

GENOA TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
July 10, 2000
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, Jerrold Joseph, John Cahill, Bill Litogot and Ken Burchfield. Also present was Michael Archinal, Township Manager; Jeff Purdy and Kelly Schuler from Langworthy, Strader, LeBlance & Associates, Inc.; and Melissa Talley 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 7:00 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Litogot to approve the Agenda with the following changes:

- Deleted Public Hearing #2 and #4
- Change Public Hearing #3B to Recommendation of Preliminary Condominium site plan
- Change Public Hearing #5B to Recommendation of Site Plan

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 7:04 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 a special use application and site plan for a 26,000 sq. ft. manufacturing facility, 741 Victory Lane, Section 5, Lot 20, Grand Oaks West, petitioned by Ed Akin. (PC 00-22)

Planning Commission disposition of Akin petition

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

Neil Plante of Boss Engineering, Andy Klein of Rand Construction, and Ed Akin, the property owner were present to represent this project.

Mr. Plante stated they are here tonight to receive the Planning Commission's recommendation for a new use for the site plan that has already been approved. They are proposing a 26,000 square foot manufacturing facility with the following features:

- Access will be off of Victory Lane to the north side of the property.
- They have received MDEQ permit to reduce the width of the drive to protect the wetlands.
- There will 46 parking spaces.
- The drive will circulate all around the building.
- There will be two overhead loading doors.
- 27,000 square feet will consist of office space
- The entire parking lot will be curbed.
- They are proposing a wood dumpster as opposed to concrete block.

Mr. Klein described the building. They are proposing a flex building, which will be able to support any type of manufacturing facility for leasing. Over 50% of the outside of the building will be pre-finished masonry material with color throughout. They are proposing Butler metal, which has a 20-year guarantee against fading. He feels this is an upgrade from what is in the park currently. There will be windows placed on each side and there will be horizontal strips of brick to break of the mass of the building. All colors will be in the tan family.

Commissioner Litogot asked if any roof equipment was going to be concealed. Mr. Klein stated if the equipment is on the roof, it will be concealed, but if it is on the ground, they will be covered by landscaping and will not be visible. Commissioner Litogot feels there should be more landscaping in the front.

Chairman Pobuda asked if the wetlands are being touched only for the road. Mr. Plante answered yes. They have DEQ approval for this.

Chairman Pobuda asked if the 26-foot wide road was approved in the original approval. Mr. Plante answered yes.

Chairman Pobuda asked about signage? They have proposed one sign to be located at the beginning of the road. It does meet the height requirements and the colors will be similar to the building.

Ms. Schuler reviewed their letter of July 5, 2000. Because the building exceed the 20,000 square feet maximum, the plan requires approve from the Township Board upon recommendation from the Planning Commission.

The petitioner has met the requirements for the additional architecture, but the Planning Commission might want to recommend two additional canopy trees.

Commissioner Joseph asked where any addition office space would be build. Mr. Klein stated they would have to come before the Planning Commission again. There is plenty of land to build an office facility.

Ms. Schuler stated the petitioner has proposed a wood trash container. After a brief discussion, the petitioner agreed to change the container to masonry block.

Ms. Tally reviewed her letter of June 30, 2000. She stated the petitioner has obtained a permit from the DEQ, and she has received a copy of it.

The drainage and grading and utilities are acceptable.

The 26-foot wide road was previously approved but the Planning Commission has the discretion to require the 30 feet. After a brief discussion, all commissioners agreed on a 26-foot road.

Ms. Tally noted from her June 21, 2000 letter that the REU's have been determined at 13. The connection fees are \$3,100 per REU for sanitary sewer, which is \$40,300 and \$3,500 per REU for water, which is \$45,000. She stated if the petitioner chooses to use a water softener, the discharge cannot be connected to the sanitary sewer and a potassium based regenerate should be used.

The call to the public was made with no response.

Commissioner Figurski stated the dust control measures should be added to the construction plan. The petitioner will comply.

Moved by Burchfield, seconded by Litogot to recommend to the Township Board approval of the special use application for a 26,000 sq. ft. manufacturing facility, 741 Victory Lane, Section 5, Lot 20, Grand Oaks West, petitioned by Ed Akin. (PC 00-22).

The motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Burchfield, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the impact assessment dated June 26, 2000 for a 26,000 sq. ft. manufacturing facility, 741 Victory Lane, Section 5, Lot 20, Grand Oaks West, petitioned by Ed Akin. (PC 00-22). **The motion carried unanimously.**

Moved by Burchfield, seconded by Litogot to recommend to the Township Board approval of the site plan dated June 4, 2000 for a 26,000 sq. ft. manufacturing facility, 741 Victory Lane, Section 5, Lot 20, Grand Oaks West, petitioned by Ed Akin. (PC 00-22) with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the Special Use as recommended by motion this evening.
2. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as recommended by motion this evening.
3. Shielding of all rooftop units and rooftop units shall be included on the site plan.
4. Addition of two canopy trees to the front of the building.
5. Proposed trash receptacle will be of masonry material
6. All plans and specifications to be approved by the Township Engineer with the driveway entrance being 26 feet in width.
7. The REU's are \$3,500 per REU for water and \$3,100 for sanitary sewer.
8. If the petitioner chooses to use a water softener, the discharge cannot be connected to the sanitary sewer and a potassium based regenerate should be used.
9. Dust control measures shall be added to the construction plans.
10. Building shall be constructed of the block and color as proposed this evening.

The motion carried unanimously.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 3... Review of a site plan for 22 multiple family buildings, east of Latson, between Grand River and Golf Club, adjacent to Lakewood Knoll, petitioned by Fox Run, LLC. (PC 00-24)

Planning Commission disposition of Fox Run, LLC petition

- A. Recommendation regarding impact assessment.
- B. Recommendation of preliminary condominium site plan.

David LeClair of Boss Engineering was present to represent Fox Run, LLC. Mr. LeClair stated he is here this evening to receive preliminary site plan approval of a detached condominium development, which is on the Fox Run PUD. Two hundred and fifty seven units remain on the PUD. That is what they are proposing tonight. It will be on the 33 ½ acres on the south side of the PUD. There will be two major thoroughfares. One from Latson Road and then another one connecting the other two projects. There will be 20, 12-unit buildings and one five-unit building in the front. There will e a continuous pedestrian path around the entire project with a bike path along Latson Road. There is a tot lot on the back half. There will also be a clubhouse and a pool on the back half.

They are asking for an 80-foot radius because they had to move the detention pond to save the wooded area on the site. There will be light fixtures at each intersection and some by the clubhouse. The streetlights will be 10-foot high decorative poles with a single light on top. The front and rear elevations are the same.

Commissioner Litogot asked what is the height of the buildings? Mr. Purdy stated they are 28 feet between the peak and the eave. The tallest point is 35 feet. These measurements meet the requirements.

Commissioner Litogot asked if the easement agreement with Detroit Edison has been approved? The petition had no problem receiving the other two easements, so they do not see a problem getting the third.

Commissioner Burchfield asked how many associations would be at this site? There will be one.

Mr. Purdy reviewed his letter of July 5, 2000. The petitioner has addressed a majority of their preliminary concerns. This was approved for multiple family homes and it was also approved for this number of units.

Mr. Purdy suggested the petitioner transfer some of the density from the west to the east. The petitioner stated they had to tie into two projects as well as the industrial portion to the south. They wanted to leave as much buffer as possible between the homes and the industrial park. They also had to allow for the detention pond in the east portion. The west portion does not need its own detention pond.

Commissioner Litogot likes the site the way it is proposed. He feels the petitioner is land locked. He doesn't see where it can be changed.

Commissioner Cahill would like to see one of the buildings removed due to the interface with the single-family homes in that area. He feels that condominiums adjacent to condominiums are better than condominiums adjacent to single-family homes. He prefers the petitioner's alternate proposal. The petitioner prefers to keep the residential close to residential instead of moving the residential closer to the industrial. He also noted that the landscaping has been "beefed up" along the residential/residential area. He added they were very sensitive to the transition from residential to industrial so they put the park there and made it larger. He feels this is the best use from a marketable and desirable aspect.

Commissioner Litogot does not like the alternate plan.

Commissioner Joseph agrees with Commissioner Cahill. He prefers the alternate plan.

Commissioner Burchfield supports the petitioner's arguments of the best use of the site from a marketability and desirability aspect.

Commissioner Figurski supports the petitioner as long as they have a lot of landscaping along the back of the site.

Chairman Pobuda likes the petitioner's plans.

Chairman Pobuda asked about the building materials and colors. The petitioner will present them at the final approval.

