

GENOA CHARTER TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
APRIL 9, 2007
6:30 P.M.
AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER: At 6:31 p.m., the work session of Genoa Township Planning Commission was called to order. Present constituting a quorum were Chairman Pobuda, James Mortensen, Barbara Figurski, Teri Olson, and Steve Morgan. Brian Borden of LSL Planning was present, as well as Tesha Humphriss of Tetra Tech. Also present was Kelly VanMarter, Planning Director.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Upon motion by Barbara Figurski and support by Teri Olson, the agenda was approved as submitted. **Motion carried unanimously.**

DISCUSSION: of Agenda items of the regular meeting of the Planning Commission

DISCUSSION: of general items

ADJOURNMENT: The work session of the Genoa Township Planning Commission was adjourned at 6:58 p.m.

GENOA TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING
APRIL 9, 2007
7:00 P.M.
AGENDA

CALL TO ORDER: At 7:05 p.m. the Genoa Township Planning Commission was called to order. Present constituting a quorum were Chairman Pobuda, James Mortensen, Barbara Figurski, Steve Morgan and Teri Olson. Also present were Kelly VanMarter, Planning Director, Brian Borden of LSL Planning and Tesha Humphriss of Tetra Tech.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, followed by a moment of silence.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA: Upon motion by Barbara Figurski and support by Teri Olson, the agenda was approved as submitted. **Motion carried unanimously.**

CALL TO THE PUBLIC: (**Note: The Board will not begin any new business after 10:00 p.m.**)

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 1... Review of special use, impact assessment and sketch plan for the sale and storage of propane, located at 3652 E. Grand River, Sec. 5, petitioned by ACO Hardware. (07-12)

Petition presented by Ken Johnston, Director of Construction for ACO and Dick Russenberger, Director of Properties for ACO. Their address is 2333 Commerce, Farmington Hills, Michigan.

Petitioner addresses buffer zones, in particular buffer zone "c". He asks what would be required there. Brian Borden suggests that it's a 10' buffer zone width and the requirements are 1 canopy, 1 evergreen or 4 shrubs for every twenty feet of property. Petitioner agrees to do that. He sees no problems with the green belt out front. He'd like to upgrade the properties by replacing the trees in the green belt with fresh trees.

Petitioner asks about the concrete slab that is required to be below the fuel tank. He will bring this up to any codes that are required.

Petitioner addresses secondary containment. He is not aware of any federal regulations requiring that for propane. Brian Borden explains that this secondary containment could even be referring to a tank within a tank. He suggests this is more of a fire code issue and it is required by the ordinance.

Jim McVicker, Operations Manager for Reliance Propane and Fuel Oil addresses the Planning Commission. There are no containment tanks for propane. It vaporizes into the atmosphere and dissipates if it leaks. The vapor could create an ignition, but the dissipation is what would be expected. Chairman Pobuda suggests that the containment tank is for the purposes of preventing a fire from spreading. Steve Morgan suggests the Fire Marshall approved it and it should be left up to them. Brian Borden is satisfied with that.

Petitioner will provide all evidence of compliance required and necessary permits.

The PIPP plan has not been provided yet because this is not a hazardous waste or raw material. Petitioner feels with Kelly VanMarter's help, he can get through this.

Petitioner feels he cannot put a sidewalk/bike path along the front of the property due to a lack of available frontage. James Mortensen indicates the sidewalk is required and is not negotiable. It is suggested that if it's a problem, the petitioner could relocate his sign.

Brian Borden indicates there are various site design deficiencies that should be further investigated. He was unable to do a site visit. Brian Borden would like to review the lighting plans.

Planning Commission disposition of petition

- A. Recommendation regarding Special Use.
- B. Recommendation regarding Impact Assessment.
- C. Recommendation regarding Sketch Plan.

Motion by James Mortensen to recommend to the Township Board approval of a special use permit for ACO hardware to store and sell propane at their Grand River store in Genoa Township, subject to:

1. Petitioner will plant such additional trees/shrubs in buffer zone “c” as is required under the ordinance, as well as an additional six canopy trees at the Grand River greenbelt;
2. The propane tank will be mounted on a solid concrete slab;
3. The applicant will comply with all secondary containment fire codes, NFPA standards and other regulations regarding the sale and storage of propane, including any necessary PIPP plan, as required;
4. The documentation will be supplied to the Township staff prior to issuance of the special use permit;
5. An eight foot concrete bike path will be required along property frontage, the precise location and any necessary signage will be reviewed by Township staff;
6. Petitioner will provide evidence that the light fixtures comply with the ordinance as far as foot candles of illumination at the property line are concerned; and
7. All sales and storage of propane related tanks/equipment will be within the outdoor fenced area for propane.

