

GENOA TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
March 25, 2002
6:30 P.M.
MINUTES

The work session of the Planning Commission was called to order by Vice-chairman John Cahill at 6:30 p.m. The following commission members were present constituting a quorum for transaction of business: Barbara Figurski, James Mortensen, Ken Burchfield, Curt Brown, and Bill Litogot. Also present was Michael Archinal, Township Manager; Jeff Purdy from Langworthy, Strader, LeBlanc & Associates, Inc. and Deb Huntley 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 Vice-chairman John Cahill at 7:00 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Moved by Litogot, seconded by Figurski, 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 7:02 p.m. Vice-chairman Cahill noted that the Board will not begin any new business after 10:00 p.m.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #1... Review of final site plan and environmental impact assessment for proposed 264-unit apartment complex located on the north side of Grand River Avenue in the Lorentzen PUD, Sections 4 & 9, petitioned by Singh Development Company (PC 00-48)

- **Planning Commission disposition of petition**
 - A. Recommendation regarding impact assessment
 - B. Recommendation regarding final site plan

Mr. Dave Zaitchik of Singh Development and Mark Mahajan of Boss Engineering were present to represent the petitioner.

Mr. Zaitchik advised that they have made revisions to the plan as suggested by the planner. He presented samples of building materials as well as a colored architectural rendering.

Mr. Purdy reviewed his letter of March 20, 2002.

A shared private road access agreement needs to be recorded between the neighboring developments. It was decided that this can be handled administratively by Township staff.

The street trees should be placed at least 30 feet from road intersections. The petitioner will comply.

The grading plan must be revised to indicate a grading limit that corresponds with the tree protection plan. Also, more trees along the existing fence line on the east property line should be preserved. Mr. Zaitchik stated they showed the "worst case scenario" on the plan. Mr. Purdy suggested reducing the limits of grading near Building #28 as well as around the tennis courts. He also suggested keeping the natural tree line along the north property line as well as on the east property line, instead of grading all of the way up to the property line, keep the natural tree line by following the drainage swell more closely. Mr. Mahajan stated they will make this revision.

Ms. Huntley stated the petitioner has met all of their requests.

Commissioner Litogot likes the layout and the design of the buildings. He would like to have a rendering of the clubhouse presented to the Township Board.

Mike Archinal stated that the petitioner and Mr. Heximer who owns the Sunoco gas station have agreed to provide the access road to Lawson Drive, which will eventually have a signal. This can be handled at the Township staff level.

Vice-chairman Cahill feels it is a beautiful project and he thanks the petitioner for the work that has been done since the last meeting.

The call to the public was made at 7:22 with no response.

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Mortensen, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment dated 02/07/02 for a proposed 264-unit apartment complex located on the north side of Grand River Avenue in the Lorentzen PUD, Sections 4 & 9, petitioned by Singh Development Company (PC 00-48). **The motion carried unanimously.**

Moved by Burchfield, seconded by Mortensen, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Site Plan for a proposed 264-unit apartment complex located on the north side of Grand River Avenue in the Lorentzen PUD, Sections 4 & 9, petitioned by Singh Development Company (PC 00-48) with the following conditions:

1. Township Attorney approval of the shared private road access agreement.
2. For sight distance reasons, no trees shall be located within 30 feet of a road intersection.
3. Grading shall be moved to a maximum of 30 feet from all proposed structures, including the tennis court.
4. The petitioner shall revise the tree survey to show the grading line to follow the drainage swell along the east property line as well as to preserve the trees along the north property line.
5. Approval by the Township Board of the Impact Assessment dated 02/07/02 as recommended by motion this evening.
6. Petitioner shall provide an architectural rendering of the clubhouseTownship Board approval.
7. Township Engineer review and approval of all plans.
8. Petitioner shall coordinate the location of the east/west connector road with Township staff and adjacent property owners to accommodate the future connection to Lawson Drive.
9. Building materials, as presented this evening, are satisfactory and shall be presented to the Township Board.

