

GENOA TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
September 29, 2003
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, James Mortensen, John Cahill, and Bill Litogot. Also present was Kelly Kolakowski, Township Planner; Jeff Purdy from Langworthy, Strader, LeBlanc & Associates, Inc. and James Miller 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 7:03 p.m.

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

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Litogot, 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 7:05 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, sketch plan, and impact assessment for proposed construction of three 60' x 80' storage buildings to the rear of an existing storage building at 945 Lucy Road, Section 6, petitioned by C. Now (PC 03-10).

Planning Commission disposition of petition

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

Mr. Lou Teffler, the property owner, and Mr. Jeff Teffler, the builder, were present to represent the petitioner.

Jeff Teffler stated they are proposing to construct three 60' x 80' storage buildings behind the current storage facility to eliminate the outside storage. These plans have been approved administratively and they were asked to come before the Planning Commission for approval of their sketch plan.

Mr. Purdy reviewed his letter of September 22, 2003. He advised this is a non-conforming site and suggested some upgrades to improve the site.

The landscaping along the Lucy Road frontage should be upgraded to include 12 evergreen trees. The petitioner agreed.

With regard to parking, the ordinance requires five spaces and one per employee or one per every 1,700 square footage of floor area. Mr. Purdy would like clarification on the use of the site and the number of employees as well as what parking would be required. Lou stated they have no employees. This is just used for storage. He feels there is plenty of room in the front of the site for parking. He advised that his business is buying excess and obsolete new materials from automotive companies. He then sells it to foreign markets.

Commissioner Mortensen would like to have the parking part on the gravel for 17 cars in case the ownership of the site changes. The petitioner would agree to this; however, he does not see the benefit of laying asphalt. All commissioners agreed to the parking area being gravel and on the front of the site.

Mr. Purdy advised no outdoor storage would be allowed on the site and he would like this stated in the motion for approval.

Mr. Purdy noted there is no waste receptacle enclosure being proposed. Lou advised there is no receptacle planned for the site.

Mr. Purdy advised any new or existing outdoor light fixtures must be downward directed, cut-off fixtures that comply with Section 3.51 of the Zoning Ordinance and should not cause off-site glare. The petitioner will comply.

Mr. Miller had no comments; however, he stated that the gravel road would need to comply with Livingston County Road Commission standards.

Chairman Pobuda asked what materials will be used. The buildings will have taupe aluminum siding with a shingled roof.

The petitioner advised there is no signage proposed.

Commissioner Cahill questioned the sketch plan. There is not as much information for this site as is usually seen by the Planning Commission. There are no building materials shown, colored rendering, etc. Mr. Purdy advised this was determined by the Zoning Administrator, who is the Township Manager, to be a sketch plan and they do not require as much detail as a site plan.

The call to the public was made at 7:28 p.m. with no response.

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Litogot, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment date stamped April 2, 2003 for construction of three 60' x 80' storage buildings to the rear of an existing storage building at 945 Lucy Road, Section 6, petitioned by C. Now with the condition that dust control measures be added. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Moved by Mortensen, seconded by Litogot, to approve the sketch plan dated March 28, 2003 for construction of three 60' x 80' storage buildings to the rear of an existing storage building at 945 Lucy Road, Section 6, petitioned by C. Now with the following conditions:

1. A total of 12 evergreen trees shall be planted along the Lucy Road frontage.
2. A total of 17 gravel parking spaces will be installed along the front and south side of the existing building subject to review and approval of staff, who will assure that the 20 foot setback from the ROW is adhered to.
3. The sketch plan will be resubmitted to the Howell Area Fire Department to assure that a gravel driveway vs. a dirt access is acceptable.
4. No outdoor storage will be permitted on the site.
5. Waste will be handled within the buildings and no exterior Dumpster will be permitted.
6. Any new or existing outdoor lighting fixtures shall be downward directed, cut-off fixtures that comply with Section 3.51 of the Zoning Ordinance and should not cause off-site glare.
7. The building will be constructed of aluminum siding with a taupe or beige color and the roof will be shingled in an earth-tone color.
8. Dust control measures shall be added to the sketch plan.
9. Only a silent alarm will be employed.
10. The cross section gravel road shall meet Livingston County Road Commission standards.

Commissioner Mortensen stated this is a non-conforming lot and eligible for sketch plans rather than a site plan review per Section 13.0308 of the Genoa Township Zoning Ordinance.

The motion carried (Cahill – No; Mortensen – Yes; Figurski – Yes; Pobuda – Yes; Litogot – Yes).

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #2... Review of special use application, site plan, and environmental impact assessment for proposed Cedar Closet storage facility with one storage and office/manager's residence building and three additional self

storage buildings with exterior access, located on the south side eof Grand River Avenue, between Dorr and Gray Roads, Section 10, petitioned by Joseph A. Guido, Guido Associates, Inc. (PC 03-21)

Planning Commission disposition of petition

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

Mr. Joseph Guido from Guido Associates, Inc., and Mr. Jason Wallace, from Desine, Inc., were present to represent the petitioner.