Second by Barbara Figurski. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Motion by Barbara Figurski to recommend to the Township Board approval of the impact assessment stamped with the date of March 20th. Support by Jim Mortensen, provided that it be made contingent upon approval of special use permit. **Motion carried unanimously.**

Motion by James Mortensen to recommend to the Township Board approval of the sketch plan for ACO Hardware’s storage and sale of propane subject to:

1. Approval of special use permit;
2. Approval of impact assessment;
3. Addition of requirements of the special use permit as it relates to the site plan received 4/6/2007.

Support by Steve Morgan. **Motion carried unanimously.**

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 2...Review of rezoning application, impact assessment, conceptual PUD plan and PUD agreement to rezone 10.4 acres located on the north corner of Sterling Drive and Dorr Road between Crooked Lake Road and Grand River Avenue, (11-15-200-018) from IND (Industrial) to MUPUD (Mixed Use Planned Unit Development) to construct a 16,101 sq. ft. retail, 5,935 sq. ft. office and a 41,966 sq. ft. industrial buildings, petitioned by Sterling Development Properties, L.L.C. (07-11)

Phil Glieb of Sterling Development. Bob King, architect with Lindhout & Associates in Brighton.

Building "A" discussed first. Petitioner believes it is classical and traditional. The lower level will be store fronts, upper levels for offices. No residential would be anticipated.

Building "F" is discussed next. It is intended to be a transitional building to bridge the gap between classic style of "A" and the more high tech or modern buildings back in the industrial park. It is still brick, but more modern elements are adopted in. The brick cornice is more streamlined and more modern forms are introduced in the steel trellis, etc. This building would be almost exclusively retail.

James Mortensen discusses the west elevation versus east elevation as it relates to how attractive the facility is. Bob King indicates this is not a "cookie cutter" building and is an original design.

The land between the building and Dorr Road would be semi manicured and semi natural.

Sidewalk plan is discussed. Dorr Road is planned for a bike path. A bridge may be required. Lighting is addressed in conjunction with the sidewalk in that the lighting is only planned as far as the wetlands and no further. Future planning will have to take that into account.

The industrial park buildings are discussed next. The buildings become more modern. The glass is now reflecting and canopies are now metal. In general, the Planning Commission has been opposed to reflective glass. James Mortensen asks Kelly VanMarter to check into what has been permitted as it relates to reflective glass, in other industrial areas within the Township.

Brian Borden suggests that the industrial buildings are meeting the industrial design requirements that exist. Petitioner indicates the buildings are a "step up" and that's by design. No outside storage would exist. The design characteristics are such that the expense would be catering to a higher quality of tenant.

Petitioner hopes to control the architecture of each of the buildings and is attempting to design it to split off into its own parcel. This may require a contiguous two acre parcel for each and an exception being made for an acre and a half for one of the parcels. Petitioner would like to have the flexibility to sell, as well as lease.

The lighting plan is discussed. The decorative lighting is from building "a" down along private drive. The lighting would be maintained by the association of businesses there. When the PUD is written, the light maintenance should be spelled out specifically.

Landscaping is discussed. They believe their requirements are met. Behind building "C", the detention area is to be planted as a detention area. The retaining wall provides for a 4' drop to where the slop begins. Petitioner believes that planting shrubs there where no one would see is fruitless. Across the detention pond is another detention wall with berm on the adjoining property. Planting in that area doesn't make sense. The second area discussed is the area west of Sterling Drive. The entire stretch along Sterling Drive is regulated wetlands. The ordinance requires 15 sugar maple trees to line that road. There are no trees on the other side of the road and the wetlands go up to the road. This doesn't seem logical to petitioner. They ask for leniency in these situations. Chairman Pobuda suggests the DEQ could give guidance on this and could make suggestions as to what would grow.

The Fire Department letter has been received by the Township. The cul-de-sac is proposed to contain plantings and two fire hydrants. Each building has a truck well. Therefore the cul-de-sac was designed to accommodate large trucks.

Chairman Pobuda asks why petitioner didn't implement the earlier suggestion of a common park/picnic area into their plans. He asks petitioner to consider adding that to the plan again.