The motion carried unanimously.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #2...Review of final site plan and environmental impact assessment for proposed 47 single-family units on 66.91 acres located on the north side of Cunningham Lake Road in Section 34 of Genoa Township, petitioned by The Terra Land Group, LLC (PC 01-25)

- **Planning Commission disposition of petition**
 - A. Recommendation regarding impact assessment
 - B. Disposition regarding condominium final site plan

Ms. Kim Hiller and Mr. Thomas Dumond from Boss Engineering as well as Mr. David Holdwick from Gordon Builders and Mr. Geof Greeneisen from The Terra Land Group were present to represent the petitioner.

Ms. Hiller stated that all three parties involved met and discussed each lot on this site. Gordon Buildings provided a sample home and they determined that they will need an 80 x 80 building envelope in order to construct this type of home.

It was difficult to obtain an 80 x 80 building envelope on Lot #26 because of the drainage easement so they filled in a small area and eliminated that easement.

With regard to Lots #11, 17, 30, 31, and 33, they feel comfortable that each lot has an 80 x 80 building area.

They have two options with regard to Lot #45. Ms. Hiller showed the Planning Commission two plans for this lot. They are asking for some guidance from the Commission as to what is preferred. Mr. Purdy stated that he would like to see the 20-foot setback on Lot #45, which is what is also required on Lot #1. He does not want the septic field in the rear yard near the greenbelt. This information allowed the petitioner to choose Option A as the building envelope for Lot #45.

They have added the 20-foot-wide cross section to Sheet #3 per the engineer's request.

Mr. Purdy stated he would like to see the conveyance of an easement to allow for the adjacent property to connect to the road stump of Shady Knoll Court. Mr. Greeneisen stated this is currently in the Master Deed under Article 6, Section 8.

Ms. Huntley stated the petitioner has met their concerns. They will address the drainage issues during the construction phase of the plan.

The Brighton Fire Chief's letter was discussed. The petitioner shall comply with the Fire Department's request for the drives leading to Lots #17, 18, 23, and 24 to meet the requirements for fire access roads.

Commissioner Burchfield asked the petitioner about the construction traffic being restricted to Cunningham Lake Road as requested by a member of the public at the last Planning Commission meeting. Mr. Holdwick of Gordon Builders stated this will be "taken care of" with all of his contractors.

Commissioner Mortensen feels this is a very nice development and he appreciates the work that was done since the last meeting.

The call to the public was made at 7:50 p.m.

Mr. Bob Hertz of 5390 Mountain Road stated there is ¼ - 1/3 mile straight stretch of road on Mountain Road that currently has a problem with speeding. He would like to know what the Township plans to do to take care of these roads with the increased traffic from this and future developments.

Mr. Smith of 5111 Mountain Road has concerns with the increased traffic on Mountain Road because of this development.

Ms. Janet Smith of 5111 Mountain Road does not want any extra traffic on her road.

Mr. Vernon of 5421 Mountain Road asked what is designated as the main entrance to this development. Mr. Holdwick of Gordon Builders stated they have not designated one entrance as the "main" entrance. There is dual access to this subdivision.

Jeff Wink of 5455 Mountain Road stated Mountain Road will become a main thoroughfare for this development. They would like to do what they can to stop the increased traffic on their road.

Ms. Rona Sigick of 5714 Eggert Place stated that the neighbors were not notified of this subdivision being proposed in their area. There is a small notice in the newspaper and it references Cunningham Lake Road, not Mountain Road or Eggert Place. She asked if this development can be accessed only from Cunningham Lake Road and not Mountain Road.

Mr. John Sigick of 5714 Eggert Place stated that he has lived in this township for over 15 years. He moved from Brighton Lake Road into the subdivision on Eggert Road. He feels the residents are going to prefer traveling on Mountain Road as opposed to Cunningham Lake Road because it is paved. He urges the members of the Planning Commission to take a trip down Cunningham Lake Road and it will be obvious as to why the residents of this new development will prefer to travel Mountain Road.

He also had a concern about the notification. None of his neighbors knew of this development until it was at this stage. They would have liked to have stated their opposition to this project before this point.

