

GENOA TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
May 9, 2005
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, James Mortensen, Curt Brown, Teri Olson, and Dean Tengel. Also present was Kelly Kolakowski, Township Planner; Brian Borden from Langworthy, Strader, LeBlanc & Associates, Inc. and Tesha Humphriss 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 7:05 p.m.

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

Moved by Brown, seconded by Mortensen, to approve the Agenda as written.
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 7:06 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 PUD agreement amendment, final PUD site plan and impact assessment for a proposed 21,897 sq. ft. Tractor Supply Store with a 26,870 sq. ft. of outdoor display located on northeast corner of E. Grand River and Lawson Drive, Sec. 9, petitioned by Bunnell Hill Development Co., Inc. (05-14)

- **Planning Commission disposition of petition.**
 - A. Recommendation regarding PUD amendment. (4-20-05)
 - B. Recommendation regarding impact assessment (3-7-05).
 - C. Recommendation regarding final PUD site plan (3-9-05).

Mr. Larry Sims of Bunnell Hill Development, and Mr. Doug Gardner, the project engineer, were present to represent the petitioner.

Mr. Sims stated they have made the changes that were recommended at the previous Planning Commission meeting and subsequent worksession with regard to the fencing. There was discussion at these meetings if the outdoor sales should be included in the overall square footage for the PUD and it was decided that this would not be counted. They feel that 101 spaces is sufficient for their use. He showed colored site plan, renderings, and building materials.

Mr. Borden reviewed his letter of May 3, 2005.

- Planning Commission approval is required for all architecture and building materials. Mr. Sims showed which materials will be where on the building. Commissioner Tengel stated since there is no sample of the mesh fabric that will be used for the fencing, he suggested it be approved administratively. Chairman Pobuda is not in favor of any fabric and/or net on the site. He also does not want any cyclone fencing as that is what was stated on the original PUD.
- The PUD Agreement needs to be amended to permit a reduction in parking as the petitioner is only proposing 101 spaces. Chairman Pobuda stated that the Planning Commission has taken the position that if the petitioner feels they only need 101 then it would be approved. Commissioner Mortensen's concern is that if the use changes, the parking may not be sufficient. Mr. Sims stated they have outside sales area that could be converted to parking if there were a need in the future. Commissioner Brown's concern is if the use changes, what would happen with the outdoor storage area. If different things are going to be sold, the Township may want to not allow outdoor sales. Ms. Kolakowski stated that the PUD states that there be no outdoor sales and display next to Grand River, but suggested that the Commission amend the PUD Agreement to allow for outdoor sales specific to Tractor Supply. Commissioner Mortensen suggested it speak to the types of items and not the actual vendor.
- One additional barrier free space is required. The petitioner will add this space.
- The landscape plan is deficient for the detention pond plantings by 100. Commissioner Mortensen feels they have provided a lot of landscaping and added additional to the north that was not required. There was a discussion regarding the landscaping on the east side of the site. The petitioner stated they have the DTE overhead power line easement on that side, which dictated where they could plant these trees and shrubs. Chairman Pobuda would like to see more trees and shrubs on the overall site. Commissioner Tengel would like the 27 deficient shrubs planted at the detention pond. The petitioner will comply with this request. Commissioner Brown feels the outdoor sales area is too large and if it were reduced, they could plant more landscape and meet the requirements. Mr. Borden stated they are deficient

by 88 shrubs, 10 canopy trees, and 15 evergreen trees, but these can be planted anywhere on the site to meet the ordinance. Commissioner Mortensen stated that if the Planning Commission wanted the requirement met, they need to do it and not allow them to arbitrarily plant them on the site. If what they have proposed for the east side provides adequate screening, then that should be sufficient. Commissioner Tengel suggested planting the 88 shrubs along the east and north side of the display area. Commissioner Brown would like the landscaping to be able to fit and then determine where the building should be and not place the building and then see if the required landscaping fits. It was agreed that 88 shrubs will be planted close to the display area along the east and north sides.

- The light fixture detail needs to be provided and the intensity exceeds the requirement. Ms. Kolakowski feels this can be addressed and approved administratively before they present their plan to the Township Board.

Ms. Humphriss reviewed her letter of May 4, 2005.

