

GENOA TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
OCTOBER 25, 1999
WORK SESSION
6:30 P.M.
MINUTES

GENOA TOWNSHIP
OCT 28 1999
RECEIVED

The work session of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Bill Colley at 6:30 p.m. The following commission members were present constituting a quorum for transaction of business: Bill Colley, Don Pobuda, Barb Figurski, Jim Mortensen, Gary McCririe and Bill Litogot. Also present were Michael Archinal, Township Manager; Jeff Purdy and Caryn Champine from The Strader Group; and Melissa Talley and Kevin Fern from McNamee, Porter and Seeley. By the end of the work session there were several persons in the audience.

Items scheduled for action during the regular session of the commission were discussed. No formal action was taken.

GENOA TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING
7:00 P.M.
MINUTES

The regular session of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Colley at 7:03 p.m. **Moved** by Figurski supported by Litogot to approve the Agenda, tabling Public Hearings #2 and #3, Crest Mobile Homes and Wal-Mart, as the applicants do not have all their information submitted. **Motion unanimously carried.**

A call to the public was made to discuss items not on the agenda with no response. Chairman Colley noted that the Board will not begin any new business after 10:00 p.m.

- 1) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #1...REVIEW OF A PROPOSED ZONING AMENDMENT TO REZONE PROPERTY IN SECTION 16 FROM CE (COUNTRY ESTATES) TO RR (RURAL RESIDENTIAL) AS DIRECTED BY GENOA TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION AT THE SEPTEMBER 13, 1999 MEETING.

A. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING REZONING REQUEST.

Mr. Archinal explained the reason this issue is before the Planning Commission again. Apparently, there was miscommunication between his office and the assessor's office, and several persons within 300' of the proposed rezoning were not notified of the public

hearing. They have since been notified and another public hearing is required. He noted that he has taken a number of calls against the rezoning.

Mr. Purdy explained the procedure for the rezoning. The Planning Commission holds a public hearing and makes a recommendation to the Township Board. The rezoning request goes to the County for their recommendation to the Township Board, also. The Township Board considers the recommendations and makes a final decision. The Township Board may reduce the rezoned area, but cannot enlarge it. An Impact Assessment is not required.

Chairman Colley opened the call to the public at 7:08 p.m.

Mr. Dave Davies, 2700 Spring Hill, presented a petition from surrounding property owners who are against the rezoning. He had several questions for the Commissioners. Why did section 400-034 get the right to split their 10 acres of property? Many of the property owners in this area would be excluded and he would have to come before the Township again. He wouldn't be able to split his 10 acres; either all or none should be able to split. Why does 400-034 have the right-of-way? Why was 400-036 excluded? He noted that the meeting minutes of the last public hearing talk about not wanting to "spot" zone. He felt this is exactly what the township is trying to do now.

Commissioner McCririe noted that Mr. Davies' property, 400-028, is not within the area that is being considered to be rezoned. Mr. Raether's parcel is also not within the area. Everyone within 300' of the proposed rezoning had to be notified; it does not necessarily mean their property is within the proposed rezoning.

Ms. Cheryl Reed, 6542 Fleming, stated she is the owner of 400-034. She is in favor of the rezoning. She feels there needs to be more affordable housing in the township and this area would be a perfect area to split to fill some of this need. There are already several non-conforming parcels here.

Ms. Kelly Guilloz, 2861 and 2863 Spring Hill Dr., stated the area already has reasonable housing. She is a single parent and rents out 1/2 of her property. She wanted to know if this would affect her taxes. What is the difference between CE and RR for tax purposes? She felt taxes are already high in this area, especially for the "cheaper" housing. She also voiced her concern with the traffic in the area. The school buses already had to change their routes so that the children wouldn't get hit. The children play on that private road. She is not for the rezoning.

Mr. Ed Jarvis, 4859 Crooked Lake, is in favor of the rezoning. This is in line with the Master Plan of two-acre parcels. It will not affect the character of the area. It will stabilize the area in that the smaller parcels will not seem as attractive to developers to be broken up into condos, etc. Many of the affected parcels are already non-conforming. The rezoning will bring them in line. It will only add a few homes. He noted that Mrs. Keeling (his mother-in-law) has been a long-time resident of the township who eventually

wants to move back. With the death of her husband, she was hoping to be able to split her property so she could stay there. The rezoning is in line with the Master Plan and it won't materially affect the other properties in the area.