Mr. Wallace advised they are proposing to build 4 buildings of approximately 10,000 square foot each. Since their last appearance at the Planning Commission, they have made the following changes:

- 1. They relocated the driveway to the east side of the site as requested, which allowed them to preserve more trees and eliminate the detention area along Grand River.
- 2. They have added landscape screening on top of the berm on the east side of the site.

Mr. Purdy reviewed his letter of September 22, 2003.

An undisturbed 50 feet wide landscape buffer must be provided to the property to the west. The petitioner is proposing a concrete wall and no new landscaping. Mr. Wallace advised they are proposing a screening wall as well as preserving the current trees, which is in excess of what is required by Ordinance. They feel the screening is sufficient. Commissioner Mortensen asked if there is room for a 50-foot greenbelt buffer. Mr. Guido stated there is not. They would have to remove 30 feet of the buildings. He stated that all of the activity would take place on the other side of the site (i.e. office, apartment, entrances to storage units). The walls on the west side of the buildings are solid and will not have any overhead doors. There was a brief discussion regarding the screening and if it is adequate for the residential area to the west.

Commissioner Mortensen would recommend that staff review this to ensure that it is sufficient.

Mr. Purdy advised that since the trees are not shown on the plans, he is not sure where they are located in relationship to the property line and where the driveway is going to be constructed. He would like to see a tree survey. Mr. Wallace referenced that they are preserving the existing 47 trees; however, they can provide a tree survey if it is desired.

The petitioner advised the proposed wall is a solid concrete with a brick pattern. Mr. Purdy advised that when a commercial property abuts a residential property,

brick walls are used. Mr. Guido advised they would like to have a concrete wall for cost reasons. They can add color to the concrete if it is desired.

Commissioner Cahill asked why the project wasn't designed to accommodate the 50-foot buffer. Mr. Guido stated they are an atypical industrial use. It is low intensity. He has a current development like this and it is very quiet. It is the least intense industrial use. The buildings are only 12-feet high and 30 feet wide. Commissioner Cahill feels he can compromise with the petitioner, but 20 feet is not sufficient. He would like to see canopy trees as well.

The five-foot sidewalk along Grand River needs to be installed with the current site plan and not when the property to the front is developed. The petitioner will comply.

The plantings proposed in the property to the east should be within the site boundaries unless a written agreement with the adjoining property owner can be obtained. Mr. Wallace advised they would like to plant the trees along the berm between the properties and will work with the property owner to reach an agreement. If they are not interested, then the petitioner will plant them on their property. All commissioners agree.

A photometric grid shall be supplied. The petitioner will resubmit a photometric grid. It will be the same as the original; however, the buildings were "flipped" to accommodate the driveway on the east.

Mr. Miller reviewed his letter of September 26, 2003.

1. The petitioner should provide information on the existing drainage system at the south property line. It is unclear where the water goes once it exits the detention facility. Mr. Guido showed this information; however, he will revise the site plan to reflect it.
2. The petitioner should provide documentation that the existing storm water system that will be collecting runoff from the proposed site is adequate to handle the additional lows. The petitioner will comply.

The call to the public was made at 8:05 p.m.

Shannon Van Sach of 1791 Gray Road stated her home will be directly affected by this development. She is not sure how the wall is going to be built on the property line. There are two rows of evergreen greens, one on each side of the property line. She would like the wall to be on the east side of the two rows of trees and would also like it to be higher. She wants to make sure the applicant is meeting the Township Ordinance.

Tom Van Sach, Shannon's husband agrees with what his wife said about the applicant not being able to build the wall between the two rows of trees. They have a two-story home and it is 50 feet from the property line.

Mr. Leonard Howe of 1837 Gray Road is concerned about the drainage. He agrees that a poured concrete wall will last longer than a brick wall.

Mr. Kevin Patterson of 20114 Woodhill, Northville, MI owns Lots #40 and #41. He is concerned about the drainage in this area. He would like more detail.

Mr. Will Friend of 1829 Gray Road lives next to Mr. Howe. He is also concerned about the drainage. He questioned if the wall is put on the property line, how would it be maintained without going onto the adjoining residents' properties.

Ms. Tamra Howe, Leonard's wife, would like the wall to be on the east side of the trees. She wants to make sure those trees are saved.

The call to the public was closed at 8:23 p.m.

Mr. Purdy feels that the wall should be on the east side of the tree line and not on the property line. Mr. Guido advised that there would be maintenance and liability issues with regard to the property on the other side of the wall. He would need to speak to the developer.

Mr. Purdy added he would like to have color added to the poured concrete as well as canopy trees added to this area. He suggested 15 trees unless the staff determined there is not sufficient room. All commissioners agree.