- The proposed lawn slope for the detention pond is 1:3. Genoa Township requires a 1:4 slope. The Planning Commission needs to approve the 1:3 slope and if it is approved it needs to be fenced. Mr. Sims stated they are proposing a four-foot black fence. Ms. Kolakowski advised that at previous meetings, it was agreed that the fence will be black metal. All Commissioners agree with allowing the 1:3 slope with the black fence.
- The detention pond is sized for Phase I only and it will need to be modified when Phase II is developed.
- The petitioner needs to clarify if the outlet rate for the detention pond meets Livingston County Drain Commission standards.
- It was agreed at staff meetings that a traffic study is not needed at this time; however, one should be required when future development to this site is proposed.

Commissioner Tengel asked to review the issue of the fencing. He stated he would prefer that the detention pond be nicely landscaped with boulders and shrubs instead of fenced. He feels that if the Township is allowing the 1:3 slope, then some concessions should be made by the petitioner. He does not want fencing on the front of the site. Chairman Pobuda and Commissioner Brown agree. Ms. Humphriss stated that a fence is required when the slope is steeper than 1:3 based on the Drain Commissioner's requirements. Mr. Tengel noted that other developments in the area, such as Savannah, have bolder-type walls surrounding retention ponds.

Commissioner Mortensen questioned if the Drain Commissioner will allow boulders and landscaping to be put there instead of a fence. Ms. Humphriss is not sure; however, a way to eliminate the fence is to change it to 1:4 slope, which would mean making the parking lot smaller. Commissioner Tengel does not feel this is an appropriate place for a 1:3 slope since the fencing is required. Commissioner Brown agrees.

Commissioner Mortensen stated that this is an industrial site that was rezoned to commercial. It is 250 feet from Grand River with two buildings in front of it and it was previously decided to add 27 shrubs to the detention pond. Chairman Pobuda stated the reason it was rezoned was so an upscale development would be put there as this is the gateway to the Township. Commissioner Olson does not have a problem with the fence, especially since the shrubs were added. Chairman Pobuda is not in favor of the fencing.

Mr. Sims stated that the fencing was approved during all of their previous work sessions. They are not prepared to make changes at this time. They have addressed all of the requests that were made at the previous Planning Commission meetings and work sessions. They would like to have a vote on this project as presented this evening. Commissioner Mortensen noted there were 21 issues in the engineering letter and the issue of lighting that is in the consultant's most recent letter was discussed previously and was still not addressed prior to this meeting.

The call to the public was made at 8:08 p.m.

Ms. Elaine Groat of 612 Sunrise Park Drive asked what the distance is between the property line of Sunrise Park residences and the building and is it such a narrow area. It seems to be close and this will reduce the property values of these homes. It is very upsetting that it is that close to the residences. She stressed that if this project is approved, that dust control measures be implemented. She questioned if the area is staked out so the residents can visit the site.

Mr. Todd Smith of Thompson Brown stated that with regard to the stone retaining wall suggested for the detention pond, the County requires the specific slope so that if someone falls in they can get out. With reference to the Savannah development, they do have the stone wall, however, there is an area where someone could get out if they fell in.

Mr. Harvey Weiss, of Weiss Properties, understands the Planning Commission and Mr. Tengel's concerns regarding the slope. There have been many meetings and this is the first time this has been brought up. Before denying them or tabling it, he would like the Planning Commission to work with them to reduce the slope or amend the screening. These petitioners have worked very hard on this project.

The call to the public was closed at 8:14 p.m.

Mr. Gardner addressed Ms. Groat's concerns. It is 35 feet from the display area to the property line and the building is 160 feet from the property line. He

showed an aerial view, which showed where some of the homes are at the property line or very close to the line. The site is not currently staked out.

Commissioner Mortensen wanted to remind the public that this was zoned industrial before it was rezoned commercial.

Chairman Pobuda understands that the petitioner has worked hard on this, but work sessions are administrative and these seven people on the Commission make the final decisions. The Planning Commission's duty is to address the betterment of the entire Township.

Commissioner Tengel reiterated that he is only opposed to the fencing. If this can be eliminated he would be in favor of the project.