Chairman Colley asked how the township decided what area to look at for rezoning?

Mr. Purdy answered the township is trying to include as many non-conforming parcels as possible. Out of the 20 parcels included, 15 are non-conforming. We stopped short of the DeLuca property to the west, and then up to Spring Hill as those are larger. He noted that the township may reduce the rezoning, but not enlarge it, per the public notice. The rezoning boundaries correspond to the RR and CE boundaries in the Master Plan.

Mr. Colley reiterated that Mr. Davies' property is not within the boundaries for RR.

Mr. Davies stated that it doesn't seem fair that you would have to come back before the Board when you want to split. He would like the option to be able to split to two acres.

Mr. Archinal stated that if the property is within the correct zoning for the split, they wouldn't have to come before the Board. It would be done administratively.

Chairman Colley noted that Mr. Davies' property is Master Planned for CE, not RR. CE does not allow for splits of two acres. He could split to two, five-acre parcels, or could come before the Board and ask to be rezoned.

Commissioner McCririe explained that in this case, a resident came before the Board to be rezoned according to the Master Plan. The Commissioners felt it would be spot zoning for just one lot, especially when it is in an area where there are several non-conforming lots. The Commission felt it would make sense to look at the entire area.

Mr. and Mrs. William New, 2786 Fishbeck, stated they have a 4 1/2 acre parcel. The area will look like a subdivision. What happens to the ones who moved in the area because they didn't want to live in a subdivision? They moved out here to get some space.

Mr. Brett Yoder, 2926 Fishbeck, asked about the boundaries of the Master Plan. Which area is RR in the Master Plan?

A resident from Springhill Drive stated she moved here from the city and doesn't want to live in a subdivision. She can't understand why one person's rezoning has to affect so many people. Let the applicant do what she wants, and leave the rest alone, as is.

Commissioner McCririe stated the area in question is envisioned as two-acre parcels in the Master Plan. The Township is changing and growing, whether we like it or not. The question is whether or not now is the right time to implement the Master Plan zoning. He noted he was trying to tally up the favorable and unfavorable votes of the residents in the area.

Mr. Purdy drew a map of the area on the board to better illustrate what area is in the rezoning request. North and west of the 20 parcels is Master Planned at CE. East of the parcels is Master Planned at RR. While the rezoning would take care of several non-conforming lots and bring them into conformance, there would still be a few non-conforming lots on Spring Hill. He noted that any splits would require the proper road frontage, land perks, etc. As land splits become smaller in size, the County has more stringent requirements.

With no other comments, the public hearing was closed at 7:40 p.m.

Commissioner McCririe noted that the petition presented includes properties inside and outside of the proposed rezoning. He noted that the signatures and addresses have not been formally validated by the Clerk; however, of the 20 properties involved, nine (9) are opposed. Several other properties outside of the rezoning are opposed, too. He felt that if a person does not take the time to write a letter or come to a meeting, they must not be in opposition.

A resident from the audience stated that would be an assumption and would not necessarily be the case.

Commissioner Mortensen noted that of the nine opposed, four are non-conforming already.

Commissioner McCririe stated that at the last meeting, it was apparent to him that there were more who wanted the rezoning than there were who didn't. Now he's not sure. The question is do these people want this now, or don't they?

Commissioner Pobuda stated he felt it seemed the sentiment was that the residents did not want it now. Commissioner Figurski agreed with him.

Moved by Litogot, supported by Figurski to rescind the Planning Commission motion made on 10/11/99 regarding the recommendation to the Township Board to approve the rezoning of this property. **Motion carried (5 yes, 1 no with Mortensen dissenting).**

Moved by McCririe, supported by Litogot to recommend to the Township Board that the proposed rezoning for the 20 parcels identified, not be rezoned from CE to RR at this time.

During discussion, Commissioner Pobuda asked about the one owner of the parcel who, more or less, initiated the whole rezoning. Commissioner McCririe stated he was not inclined to look at only one parcel for rezoning.

Motion carried (5 yes, 1 no with Mortensen dissenting).