Mr. Archinal stated that a notification letter is only sent out to residents within 300 feet when there is a rezoning proposal. The notice in the paper is sufficient for this type of proposal and they try to word it as clearly as they know how.

Mr. Purdy stated the Township encourages the interconnection of subdivisions to help disperse traffic and discourages the building of cul-de-sacs.

Commissioner Mortensen noted that people have the right to develop their property and he agrees that no one likes increased traffic, but this is going to be a very nice subdivision.

It was asked if Cunningham Lake Road has plans of being developed. Mr. Archinal stated it has been discussed, but it is difficult because it is on the border of Genoa Township and Hamburg Township. He did state that it is very realistic that Cunningham Lake Road will be improved within this year with crushed limestone, which compacts very well to where it gives the appearance of concrete.

Vice chairman Cahill asked what can be done about the speeding on Mountain Road. Mr. Purdy stated that this is a county road but additional enforcement can be looked into. He suggested the residents contact the County Road Commission and look at some options for trafficking calming along this roadway.

Mr. Smith stated the intersection of Brighton Road and Mountain Road is very dangerous. He feels the access should be from Cunningham Lake Road only.

Ms. Sigick agrees with Mr. Smith. She also stated that crushed limestone will make a tremendous difference to Cunningham Lake Road.

Dan of 5700 Eggert Road asked about the easement on Shady Knoll to a new development. Commissioner Burchfield stated that the Township is requiring an easement to access it, but it will be a private road.

A member of the public stated he appreciates the planner's comments with regarding to trying to encourage the interconnection of subdivisions and traffic disbursement. He asked if the Township has done a study to determine what the impact would be on the existing roads. He also asked if the safety improvements done to the surrounding roads can be paid by the developer. Mr. Archinal stated that even if the developer agrees to pay, requiring off-site improvements from a developer is against Michigan State law.

Vice chairman Cahill asked if something can be done where this development leads into the next development in order to slow down traffic. Mr. Purdy does not feel that this location is where the problem is. The problem seems to be on Mountain Road where the road has a long stretch of straight road. He added that the layout and design of the roads in this development are being designed to discourage speed.

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

Moved by Litogot, seconded by Burchfield to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment dated October 2, 2001 for a proposed 47 single-family units on 66.91 acres located on the north side of Cunningham Lake Road in Section 34 of Genoa Township, petitioned by The Terra Land Group, LLC (PC 01-25)

1. By recommending approval, the Planning Commission takes the public comments into consideration with respect to the Impact Assessment's stand of the impact on traffic and pedestrians in Section I, which states "As Cunningham Lake Road currently operates at such a favorable level of service, the additional traffic generated by this development will not adversely affect the current level of service on Cunningham Lake Road in the vicinity of this development". The Planning Commission believes this is an opinion and does not match the opinion of the residents. The Commission does not give validity to that statement.

Commissioner Litogot supported this and **the motion carried unanimously.**

Moved by Burchfield, seconded by Mortensen, to approve the Site Plan for Copperleaf Development, a 47 single-family unit development on 66.91 acres located on the north side of Cunningham Lake Road in Section 34 of Genoa Township, petitioned by The Terra Land Group, LLC (PC 01-25) with the following conditions:

1. The building setbacks from the buffers along Cunningham Lake Road for Lots #1 and #45 shall not be less than 20 feet.
2. The Planning Commission recommends that Proposal A be the required building envelope and the dimensional requirements of that be adhered to with respect to Lot #45.
3. All detention ponds are to be identified on Section B of the Master Deed as common elements.
4. The Planning Commission, by this approval, does not constitute acceptable by the Township for future building variances that may be required.
5. The construction plan shall provide tree preservation details with the developer being required to preserve as many 8" caliper trees and all undisturbed areas with the markings of limited grading to be inspected by the Township Landscape Architect and the granting of a grading permit.
6. The required approvals of the Livingston County Drain Commission shall be obtained.
7. The required approval of the Livingston County Road Commission shall be obtained.
8. The Master Deed shall require the granting of an easement for the future potential road connection of Sandy Knoll to the adjacent parcel with the easement grant language being approved by the Township Attorney.
9. The driveway access to Lots #17, 18, 23, and 24 must meet the requirements of fire access roads as advised by the City of Brighton Fire Department.
10. All construction plans as required by the Township Engineer shall be submitted for review before the issuance of any permits.
11. The petitioner is responsible to notify all contractors and suppliers that all construction traffic be required to use only Cunningham Lake Road to access to and from the development.
12. The Township board approval of the Impact Assessment for Copperleaf Development as recommended by motion this evening.