Moved by Mortensen, seconded by Tengel, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the PUD Amendment presented this evening for a proposed 21,897 sq. ft. Tractor Supply Store with a 26,870 sq. ft. of outdoor display located on northeast corner of E. Grand River and Lawson Drive, Sec. 9, petitioned by Bunnell Hill Development Co., Inc. with the following conditions:

1. Paragraph 3.5 will eliminate the reference to the Township constructing White Horse Drive. It is the intent that a future road be constructed; however, the Township will not be the ones to construct such a road.
2. Paragraph 3.5 shall read "any design and change of a road within the PUD Site will be done at the developer's expense".
3. The Agreement shall be reviewed by the Township Attorney.
4. Approval by the Township Board of the Site Plan as discussed this evening.

The motion carried (Tengel - yes; Brown – no; Mortensen – yes; Pobuda – no; Olson – yes).

Chairman Pobuda stated that he is not voting for it because he does not feel this is the proper site for this development.

Moved by Mortensen, seconded by Olson, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment with a revision date of April 18, 2005 for a proposed 21,897 sq. ft. Tractor Supply Store with a 26,870 sq. ft. of outdoor display located on northeast corner of E. Grand River and Lawson Drive, Sec. 9, petitioned by Bunnell Hill Development Co., Inc.

The motion carried (Tengel - yes; Brown – no; Mortensen – yes; Pobuda – no; Olson – yes).

Moved by Mortensen, seconded by Tengel, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Final PUD Site Plan dated April 20, 2005 for a proposed 21,897 sq. ft. Tractor Supply Store with a 26,870 sq. ft. of outdoor display located on northeast corner of E. Grand River and Lawson Drive, Sec. 9, petitioned by Bunnell Hill Development Co., Inc. with the following conditions:

1. The architecture and materials reviewed this evening are acceptable and will become the property of the Township.
2. The mesh or fabric that will be added to the cyclone and ornamental fencing on the east side of the property line will be earthtone and approved administratively.
3. The reduction to 101 parking spaces versus the Township ordinance is acceptable; however, one additional barrier-free space will be added.
4. The east/west road on the entrance portion of the property will be temporary until alternative solutions can be developed and the improved road will have curb and gutter and will be completed by July 1, 2007.
5. Twenty-seven additional shrubs will be placed around the retention pond and 88 shrubs will be placed near the east property line.
6. The detail for the light fixtures and a photometric study of the lighting will be completed and reviewed administratively prior to presentation to the Township Board.
7. A 1:3 slope will be acceptable for the detention pond, provided there is no fencing. If the only alternative is a 1:4 slope, this will entail reengineering the site and the Planning Commission request that the proposal be remanded back to the Planning Commission.
8. With regard to the items in TTMP's letter dated May 4, 2005, the petitioner should be aware that Items #3, 6, and 10 require MDOT approval.
9. Items #4, 5, 11, 14, 18, 19, and 20 of the TTMP's letter dated May 4, 2005 shall be complied with.

The motion carried (Tengel - yes; Brown – no; Mortensen – yes; Pobuda – no; Olson – yes).

Chairman Pobuda again reiterated his reasons for voting against the project. It is not an upscale use and is not an anchor store that was proposed originally.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 2... Review of PUD agreement amendment, site plan and environmental impact assessment for a proposed retail building located on the south side of Grand River Avenue at Lawson Drive. Sec. 9, petitioned by Boggio and Associates. (PC 05-06)

• Planning Commission disposition of petition.

- A. Recommendation regarding PUD amendment. (4-20-05)
- B. Recommendation regarding impact assessment (3-7-05).
- C. Recommendation regarding final PUD site plan (3-9-05).

Michael Boggio of Michael Boggio Associates, the architect, and Harvey Weiss, the property owner, were present.

Mr. Boggio showed the site plan for the entire PUD as well as a colored site plan for Outlot #1 and colored elevations. They are proposing to build a 6,750 square foot, multi-tenant building. He reviewed the site layout and traffic pattern.

He feels that the site plan was favorably received at the last meeting; however, it was suggested that the architecture and rear elevation be changed. They have pushed out part of the building on the southwest corner as well as changed the rear elevation to remove the spandrel glass and add real glass. He showed building material samples.

Mr. Borden reviewed his letter of May 3, 2005.