Mr. Miller advised that the drainage that the applicant is proposing is adequate. He noted their two outstanding concerns.

1. The petitioner should provide information on the existing drainage system at the south property line as it is unclear where the water goes once it exits the detention facility.
2. The petitioner should provide documentation that the existing storm water system that will be collecting runoff from the proposed site is adequate to handle the additional flows.

The petitioner will provide all of the required information.

It was noted that the proposed sign is too high and it shall be no higher than six feet tall. The petitioner advised he will comply.

Moved by Mortensen, seconded by Litogot, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Special Land Use for Cedar Closet storage facility with one storage and office/manager's residence building and three additional self storage buildings with exterior access, located on the south side of Grand River Avenue, between Dorr and Gray Roads, Section 10, petitioned by Joseph A. Guido, Guido Associates, Inc., with the following condition:

1. Approval by the Township Board of the Impact Assessment and Site Plan.

This recommendation is made because this use is a right of special use within an industrial zoning and safeguards for the nearby residents are part of the site plan review.

The motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Mortensen, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment dated September, 2003 (Revision) for Cedar Closet storage facility with one storage and office/manager's residence building and three additional self storage buildings with exterior access, located on the south side of Grand River Avenue, between Dorr and Gray Roads, Section 10, petitioned by Joseph A. Guido, Guido Associates, Inc., with the following changes:

1. Page 1, second paragraph from the bottom should be changed to read ".....proposed driveway at the **east** side".
2. Page 2, third paragraph from the bottom, the word "chemical" shall be changed to "**chloride**"

The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Cahill asked for a discussion. He stated there was no review of the lighting. The petitioner was advised that the lighting shall be downward directed and shoebox style.

There was also a discussion regard the PIP plan. It was decided that the PIP plan should be part of the Impact Assessment. Commissioner Figurski agreed and **Moved** to reconsider her previous motion. Commissioner Mortensen seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Mortensen to add the following to her motion recommending approval of the Impact Assessment for Cedar Closet:

1. The PIP plan dated September, 2003 shall be included in the Impact Assessment.

The motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Mortensen, seconded by Litogot, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Site Plan dated September 10, 2003 for Cedar Closet storage facility with one storage and office/manager's residence building and three additional self storage buildings with exterior access, located on the south side of Grand River Avenue, between Dorr and Gray Roads, Section 10, petitioned by Joseph A. Guido, Guido Associates, Inc., with the following conditions:

1. Approval by the Township Board of the Impact Assessment and Special Land Use as recommended by motions this evening.
2. The six-foot wall will be moved 20 feet to the east on the site and constructed of concrete matching the masonry block portion of the buildings.

3. Three garage doors on the east side of the northernmost building will be removed and one small access door will remain.
4. A five-foot wide concrete sidewalk will be installed along Grand River prior to occupancy.
5. The plantings on the east side of the property will be within the site unless an easement can be obtained from the property owner to the east to plant them on top of the berm.
6. The lighting will be shoebox and downward directed and are not to exceed 0.5 footcandle at the west property line.
7. A revised photometric grid will be provided to the Township Board.
8. A six-foot monument sign will be permitted with materials compatible with the office / residential portion of the building.
9. Fifteen canopy trees will be planted along the west property line unless Township Staff determined a lesser number are required.
10. Any trees destroyed during construction of the buildings or six-foot wall shall be replaced by the petitioner.
11. The petitioner will provide documentation regarding the draining at the south property line.
12. The petitioner will provide documentation that the existing storm water system is adequate.
13. A Knox box and fire extinguishers will be required for this site and shall be obtained from the Howell Area Fire Department.
14. No outdoor storage shall be permitted on the site.
15. The alarm system shall be silent.
16. Dust control measures shall be added to the site plan.
17. Irrigation shall be provided for all lawns and vegetation.
18. The petitioner shall provide to Township Staff an inventory of existing trees from the property line to the east to where the wall will be built.

The motion carried unanimously.

Member Discussion

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Litogot, to approve the minutes of September 15, 2003. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Commissioner Cahill advised that his wife, Irene, received a \$3,000 grant from the DNR for the front of the Genoa Township Hall.

Commissioner Cahill questioned the concept of a sketch plan. Commissioner Mortensen advised that the Township Manager determined in this case that the applicant did not have to invest approximately \$15,000 in engineering fees to erect three pole barns on an industrial property with no utilities. It would be unreasonable to ask them to spend that money. Commissioner Figurski agrees with that; however, she feels more information could have been included. Mr. Miller advised he was not aware that a gravel road would have to be built until the fire department letter was discussed this evening.

Ms. Kolakowski advised they are going to begin requiring staff meetings for all submissions and will include sketch plans in this. That is where Staff could advise the petitioner that more information would be required for their presentation to the Planning Commission.

Submitted by: Patty Thomas, Recording Secretary

Approved by: Barbara Figurski, Secretary