Mr. Purdy stated the petitioner is requesting a reduction of road width from 30 to 26 feet. The Planning Commission can reduce the width of a private road. He added that the petitioner is providing more than the minimum number of parking spaces that are required. Commissioner Figurski prefers the 26-foot wide road because it allows for less hard surface area. Commissioner Burchfield agrees. Commissioner Joseph is fine with the 26 feet, but he has a problem with the turning radius. Mr. Purdy suggested adding "Sharp Curve" and "No Parking on Road" signs if the Planning Commission was going to allow the 26-foot wide road. The petitioner does not feel there will be any parking on the road because they have added extra parking and he agreed to add the signs suggested by Mr. Purdy. All commissioners agreed. Mr. Purdy stated the signs should be added to the final site plan.

Mr. Purdy stated the petitioner is asking to reduce the curve radius from 150 feet to 80 feet on the northeast corner, by Units #19 and 20. The petitioner stated they will erect the signs in this area. He added the reason they are reducing the width is because they had to pull the retention pond in order to save the wooded area.

Mr. Purdy recommends a continuous sidewalk on both sides of the main road through the development. The petitioner stated they have a continuous pedestrian trail around the site. Each unit has access to that sidewalk. There are plenty of sidewalks in front of the buildings to get from the buildings to the parking. Commissioner Joseph feels sidewalks are a good idea. Chairman Pobuda feels the proposed sidewalks are sufficient. He does not want to take out an additional five feet of green space along the road. Commissioners Cahill, Litogot, and Figurski feel the proposed sidewalk is sufficient. Commissioner Burchfield asked if Mr. Purdy's suggestion is for safety reasons. Mr. Purdy stated his suggestion was not for safety reasons, but more for convenience. Commissioner Burchfield supports the petitioner. Chairman Pobuda supports the petitioner.

Mr. Purdy feels the bike path should continue through Aster Boulevard. He feels extending the bike path 195 feet would be a tremendous benefit to the

subdivision. The petitioner agreed to extend the sidewalk, although it is not on his property. It is public property. All commissioners agreed that it is a very nice gesture by the petitioner to extend the sidewalk.

Ms. Talley reviewed her letter of July 7, 2000. She stated the petitioner has met all of the requirements for the preliminary site plan. She has some issues that will be addressed at the final site plan approval.

The call to the public was made with no response.

Moved, by Figurski, seconded by Litogot, to recommend approval of the impact assessment dated June 30, 2000 for the high-density residential portion of the Delgudice PUD, 22 multiple family buildings, east of Latson, between Grand River and Golf Club, adjacent to Lakewood Knoll, petitioned by Fox Run, LLC. (PC 00-24) with the following conditions:

1. To include Appendix A and Appendix B for the final approval state of the site plan.
2. Page 1 should include the clubhouse.
3. Dust control measures should be added to Page 2.

The motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Burchfield, seconded by Litogot to recommend to the Township Board approval of the site plan dated June 7, 2000, revised June 30, 2000 for the high-density residential portion of the Delgudice PUD, 22 multiple family buildings, east of Latson, between Grand River and Golf Club, adjacent to Lakewood Knoll, petitioned by Fox Run, LLC. (PC 00-24) with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as recommended by motion this evening.
2. Reduction of the road width to 26 feet conditioned no on street parking and posted speed reduction signs.
3. Reducing the street radius from 150 feet to 80 feet adjacent to Units #19 and #20 as depicted on the preliminary site plan and conditioned and subject to posted signs and further conditioned with preserving the wetlands on the northeast corner of the subject property.
4. The blue line architecture plans as presented tonight dated July 10, 2000.
5. Extension of the bike path within the existing right of way along Latson to Astor Blvd.
6. All plans and specifications to be approved by the Township Engineer.
7. The petitioner obtaining an easement from Detroit Edison as depicted on the site plan.

The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Pobuda called at five-minute break at 8:30.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #5... Review of a site plan for Village at Mercy Health Center, for Phase 2, a 90 unit assisted care facility, on the north side of Grand

River, between Bendix and Euler, petitioned by Mercy Health Services. (PC 00-26)

Planning Commission disposition of Village at Mercy Health petition

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

Wayne Perry of Design Engineering and Link Wilson of Miller, Hanson, Westerbeck, Berger architects were there to represent this proposal.

Mr. Perry stated they are here tonight to receive a recommendation for approval for Phase 2 of the Mercy Health Center PUD project. They are proposing a two-story structure on seven and a half acres for a continuing care facility. There will be a total of 90 units; 40 for assisted living and 50 for congregate care. The access will be from the far west side and terminate on the southwest corner in a cul-de-sac. There is a six to eight foot burn along the east and north sides containing a few hundred trees. There will be a pathway around the building, which will be connected to the Phase 1 pathway. This will also be able to be connected to future phases.