The motion carried unanimously.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #3... Review of a site plan application, environmental impact assessment, and site plan for proposed 11,300 sq. ft. office addition to 3,200 sq. ft. existing building located in Section 9, on Grand River Avenue east of Latson Road, petitioned by Cedar West Development (PC 02-05)

- **Planning Commission disposition of petition**
 - A. Recommendation regarding impact assessment
 - B. Disposition regarding final site plan
 - C.

Mr. Dave Besche and Mr. Jeffrey Smith of Equinox were present to represent the petitioner.

Mr. Besche stated they are saving the existing building and have recognized its architecture and landmark status to the Township and are proposing to add a 11,300 square foot building, which will keep with the architecture of the current building. They have also preserved a few of the large trees.

Mr. Smith gave an overview of the landscaping for this project. He feels this is a great project and he is very excited about being a part of it. He explained the location of the detention pond and the limestone retaining wall that will be constructed around it. They are proposing a 14,500 square foot building, which includes the current house.

They are providing 49 parking spaces, which is the amount that is required. They want to minimize the paving of this area and have tried to save the trees. They have 15 trees more than is required by the ordinance.

They have aligned the entrance drive with the drive across Grand River. They have also added a landscape island in the middle of the drive to allow for a right-turn-only lane and a left-turn-only lane.

They have extended the water main and sanitary sewer to the north of the service drive for future development.

Mr. Smith referenced Mr. Purdy's comment on his review letter regarding the dumpster location blocking the future access easement to the east. The dumpster location is where it needs to be due to the way the Mr. Rubbish truck empties it. Also, they do not feel that the access easement to the east will be located in that spot. They see it being installed further to the north.

They are proposing low-level lighting in keeping with the architecture of the existing building instead of matching the current lighting on Grand River.

They will install the bike path in front of this site along Grand River.

Mr. Mike Siterlet of Mark Leonard Building gave a brief overview of the architecture of the existing building and the extension. They will keep the existing building as the focal point of the site and develop the extension to compliment it.

Proposed building materials were presented.

Commissioner Brown asked about the large walnut tree with the low-lying branches that will be along the access road. Mr. Smith stated that one branch will have to be removed to allow for larger vehicles to access the drive.

Commissioner Brown stated it is a beautiful building.

Commissioner Figurski asked how high the building extension is. Mr. Siterlet stated it is shorter than the current building and set quite a bit back.

Commissioner Figurski feels there is quite a bit of lighting on the building. The Township is trying to control the lighting as much as they can. Mr. Siterlet stated there are four lights on each side of the building for the walkway as well as ornamental lighting.

Commissioner Litogot stated it is a beautiful project.

Mr. Purdy reviewed his letter of March 19, 2002. He is happy to see the existing historic home being kept and feels it is an excellent use to preserve this landmark.

Approval of the ZBA is required because the parking is proposed in the front yard as the existing building does not comply with the 70-foot front yard setback. He feels this is an example of when a variance is appropriate.

Colored rendering of the elevations should be provided to the Planning Commission for review.

Mr. Purdy acknowledged the petitioner's response to his concern regarding the dumpster location, but he would prefer to have a permanent site for it to avoid having to move it.

Mr. Beschke stated they feel there is a better place to connect to the adjoining sites and if not, then they can move the dumpster. Mr. Purdy suggested putting the dumpster at the other end of the parking lot. Mark Leonard does not feel that is an appropriate location for the dumpster. He does not feel they should have to move the dumpster to allow for an access drive when there are no current plans to develop the adjoining site.