- Planning Commission approval is required for all architecture and building materials. All Commissioners like the changes that were made.
- It is suggested that the reference to “Krispy Kreme” should be changed to “coffee shop” in the PUD Agreement. All Commissioners, except Chairman Pobuda, agree with allowing the drive thru. He does not feel that this is the right place in the Township for a drive thru.
- The number of Hicks Yew plantings exceeds the 33% maximum for one species; however, he believes this is due to the required hedgerow along Grand River. All Commissioners agreed to allow it.
- The PUD required that ornamental lighting be installed along Grand River. The petitioner will comply with this requirement.
- There should be an amendment to the PUD Agreement addressing the issue of signage on the rear of the building that applies to all buildings on the site. Mr. Weiss requested that this restriction only be applied to this building and not all of the other outlots. With this building, there are more than one tenant and that would be too many signs, he agrees, however, other buildings may only be single users. Commissioner Mortensen suggested that the language stated that dual signage on buildings be approved by the Planning Commission on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Weiss agreed to this.

Ms. Humphriss reviewed her letter of May 3, 2005.

- A traffic study is not needed at this time; however, she suggested that as the site develops, updates to the traffic study be required.
- The easement for the proposed grading within Outlot #2 should be recorded prior to construction.
- They are proposing to live tap the existing water main along Lawson Drive and this needs to be observed by a representative of the utility.
- A permit from the Livingston County Building Department is required for the installation of the water and sewer leads.

The call to the public was made at 8:55 p.m. with no response.

Moved by Mortensen, seconded by Tengel, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the PUD Amendment reviewed this evening for a proposed retail building located on the south side of Grand River Avenue at Lawson Drive. Sec. 9, petitioned by Boggio and Associates with the following conditions:

1. Review by the Township Attorney.

2. Paragraph N on Page 2 of the Amendment shall be revised to read “The customer drive-thru facility shall only be permitted for the sale of donuts, bagels, pastries, coffee and related similar beverages”
3. This Amendment will be expanded to provide that no signage will be permitted on the rear or side of any buildings anywhere on the PUD site without the approval of the Township Planning Commission.

The motion carried (Tengel – yes; Brown – yes; Mortensen – yes; Pobuda – no; Olson – yes).

Chairman Pobuda wanted the record to reflect that he voted no because the original intent for these outlots was for one building and use per lot and as this is the gateway to the Township, no drive-thrus were to be permitted.

Moved by Brown, seconded by Mortensen, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment dated January 11, 2005 for a proposed retail building located on the south side of Grand River Avenue at Lawson Drive. Sec. 9, petitioned by Boggio and Associates. **The motion carried (Tengel – yes; Brown – yes; Mortensen – yes; Pobuda – no; Olson – yes).**

Moved by Mortensen, seconded by Olson, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Final PUD Site Plan for a proposed retail building located on the south side of Grand River Avenue at Lawson Drive. Sec. 9, petitioned by Boggio and Associates with the following conditions:

1. The architecture and materials are acceptable and the samples will become the property of the Township.
2. The lighting plan will be reviewed administratively by Township staff to ensure that it is consistent with the last review.
3. Ornamental lighting consistent with that used in the surrounding area will be installed on the site along Grand River.
4. Signage will be consistent with the amendment to the PUD Agreement made by recommending motion this evening.
5. The recommendations of the Township Engineer set out in their letter dated May 3, 2005 will be complied with; however, with respect to Item #1 referencing traffic studies, the Planning Commission will determine on a case-by-case basis if it required.

The motion carried (Tengel – yes; Brown – yes; Mortensen – yes; Pobuda – no; Olson – yes)

Chairman Pobuda called for a break from 9:05 to 9:10 p.m.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 3... Review of site plan and environmental impact assessment for a proposed retail and restaurant building (Savannah South) located on the south side of Grand River Avenue, between Latson Road and Lawson Drive within the Savannah Development, Sec. 9, petitioned by Savannah Development, LLC. (05-21)

- **Planning Commission disposition of petition**

- A. Recommendation regarding impact assessment (4-19-05)
- B. Disposition regarding site plan. (4-19-05)

Todd Smith and Mark Leonard from Savannah South, and Jeff Smith, the engineer, were present.

Todd Smith gave a brief description and history of the site. Two buildings have been developed on this site. They will continue with the same architecture and materials that were used with the other two buildings. He showed colored renderings and sample building materials. They have moved the building very close to the west property line; however, there is 250 feet of natural landscape buffer to screen them from the use on this side. They are proposing a multi-tenant building, but do not have any prospective tenants at this time. He would like one of the uses to be a restaurant and has calculated the parking requirement to accommodate this.