Mr. Wilson showed the color and materials proposed for this building. It will contain brick as well as aluminum siding. The colors are very similar to the ambulatory facility on Phase 1. There is a drop off area on the congregate side and a communal dining and patio area. The dumpsters will be contained inside an air-conditioned building. It will contain a full-service kitchen that will serve three meals per day. The only lighting is on the front side of the building. The building will create a screen from the lighting to the residential area behind the building.

Chairman Pobuda had a concern regarding the service area being the same as the drop off area for clients and visitors. The petitioner stated there is a separate door between the two guest accesses. He added they average about three to four drop offs and pick ups per day. They put the service area in the front because they wanted to keep the commercial traffic in the front and away from the residential area in the back.

Chairman Pobuda asked where maintenance vehicles, such as lawnmower, snow blowers, etc. are to be stored. The petitioner stated all outside maintenance is contracted out. There will be no on-site landscaping services.

Commissioner Cahill feels the proposal looks lovely.

Commissioner Litogot asked if there will be benches and/or picnic tables along the walk path. The petitioner stated it is intended for an interconnecting pathway and there is no proposal for picnic tables. There may be some benches along the pathway. Commissioner Litogot asked if the pathway will be lighted. There

are no plans to light the pathway. Chairman Pobuda feels the benches would be a good idea.

Mr. Purdy reviewed his letter of July 5, 2000. The ordinance calls for a 20-foot setback from the building to the parking lot. The drop off areas are less than 20 feet. He feels that, given the use of the site, this would be acceptable. All commissioners agreed.

Mr. Purdy stated the minimum size of each dwelling unit is less than the requirement for this type of use, but due to the fact that there are many common amenities for the residents, he feels the requested reduction in the unit size is reasonable. The petitioner stated only nine of the 385 on the assisted living side are less than the minimum and all meals will be eaten in the main dining room.

All commissioners like the proposed materials for the building.

Mr. Purdy suggested adding curb cut ramps where the pathway crosses the main entrance drive. The petitioner will comply with this request.

Mr. Purdy stated the proposed landscaping must be added to the landscape plan. Chairman Pobuda suggested adding more frontal landscaping; i.e. flowerbeds, more color, instead of just trees. The petitioner suggested some taller shrubs around the drop off areas. There is a final plan being worked on that will be over and above the minimum requirements.

Mr. Purdy stated the Planning Commission needs to approve the deferment of 49 of the 95 required parking spaces. The petitioner offered to escrow an amount for additional parking if it is needed. Commissioner Litogot asked how many employees are at this facility. There are five office employees, three or four in the dining area, and three full time night staff. Commissioner Litogot asked how many residents drive. They see an average of 1/3 of their residents who drive. The average age of their residents is 78. Commissioner Litogot feels the 49 parking spaces is fine as long as the escrow is set up.

Mr. Purdy stated a complete lighting plan as well as a photometric grid plan is required. The petitioner will provide this by the time the Township Board meets. Mr. Purdy stated all lighting shall not exceed 0.5 footcandles along the residential property line and 1.0 footcandles at non-residential property lines. The petitioner does not feel this is a problem because most of the lighting will be screen by the building.

Mr. Purdy stated the Township requires 66 feet for private roads. This project has not provided an easement. The petition stated all of the drives are private drives, not roads and the width was approved in the beginning. Mr. Purdy stated if the entire property is under one single ownership, then the width is no problem. All commissioners agreed.

Mr. Purdy stated the roadway cross section indicates 12-foot wide with 2-foot curbs on each side. He suggests 14-foot wide with 2-foot curbs on each side. The petitioner will comply.

Mr. Purdy stated the Township requires all private roads and parking lots serving institutional uses have concrete curb and gutter. The proposed road shows the outside edges to be soft shoulder. The petitioner stated they were looking at minimizing the impacts on the existing site. Chairman Pobuda feels the curbs should be there. All commissioners agreed.

Mr. Purdy stated the tree survey needs to contain what trees are being preserved, what trees are being added, and what tree protection measures will be taken. Mr. Archinal stated this has already been approved with the original PUD.

Mr. Purdy suggested one tree every 40 feet on the main drive. The petitioner stated this was not approved on the original PUD. This is a private drive. Mr. Archinal does not feel the petitioner should have to meet the requirements of a private road when they are proposing a private drive. After a brief discussion, it was decided that the petitioner will put one tree 40 feet on center for only the phase that is being proposed tonight.