Brian Borden reminds the commission that the majority discussed here tonight were detail items for the PUD agreement. In terms of the MUPUD rezoning, the ordinance requires 20 acres, but that can be modified/reduced by the Township Board. This site is only 10 acres. Industrial is 10 acres, but this is mixed use. This would need to be a condition so the Board looks at it. As it relates to the PUD agreement, the specific types of uses allowed in this development will need to be specified in the PUD agreement. The non-residential uses in buildings "A" and "F" should be outlined, for instance.

James Mortensen suggests the petitioner goes through the ordinances and look at permitted uses and special uses and line-out the things he would exclude. This would be a good start. Petitioner says he'd be happy to do that. Petitioner thinks research/development and high-tech industry would be the desired tenants for the industrial area.

Brian Borden says the PUD agreement would also need to incorporate the dimensional modifications requested and the draft PUD agreement will need a few minor corrections.

Tesha Humphriss refers to their letter of 4/2/2007. Petitioner is proposing some grading activities as it relates to their private drive. This should be addressed within the PUD agreement. Petitioner proposes a significant amount of retaining walls. Some additional structural calculations need to be submitted for Tetra Tech's review.

This site is located in the Grand Beach drainage district. The Drain Commission would like to do a review of the site. The Drain Commission would cover the same items as the Township Engineer. It is suggested that Tetra Tech do their evaluation and submit and follow-up with the County Drain Commission to assist in speeding up the process. The Drain Commission indicated that they may require approval of all owners of the wetland.

Tesha Humphriss indicates public water and sanitation sewer will be required.

She addresses traffic and indicates an assessment is required under the ordinance. This can be added to the environmental impact assessment.

Petitioner will need to demonstrate legal access to Sterling Road, a private drive.

Buildings "A" and "F" do not accommodate semi trucks in their lots. This is intentional according to the petitioner. Buildings "A" and "F" are retail and office and should only be accommodating UPS or Fed Ex.

Tesha Humphriss would like to see a profile of the proposed private drive.

The PUD should also contain the width of the roads and signage. James Mortensen feels the PUD agreement should be as specific as possible.

Three of the dumpsters infringe on the side setbacks and will require approval to remain there. The design and construction is correct, but they are in the setback area. This will need to be in the PUD, as well.

Brian Borden indicates the parking is within the requirements and should be in the PUD.

The PUD should contain the REU calculations/rates.

Brian Borden explains the steps for PUD approval.

Chairman Pobuda warns the architect about screening rooftop equipment and that the Planning Commission is picky about that.

Noise will be addressed in the PUD, as well as irrigation.

Steve Morgan addresses the 25' foot buffer – if it's restored, he has no problem with it. He is in favor of the building being as close to the road as possible, but doesn't want to disobey SEMCOG requirement. He disagrees with sidewalk along the private road requiring green space between it and the road. Brian Borden feels it's not a big deal since it's not a major roadway. Chairman Pobuda believes it would be better as proposed environmentally. James Mortensen and Barbara Figurski are indifferent, as is Teri Olson.

There is a detention pond on the neighboring property. This should be addressed in the plans. Tesha Humphriss indicates the petitioner is proposing to use the wetlands as a detention pond. The adjoining property is not using the wetland as a detention pond and the petitioner should discuss this with his engineer.

Steve Morgan indicates petitioner should consider this a condominium development when the final PUD is done to deal with parking and other general issues of maintenance.

Steve Morgan sees a stacking issue coming out of the drive from building "A". This needs to be addressed in the final site plan.

Steve Morgan commends petitioner on their visualization for this plan.

James Mortensen feels a staff meeting would be useful before another Planning Commission meeting. Kelly VanMarter agrees.

Mark Kassab of MJC Construction, 31550 Northwestern Highway, Farmington Hills, Michigan present and addresses the Planning Commission. They own the property at the southeast corner of Dorr Road and Grand River. He commends the developer on this plan.

Planning Commission disposition of petition

- A. Recommendation regarding rezoning application.
- B. Recommendation regarding PUD Agreement.
- C. Recommendation regarding conceptual PUD Plan.
- D. Recommendation regarding impact assessment.

Motion by Barbara Figurski to table the petition at request of petitioner. Support by James Mortensen. **Motion carried unanimously.**

4-9-07 PC Minutes Approved

Administrative Business:

- *Planners report presented by LSL Planners*
- *Approval of March 12, 2007 Planning Commission meeting minutes. Upon motion by Barbara Figurski and support by James Mortensen, the minutes were approved as amended. **Motion carried unanimously.***
- *Member Discussion*

Adjourned at 9:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kristi Cox
Recording Secretary