He noted that there is an issue with the access drive to the east. When Leo's was developed on the front of the site, they were allowed to put their dumpster in the area where this was to be located. He noted that the he was at both the Planning Commission and Board Meetings and voiced his opposition to this. He would like to provide the access drive from the site discussed this evening; however, he would lose five parking spaces and he feels he need all of the parking that he has proposed. He added that he would like to add a walking path to link his property to Leo's site in order to assist in pedestrian traffic flow.

Chairman Pobuda asked the petitioner if they can afford to lose the five parking spaces to provide for the easement drive. Todd stated the he feels that he needs those spaces; however, once the building is completely leased, he would know what his needs are.

All Commissioners agreed to leave the temporary access drive issue to be handled when the building is completely leased.

Commissioner Brown stated that he likes the building but possibly it's too large and there is too much impervious surface. Todd stated that they need to have a building this size in this market. It is at the end of a long drive and behind two other buildings. They wanted to allow for the restaurant and that is what is increasing the parking needs.

Commissioner Mortensen stated it is very hard to tell what parking is required when the petitioner does not even know what the tenants will be as well as what will evolve in the future.

Mr. Borden reviewed his letter of April 29, 2005.

- The driveway on the west side of the building does not meet the 10-foot setback requirement and will require a variance from the ZBA

- Planning Commission approval is required for the architecture and materials.
- The Planning Commission has to approve utilizing the existing vegetation on the west as the required buffer zone. All Commissioners agree.
- A photometric grid needs to be provided. Todd stated they are proposing gooseneck fixtures and will meet the ordinance requirements with regard to intensity.

Ms. Humphriss reviewed her letter of May 4, 2005.

- A “Do Not Enter” sign should be placed on the northern exit of the delivery area to indicate southbound traffic is not permitted. The petitioner will comply.
- The petitioner will need Livingston County Drain Commission approval for the underground detention as well as the detention basin coefficients
- The petitioner should upsize the two four-foot diameter manholes at a minimum of five-foot diameter.

The call to the public was made at 9:50 p.m. with no response.

Moved by Mortensen, seconded to Tengel, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment with a revision date of April 19, 2005 for a proposed retail and restaurant building (Savannah South) located on the south side of Grand River Avenue, between Latson Road and Lawson Drive within the Savannah Development, Sec. 9, petitioned by Savannah Development, LLC. **The motion carried (Tengel- yes; Brown – no; Mortensen – yes; Pobuda – yes; Olson – yes).**

Moved by Mortensen, seconded by Tengel, to approve the Site Plan for a proposed retail and restaurant building (Savannah South) located on the south side of Grand River Avenue, between Latson Road and Lawson Drive within the Savannah Development, Sec. 9, petitioned by Savannah Development, LLC. with the following conditions:

1. The existing easement near the traffic island of Leo’s Coney Island will remain as is.
2. ZBA approval is required for the west side driveway because it does not meet the 10-foot set back requirement.
3. The proposed architecture and materials will match Phase I and sample materials will become the property of the Township.
4. The petitioner agrees to meet all Township ordinances, particularly with reference to lighting.
5. Items #1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 from the Township Engineer’s letter dated May 4, 2005 will be complied with.
6. A waiver of the ordinance regarding plantings on the west property line is approved in order to permit the petitioner to utilize the existing vegetation.

The motion carried (Tengel- yes; Brown – no; Mortensen – yes; Pobuda – yes; Olson – yes).

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 4... Review of site plan and impact assessment for a proposed 7,820 sq. ft. office and showroom building for a Pro Bros. Windows and Sunroom located on the south side of Grand River Avenue, between Dorr Road and Kellogg Road, Sec. 14, petitioned by Lindhout Associates Architects. (05-20)

• **Planning Commission disposition of petition**

- A. Recommendation regarding impact assessment. (4-22-05)
- B. Disposition regarding site plan. (04-22-05)

Mr. Joe Chidester of Lindhout Associates, Mr. Dave Provenzola of Pro Bros., and Roland Alix of Boss Engineering were present.

Mr. Chidester stated that at the Township Board meeting for Trends in Tile, which is proposed to be developed next to this site, the Board asked them to revise their architecture to meet the downtown standards. They have made similar changes to this evening's submittal based on those comments. He distributed colored renderings of the new proposed Pro Bros. as well as the revised renderings for Trends in Tile.

