a water softener, the discharge cannot be connected to the sanitary sewer and a potassium based regenerate should be used.
  17. The petitioner is aware of the REU's contained in the Tetra Tech letter of October 5, 2000, subject to final review.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**Moved** by Figurski, seconded by McCririe to approve the minutes of September 25, 2000. **The motion carried unanimously.**

The meeting adjourned at 10:38 p.m.

Submitted by: Patty Thomas, Recording Secretary

Approved by: Barbara Figurski, Secretary