

**GENOA TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
FEBRUARY 27, 2006
6:30 P.M.
AGENDA**

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, James Mortensen, Curt Brown, Steve Morgan, Dean Tengel and Teri Olson. Barbara Figurski was absent. Also present were Kelly VanMarter, Township Planner; Jeff Purdy from Langworthy, Strader, LeBlanc & Associates, Inc. and Tesha Humphriss from Tetra Tech. By the end of the work session, there was 1 person in the audience.

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

**GENOA TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING
FEBRUARY 27, 2006
7:00 P.M.
AGENDA**

The regular session of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Don Pobuda at 7:06 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited and a moment of silence was observed.

Moved by Mortensen, supported by Brown to approve the Agenda as written. The motion carried unanimously.

The call to the public was made with no response.

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 and impact assessment for a proposed 5,500 sq. ft. building addition to Professional Engineering Associates, Inc. (PEA) located at 2900 E. Grand River, Sec. 6, petitioned by Professional Engineering Associates, Inc. (PC 06-02)

Planning Commission disposition of petition

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

Mr. John Harvey of Professional Engineering Associates, 2900 E. Grand River, Howell, MI 48843 was present to represent the petitioner.

Mr. Harvey went over a proposal for a 2750 sq. ft. addition to the existing building which is currently housing Professional Engineering Associates. Mr. Harvey explained that as time gone on they feel that they are in need of more space. During the peak season which would be the summer they have about 50 employees. Mr. Harvey stated that they do have future growth plans which include interior renovations to the existing building. This plan presented tonight would just include the exterior improvements. They did look at building a new building but they felt that the current structure is still worth at least \$200,000 to \$300,000. Mr. Harvey went on to give a presentation that included a one story addition which would include a walkout. We need to move the line on the south side as far as possible to allow the expansion. He also stated that they have tried as best to avoid that wetland and buffer area. In order to maintain access to the rear walk-out area they do need to encroach into the wetland buffer. They are trying to offset that buffer setback intrusion by creating swales and getting a first flush of the existing stormwater runoff.

Mr. Harvey presented the architectural information pertaining to the addition. He stated they will save the lower portion of brick on the existing home and will match as close as possible for the addition.

Pobuda questioned why they did not go up 2 stories. Mr. Harvey responded that they already have a walk-out and to go up another floor would require an elevator and that would be more costly.

Mortensen- Do you object to turning these parcels into one tax code and what do the future plans include? Mr. Harvey stated that they could live with that. Chairman Pobuda polled the board members and it was decided that the parcels could remain two separate parcels.

He presented a future development concept plan including the south property, which showed above ground detention facility but requires DEQ approval to store in a regulated wetland. Ms. Humphriss stated that in her experience, the DEQ doesn't allow storage in a regulated wetland.

Mr. Purdy reviewed his letter dated February 20th, 2006.

1. The building expansion does not meet the 70-foot front yard setback requirement from Tahoe Drive.
2. The parking lot expansion does not meet the 20-foot front yard setback requirement from Tahoe Drive and the Grand River Road Right of Way.
3. The proposed drive aisle does not meet the 25-foot required natural features setback.
4. Planning Commission approval is required for the proposed architecture, including materials and colors.

5. Planning Commission approval is required for the total number of parking spaces.
6. An 8-foot wide bike path is required along Grand River Avenue.
7. The Planning Commission may waive a portion of the Grand River Avenue greenbelt requirements due to the presence of existing vegetation and topography changes.
8. The proposed parking lot expansion does not meet the required greenbelt width along Tahoe Drive.
9. The Planning Commission may substitute evergreen trees for up to 50% of the required trees.
10. The treated lumber waste receptacle enclosure requires approval from the Planning Commission.
11. The existing sign location does not conform to current sign regulations for the GCD.

Mr. Purdy stated that he would recommend to install a portion of the sidewalk or provide payment in lieu of installing sidewalk for the future. Chairman Pobuda polled the board members and it was decided they would be allowed to issue payment in lieu of installing sidewalks at this current time.

In regards to the parking spaces, Mr. Harvey stated that they need as many as they can have, due to the fact that during peak season they have 50-55 employees. Tengal asked if a variance is needed to approve the parking spaces. Mr. Purdy responded no. After some discussion, it was decided that the petitioner could go with 54 parking spaces.

Chairman Pobuda stated the waste receptacle should be brick. Mortensen asked if it can be seen from the road. Mr. Harvey stated that maybe in the winter time. It was determined per the board that the treated lumber waste receptacle would be allowed with the installation of poles in front as long as it can not be seen from the road.

After some discussion it was decided that the petitioner needed to plant canopy trees.