- 2) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #2...REVIEW OF A SPECIAL USE APPLICATION, SITE PLAN, AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR A PROPOSED EXPANSION AT WONDERLAND MARINE, SOUTH OF GRAND RIVER AND EAST OF GRAY ROAD, SECTIONS 10 & 15, PETITIONED BY GARY MITTER/LINDHOUT.
(Tabled from 9/13/99 meeting)
- A. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING SPECIAL USE APPLICATION.
 - B. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING IMPACT ASSESSMENT.
 - C. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING SITE PLAN.

Mr. James Barnwell of Desine Engineering, introduced Mr. Terry Clark from Lindhout Associates and Mr. Gary Mitter, Sr., owner. Mr. Barnwell explained the plans. Mr. Mitter wishes to construct a new sales/display and repair facility and additional storage facilities for his existing boat dealership. Proposed building #4 would include office/sales and the relocation of the boat service department. Proposed buildings #5-12 would be used for boat storage. A large outdoor storage area is also proposed. He presented aerial photographs of the existing screening for the residents on Gray Road. He noted they added more landscaping at the top of the existing berm (30 trees at a minimum of 6' tall, staggered every 10'). Additional parking has been added as requested. Loading and unloading zones have been designated.

Mr. Terry Clark presented the building materials and stated they will match the existing buildings (gray tones). The Commissioners agreed the building materials were acceptable.

Chairman Colley asked about providing additional landscaping at the existing large building. He felt that the view from Grand River could be enhanced.

Commissioner McCririe stated he wasn't sure it was appropriate to ask the petitioner to do that at this point, as the petitioner did what was originally asked of him at the time of the existing building.

Commissioner Pobuda stated he, too, was hesitant to do that on this particular project. The petitioner has done everything he has been asked.

Mr. Mitter stated he didn't want to get into "throwing rocks" but he noted that the landscaping adjacent to his site has not been done. He, on the other hand, has done more than what was required.

Chairman Colley noted that was a good point. He didn't even think about the trees that aren't there and should be there. It would make the whole area look better. He asked Mr. Archinal to please look into that.

Commissioner Figurski stated she would really like to see more green on Grand River. She conceded that there wasn't much room there, but felt it should be looked into.

Chairman Colley wondered about the possibility of eliminating one of the curb cuts. The Commissioners discussed it with Mr. Mitter and the planner and concluded that there wouldn't be enough room for people to maneuver. They would be backing up onto the sidewalk.

Commissioner McCririe stated they are currently parking boats on the access drive between the front parcel and back parcel. Is this going to cease when he expands his facility?

Mr. Mitter answered "Yes. Absolutely."

Commissioner McCririe also noted that there are survey stakes right next to a very large oak tree on Gray Road. Will that tree be removed? (Answer: "Yes.") He asked if the drive could be moved further south in order to save the tree.

Mr. Barnwell stated he could look into that and see if it can be moved just enough so that the tree is not affected.

Commissioner McCririe asked about the grading adjacent to Gray Road. What will remain and what will be removed?

Mr. Barnwell described the drainage swales and the culvert running under the road. The area to the north will remain undisturbed just beyond 20-30'. The area to the south will be mass graded. The road elevation is 980'. The high water level is 984'. The top of the berm is 985'.

Chairman Colley made a call to the public at 8:12 p.m.

Mr. Dennis Ling, 1840 Gray Rd., stated he was opposed to the access on Gray Road. He asked whose idea was it to put it there?

Commissioner Pobuda stated he believed it was the township. It is similar to what we would require for subdivisions.

Chairman Colley stated because of the size of the development and the length of travel back to the site, it makes sense to have another access to the site for emergency vehicles. The Planning Commission is adamant that it only be used for emergency vehicles.

Mr. Ling also stated there is a collection pond. What is going in it?

Chairman Colley answered just rain water. The petitioner has submitted a PIP plan which details what he has on the site, how it is collected and disposed.

Mr. Ling asked if the service garage will have a center drain?

Mr. Mitter answered "Yes" it will be drained into a tank collection system and then eventually hauled away.

Mr. Ling asked if this was a paint shop with fiberglass?

Chairman Colley answered "Yes" and they will be required to pull all the necessary permits for that.