Commissioner Litogot feels we can leave the dumpster as a temporary location where it is shown on the site plan. All Commissioners and Jeff Purdy agree.

Mr. Purdy referred to Points #4 and #5 in his letter. Since the location of the service drive connection is being planned further north, then it may not be appropriate to construct the drive to the property line, but should be 10 feet from the property line. The shared access agreement is required.

With reference to Points #6 and #7, he would prefer the detention pond be developed for the entire site and the bike path should continue the length of the site. Mr. Siterlet noted that where the detention pond is located is not their property and when the site is developed, that petitioner will continue the bike path.

There was a discussion regarding the detention pond not being on this petitioner's property. Mr. Leonard stated he is in the process of selling this property and he is receiving an easement to allow for him to use the detention pond. Mr. Purdy will leave the decision to the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Litogot does not feel this petitioner should have to build the sidewalk on someone else's site.

Commissioner Burchfield would like to modify the language to designate the draining easement is subject to review by the Township Engineer and the Township Attorney, as well as adopt language for the future installation of the bike path.

Commissioner Mortensen feels it would not be fair to the petitioner to insist this petitioner build the bike path on someone else's site. Commissioner Figurski agrees.

Ornamental light fixtures should match those used on the north side of Grand River. The petitioner will comply with this request.

A photometric grid should be required by the Planning Commission. Mr. Beschke stated there will not be a lot of lighting on this site and they will be well below the one foot candle at the property line requirement. After a brief discussion, it was decided that the lights will be no larger than 250 watts and they will match the lighting on the opposite side of Grand River. No photometric grid is required.

Tenant signs may be a maximum of two square feet in size and will need permits. Mr. Todd Smith of Thompson-Brown Realtors asked if the sign requirements will be the same as Country Corners. Mr. Purdy stated they will have to be handled administratively on a case-by-case basis.

Ms. Huntley reviewed her letter of March 19, 2002.

They are proposing a 24-foot-wide road width instead of the required 30 feet to save the walnut tree.

MDOT approval may be required for the proposed curb cut along Grand River.

Regarding the restricted turning movements proposed from the site onto Grand River, she wanted to inform the petitioner that restricting traffic is going to be difficult. If drivers want to cross Grand River, they will do that.

Note 8 on Sheet D-2 should be modified to state that signage will conform to the requirements set for in the MMUTCD.

The call to the public was made at 9:44 with no response.

Moved by Litogot, seconded by Figurski, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment dated March 13, 2002 for the Savannah Office Center located in Section 9, on Grand River Avenue east of Latson Road, petitioned by Cedar West Development (PC 02-05). **The motion carried unanimously.**

Moved by Burchfield, seconded by Litogot, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Site Plan for the Savannah Office Center located in Section 9, on Grand River Avenue east of Latson Road, petitioned by Cedar West Development (PC 02-05) with the following conditions: **The motion carried unanimously.**

1. Zoning Board of Appeals approval of the front yard parking variance for the areas that do not meet the 70-foot minimal front yard setback requirement.
2. Building materials, color, design, and architectural integrity of the existing 1860 farmhouse shall be complied with by the petitioner as proved by samples and drawings presented this evening.
3. The proposed shared access easement with the property to the east shall be provided to the Township Attorney for approval, with the location for access to be reserved for future consideration.
4. Petitioner shall be required to obtain a drainage easement for the detention pond and the language of such agreement is subject to approval by the Township Attorney and Township Engineer with a further recommendation by the Planning Commission that the proposed bike path to be built at a future date and not be located closer than the 100 year storm high water mark for the detention pond.
5. Traditional Genoa Township ornamental lighting fixtures shall be used for all outside light fixtures with light wattage for each fixture not greater than 250.
6. Approval of all engineering requirements of the Township Engineer.
7. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment dated March 13, 2002 as recommended by motion this evening.
8. Petitioner shall accept the REU's as assigned and determined by the Township Engineer.
9. The water main shall be extended along the proposed driveway with a hydrant being installed at the end.