Commissioner Olson stated that she is unsure as to what is desired by the Township for the downtown area. Ms. Kolakowski stated they are going to be working with LSL to develop some design standards and the May 23, 2005 Planning Commission meeting to discuss this further.

Mr. Chidester continued that in keeping with the recommendations that were made with regard to Trends in Tile, they have made the changes to Pro Bros.' Grand River elevation. They have removed the sunroom that was on this elevation. There was a discussion regarding the sunrooms still being located on the east side of the building and visible from Grand River. Mr. Provenzola stated he would like to be able to display sunrooms as this is their business, similar to how car dealerships have cars in their parking lots. If they are not allowed to display these in the front, then they would pull out of the purchase of this property.

Commissioners Tengel and Olson would allow the sunrooms. Commissioner Brown does not feel it is appropriate. Commissioner Mortensen stated he would allow the sunrooms if major revisions to the architecture were made. He does not like the building. All Commissioners agreed that changes need to be made to the architecture of the building.

Mr. Borden reviewed his letter of April 29, 2005.

- Planning Commission approval is required for the proposed architecture and building materials.
- A less visible location is recommended for the dumpster enclosure as it is visible from Grand River.
- The driveway along Grand River needs to be aligned with the opposite driveway unless the Road Commission approves it as is. Jeff stated that he

has spoken with the Road Commission and they are willing to work with the petitioner. Ms. Humphriss also spoke to the Road Commission and agrees with Mr. Borden that it is ultimately the Road Commission's decision.

- They recommend that the easement for a future service drive be shifted slightly to the north for better alignment with the development to the west as well as it being installed during the construction of the building and not at a future time. Mr. Chidester believes that the proposed location is the best location for this driveway. If it is moved further north, they would be granting an easement through the middle of their site and potentially impeding any future parking or building development on their site. All Commissioners agree with allowing the easement where it is proposed.

Ms. Humphriss reviewed her letter of May 4, 2005.

- Since the proposed retention pond is designed with an emergency spillway to the property to the west, she suggests that documentation indicating approval of this is provided and a 154-foot wide easement and agreement for the overflow be indicated on the plans and obtained. The petitioner's engineer is in the process of securing this easement.
- The proposed lawn slope surrounding the retention pond is a 1:3 slope and the Township requires a 1:4 slope. If the Planning Commission approves a 1:3 slope, then additional stabilization measures should be implemented. She noted that even though this is the back of the site, the property to the rear is zoned residential. She added that this is a difficult area of the Township with regard to drainage. An ideal situation is for both sites to work together; however, they are not being developed at the exact same time. She feels the best solution would be a regional detention pond be developed. Jeff stated that they have met all of the Drain Commissioner's standards and they do not know how the property to the rear is going to be developed.

This led to a discussion regarding the property to the rear. The question was raised as to what the Township envisions in this area. Commissioner Mortensen feels it is urgent that the Township determine what is going to be developed on the site behind these two lots. Ms. Kolakowski stated that this property is being planned to be included in the downtown PUD development. It is currently zoned rural residential, two-acre minimum lot size. She enforced that these two parcels are still zoned general commercial. Commissioner Tengel stated that these properties would be developed first and whoever developed the residential parcels would need to determine what would need to be done to screen the homes from the commercial buildings. Mr. Mortensen agrees; however, he feels that the Township needs to keep that zoning in mind when deciding on the rear architecture and detention ponds at the rear of the site. Commissioner Tengel stated that he would not like to see a pond surrounded by a fence on each site.

The call to the public was made at 10:44 p.m. with no response.

Commissioner Mortensen suggested that the petitioner meet with staff and present different building renderings and he also asked them to consider the drainage discussion that was held this evening. He reiterated his concerns with the appearance of the rear of these sites due to the property that abuts them.

Mr. Chidester stated that it is hard for them to make architectural changes when they do not have any design standards.

Moved by Mortensen, seconded by Olson, to table Agenda Item #4 at the request of the petitioner. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Moved by Mortensen, seconded by Olson, to approve the minutes of April 25, 2005. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Member Discussion

Ms. Kolakowski stated that there are no items for the May 23, 2005 Planning Commission meeting; therefore, a joint meeting between the Planning Commission, the ZBA, and the Township Board will be held to discuss zoning amendments as well as the downtown district.

The meeting adjourned at 11:00 p.m.

Submitted by: Patty Thomas, Recording Secretary

Approved by: Barbara Figurski, Secretary