Ms. Humphriss reviewed her letter dated February 14, 2006

1. The Petitioner should include a detail of the dumpster enclosure on the plans. The dumpster base should be a minimum of 6-inches of reinforced concrete pavement.
2. On sheet PSP-3, it appears that the Petitioner is encroaching on the 25-foot wetland buffer with the southeast parking lot expansion.
3. It is our understanding the Petitioner is pursuing underground detention at this site to retain open space on the southern parcel for future development. For us to further evaluate the proposed underground system, we will need the following:
 - a. Petitioner should provide soil borings information to the Township.
 - b. Petitioner should provide a detail of the inlet and outlet manifold with access manhole riser.
 - c. The catch basin shall be 4-foot diameter.
4. It appears that the sedimentation chamber will restrict the flow of the storm water. Restriction should occur in the outlet, which is provided at this site. The

- sedimentation chamber should be designed to collect the sedimentation only. We recommend elimination of the flow through port and concrete wall in the middle of the sedimentation chamber. Also, the Petitioner should specify the size of the inlet and the outlet pipes.
5. The petitioner is proposing a slope of 1 foot vertical to 3 feet horizontal (1:3 slope) in the lawn and the proposed swale areas. Genoa Township standards require a 1:4 slope. The Petitioner should be aware that the Planning Commission must approve the 1:3 slope.
 6. It appears that the Petitioner is grading within the 25-foot Wetland Buffer. The Petitioner should be aware that Planning Commission approval is required for this.
 7. We are concerned that the proposing swales will erode into the wetlands during heavy rainfalls. To further evaluate the outlet from the swale, the Petitioner should provide us with design calculations for the stone filters. Alternatively, an emergency spillway should be provided.
 8. The Petitioner is proposing edge drains along the north and south ends of the parking lot to direct storm water. This is not an acceptable way to transport storm water. We recommend the Petitioner install curb and gutter.
 9. The petitioner is proposing a live tap to the existing water main system. A representative of Genoa Township must be present to observe the live tap.
 10. A permit must be obtained from the Livingston County Building Department for the installation of the sanitary sewer and water leads.
 11. Genoa Township Resident Equivalent Users for an Office Building is designated as .40 REU's per 1,000 sq.ft. The connection fee for the sanitary service lateral will be based only on the proposed expansion building. The proposed floor plan equals 2,750 sq. ft. which is equivalent to 1.1 REU's. The connection fee for the water service connection will be based on the total floor plan, existing and proposed. The total floor plan equals 5,190 sq. ft. which is equivalent to 2 REU's.
 12. To comply with Genoa Township Zoning Ordinance the Petitioner should provide concrete curbing on all sides of the proposed parking lot. The curb will help to direct storm water and to control car traffic in the parking lot.
 13. On sheet PSP-5, the Petitioner is providing a concrete curb and gutter detail. It appears that the Petitioner will require a concrete curb spillout instead.

After Ms. Humphriss reviewed her letter, she stated that they should have commented on the width of the driveway because it is too wide. After some discussion, the Commissioner's agreed that the driveway should be made narrower.

The planner and engineer were worried about lack of curbing on the site. Mr. Purdy was concerned that where there is landscaping adjacent to parking you should have curbing so the landscaping is not destroyed. Ms. Humphriss stated that curbing is required because it serves to slow traffic down, direct storm water and protect trench drain from vehicles. Ms. Humphriss suggested that the parking lot be curbed with the elimination of the east end if a spillway was provided. After some discussion, a majority of the board members agreed with Ms. Humphriss' suggestion.

The Commission discussed the use of underground detention on the site. Morgan stated that he sees no reason for the underground but he won't deny the project because of it. Ms. Olson stated that she was impartial. Tengel and Brown indicated they would support the underground because this is a redevelopment. Mortensen stated that he would allow it but he will request that the petitioner work with the Township Engineer and Planner to draft an ordinance to address these types of systems. Ms. Humphriss indicated that the petitioner would need to address items 3 and 4 of her review letter for approval of the underground system.

Morgan asked if we usually see an architectural sample for the proposed building. Mr. Purdy stated that it is required. After some discussion, the Commissioner's agreed that the petitioner should supply architectural samples that should include the hardy board in earth tones instead of vinyl siding.

Mortensen questioned if the current sign meets our requirement now. Ms. VanMarter replied no that pole signs are no longer allowed and it does not meet the setback from the Grand River Road right-of-way. Mr. Purdy stated that because the sign is in the right-of-way the Commission can require that it be removed. Mr. Harvey stated that he is concerned about giving up the sign for a future buyer. Ms. VanMarter asked if they could lose a parking space and place the sign there. Mr. Harvey replied that they would work on the sign issue.

Ms. VanMarter asked if the existing shed was going to remain and if the wall pack fixture is a full wall cut off or not. Mr. Harvey stated that the shed will remain and he will look into the information regarding the wall packs.

It was decided that the petitioner should work on all the items presented tonight and submit new drawings and architectural samples for next Planning Commission meeting.

A call to the public was made at 9:03 p.m. with no response.

Moved by Mortensen, supported by Morgan to table per petitioner's request. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Moved by Mortensen, supported by Olsen to approve the minutes of January 9, 2006 meeting. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Meeting adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:

Amy Ruthig