10. Petitioner shall obtain either MDOT approval or a waiver for the Grand River curb cut and comply with all pavement markers and signage as required by MMUTCD.
11. Petitioner shall be permitted to construct the driveway at a width of 24 feet to accommodate the petitioner's attempt to save the existing walnut tree on the northwest corner of the property.
12. Except for the detention pond, approval for this site plan drawing is not to be considered as approval of any other proposal, concept, nor a promise either expressed or implied for further development
13. The dumpster location is approved as designated on the site plan, but subject to removal in the event of future development to the east.
14. Dust control measures will be added to the site plan.

The motion carried unanimously.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #4... Review of site plan application, site plan, and environmental impact assessment for proposed 3,200 sq. ft. light industrial building expansion, located in Section 5, Lot 16 of "Grand Oaks Industrial Park" on the east side of Victory Drive, petitioned by Scott Evett (PC 02-06)

- **Planning Commission disposition of petition**
 - A. Recommendation regarding impact assessment
 - B. Disposition regarding final site plan

Mr. Wayne Perry of Desine, inc. was present to represent the petitioner.

This building was originally constructed in 1996 and is a 5,000 square foot building. The company has outgrown the building. They are proposing to add a 3,200 square foot expansion in order to store the equipment that is currently outside.

Commissioner Mortensen asked if the parking lot could be located at a different location on the site. Mr. Perry stated they are restricted due to the wetlands on this site.

Mr. Purdy reviewed his letter of March 25, 2002.

A variance is required from the ZBA for the building's front yard parking.

Sample materials and colors must be presented to the Planning Commission. Mr. Perry stated the materials will match the existing building. There was a brief discussion regarding the appearance of the building. Mr. Purdy suggested adding one evergreen and two canopy trees in front of the building on the west elevation between the windows. Mr. Perry stated they will comply with this request.

Any rooftop equipment must be screened. The petitioner will comply.

The area intended for parking construction equipment should be hard surfaced with asphalt or concrete. Commissioner Litogot asked how far the gravel area is from the wetlands. Mr. Perry stated it is three to four feet away.

Mr. Purdy cited Section 12.2526, which states the Planning Commission, can grant a waiver to allow for the gravel storage. Commissioner Litogot feels that a Special Land Use needs to be granted for this large of a gravel storage yard. All commissioners agree. Commissioner Mortensen feels a new Impact Assessment, Site Plan, as well as the Special Land Use approval need to be submitted.

The waste receptacle enclosure should be constructed of masonry with a wood gate. The petitioner will comply.

Mr. Purdy would like to see additional details for the proposed light fixtures.

Ms. Huntley reviewed her letter of March 19, 2002. The dumpster enclosure in the southeast corner has a 10-foot-wide opening and a 50-foot clear loading space, which is less than the required 12-foot wide opening and 62-foot clear loading space. Mr. Perry stated there is not enough space to provide the 62-foot wide clear loading space, but they can comply with the 12-foot wide opening. This is acceptable to Ms. Huntley.

The curb cross sections are shown as 11 feet on the detail, and they should be 12 to 14 feet as shown in the "Sanitary Sewer and Water Design Standards" Manual.

The call to the public was made at 10:21 with no response.

Moved by Litogot, seconded by Mortensen, to table Open Public Hearing #4 so the petitioner can confer with his client and seek other avenues so this expansion can be approved. Mr. Purdy stated the Special Land Use requirements (i.e. landscaping, outdoor storage) should be noted on the Site Plan and sample building materials should be provided at the next meeting.

The motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Burchfield, seconded by Litogot, to approve the minutes of March 11, 2002 with the following change:

1. Page 9, the last sentence of paragraph #5 shall be changed to read "All commissioners elected to table this request this evening due to the fact that the building materials are not present as well as other items discussed needing finalization"

The motion carried unanimously.

Member Discussion

Commissioner Litogot asked for a status on the Connelly Rent-A-Car ordinance violation. Mike Archinal stated the Township is taking action on this matter.

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Litogot, to adjourn the meeting at 10:27 p.m.
The motion carried unanimously.

Submitted by: Patty Thomas, Recording Secretary

Approved by: Barbara Figurski, Secretary