Mr. Purdy stated the proposed lighting is sufficient.

Ms. Talley reviewed her letter of July 5, 2000. The petitioner has addressed concern #1 tonight. Concern #2 has been submitted and is being reviewed. She confirmed that the road will be 18 feet as well as curbed and guttered as decided this evening. She will need to review the drainage.

She still needs to determine the number of REU's for this site. This will be handled administratively. The fees are \$4,800 per REU for sewer and \$3,650 per REU for water.

Ms. Talley stated if the petitioner chooses to use a water softener, the discharge cannot be connected to the sanitary sewer and a potassium based regenerate should be used.

Commissioner Burchfield asked if the PUD agreement addresses the storage of the maintenance equipment. Mr. Archinal stated it does not. Commissioner Burchfield feel the PUD needs to address this issue in the event the petitioner decides to do their own landscaping. Mr. Archinal stated a contingency can be put in the PUD that stated if they wanted to add a maintenance equipment building, they would need to come before the Planning Commission.

The call to the public was made.

Mr. Bruce Cranston of 1964 Clayborne asked what is the next step to the approval process. Mr. Archinal stated it will be in front of the Township Board on August 7, 2000.

Mr. Cranston asked what the petitioner is planning to do with the existing fencing. The petitioner stated the fencing is outside of their property line; however, there is another fence that can be taken out.

Mr. Greg Michailuk of 1947 Clayborne asked if there is lighting being proposed along the pathway in the back of the building. Mr. Purdy stated the lighting plan will be part of the site plan and they need to comply with the ordinance. If they want to add or change lighting, they would need to come before the Planning Commission.

The call to the public was closed at 9:42 p.m.

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Litogot, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the impact assessment dated June 6, 2000 for Village at Mercy Health Center, for Phase 2, a 90 unit assisted care facility, on the north side of Grand River, between Bendix and Euler, petitioned by Mercy Health Services. (PC 00-26) with the following conditions:

1. The number of employees shall be inserted.
2. The PIPP plan and the wetland evaluation letter shall be attached.

The motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Burchfield, seconded by Litogot to recommend to the Township Board approval of the site plan dated June 6, 2000 plan for Village at Mercy Health Center, for Phase 2, a 90 unit assisted care facility, on the north side of Grand River, between Bendix and Euler, petitioned by Mercy Health Services. (PC 00-26) with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as recommended by motion this evening.
2. Reduction of 20-foot setback requirement between the building and driveways at the covered entrances, which must be included in the PUD agreement.
3. Interspersed benches and sitting areas to be depicted along the walkway path as designated by the Township staff.
4. The reduction in minimum living area for the assisted living units to not less than 450 square feet for a one bedroom, not less than 605 feet for a two bedroom, and not less than 385 feet for an efficiency unit.
5. All building materials shall conform to those materials presented this evening.
6. Curb ramps to be required where the pathway crosses the main entrance drive as designated on the site plan.
7. Reservation of 49 of the required 95 parking spaces subject to and conditioned on an escrow for the construction to complete the remaining 49 spaces. The Township Engineer will determine the amount of the escrow.

8. The petitioner shall supply a photometric grid plan prior to presentation to the Township Board further limited to three high-pressure wall mounted lighting with downward beams on the rear elevation of the building, subject to an overall lighting plan, which shall be submitted for approval prior to the Township Board meeting.
9. All plans and specifications to be approved by the Township Engineer.
10. Detached waste removal loading and unloading to be depicted on the site plan.
11. Compliance of June 12, 2000 requirements of South Lyon's fire safety official to be note on the site plan and construction drawings.
12. Revised site plan to show 18-foot wide road with curbs.
13. Revised site plan to show curb and gutter along and throughout the entire private road
14. The connection fees are \$4,800 per REU for sewer and \$3,650 for water, with the number of REU's to be determined at an administrative meeting between the Township Engineer, the petitioner, and Township staff.
15. If the petitioner chooses to use a water softener, the discharge cannot be connected to the sanitary sewer and a potassium based regenerate should be used.
16. Dust control measures should be added to the construction plan.
17. In the event maintenance equipment is kept on site, it shall be stored in an enclosed facility approved by the Township.

The motion carried unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

Prepared by: Patty Thomas, Recording Secretary

Signed by: Barbara Figurski, Secretary