Mr. Ling then asked about the noise pollution.

Chairman Colley noted that in the summer time, the bays will most likely be open. That is a legitimate concern. The question is what can be done to help mitigate the problem. The parcel is properly zoned for the use and inherently there will be some noise.

Ms. Pam Howe, 1837 Gray Road, stated she was opposed to the access on Gray Rd. She felt the township didn't adequately police what it approves. She stated she had a business on Grand River and did everything that was required by the township. The business was sold, somebody else has moved in, and they do what they are not allowed to do. The township doesn't stand behind their requirements. She stated she could see this access eventually being utilized for other than emergencies. Also, a fire truck could not turn in there, especially with a ladder truck and hazardous material truck. Another concern she had is with the drainage easement she has for her property. She voiced her concern with the grading and that she will have water in her back yard eventually.

Chairman Colley noted the plans have been engineered and detailed so that all the stormwater goes into the pond and outlets to the southwest. In fact, the plan should improve the drainage. He has no reason to believe that it won't be constructed as it is proposed on the plans.

Ms. Howe wondered what her course of action was if it should happen.

Chairman Colley stated the Drain Commissioner would be involved if during the grading of the project an adverse drainage condition is created.

Commissioner McCririe stated Ms. Howe may need to work with Mr. Mitter. Mr. Mitter is aware of the easement.

Ms. Howe stated she shouldn't have to rely on her neighbor. She should be covered on this. She works many hours and doesn't have time to visit her neighbor to work on this.

Commissioner McCririe stated the water will flow into the detention basin and Mr. Mitter is required to maintain the easement.

Another resident asked about outdoor speakers or a paging system. One can be heard now. Will that noise be reduced?

Mr. Mitter stated he did not have a pager system. His employees have hand-held radios. Perhaps they are hearing the Wilson Marine paging system. There will be no expansion of a paging system on the site.

Mr. Loraine Tallman, 1922 Gray Rd., stated she has been a resident for 23 years. Children play around back there. Will there be a fence around the pond? Also, she is against the access on Gray Rd.,

It was answered that the County requires a 6' fence around the detention area. The pond is natural and will be drained out slowly over a period of time. In fact, the entire site will be fenced.

A resident from 1815 Gray Road stated he was representing his mother who could not attend the meeting. They are in opposition to the whole development. The deck faces this property and in the summer there is lots of noise. There is a view of the buildings. It will take many years for the proposed trees to grow.

Commissioner Pobuda asked Mr. Mitter how long he has been in business?

Mr. Mitter answered he has been in business since 1983 and the business was there years before he bought it.

Commissioner Pobuda noted that many people who live on Gray Road should have been aware of what type of business was there when they moved in.

The same resident from 1815 Gray Road asked why the access is not off Sterling Dr.? This would provide easier access. Gray Road is not paved and in the winter it is in terrible condition.

Chairman Colley noted that was discussed but the petitioner's property does not connect to Sterling Dr.

Ms. Richardson of Gray Road stated she moved in only a few months ago. In what way will the use of the emergency access be controlled?

Chairman Colley stated the petitioner requires a special use permit. In that special use, the Commissioners can qualify the use of the property, including the access. If Mr. Mitter uses the access, and the residents can help police that, the township would have the right to contact their attorney to cease that use.

Mr. Larry Straits of Gray Road stated he is opposed to the access and the noise pollution. He wondered if there will be drainage from the parking area (oils, etc.) going into the detention pond?

Mr. Mitter stated the parking area drains into the existing detention area already on the property.

Ms. Karen Vigor of Gray Road asked about the detention area in the southwest corner. Isn't that a wetland area? (Answer: "Yes.") She stated she had a problem with that. Also, how much outside storage will there be?

Mr. Barnwell stated the outside storage area will be about 300' off Gray Road.

Ms. Vigor stated she had a concern with the length of time it will take the trees in that area to mature. 15 years is a long time. Also, the outside storage area will give opportunity to vandals, etc., which will allow the residential area to be more vulnerable.

Another resident asked about the construction traffic. Will it be coming onto Gray Road?

Chairman Colley answered "No." It will have to come through the petitioner's property.

With no other comments the call to the public was closed at 8:37 p.m.

Ms. Champine reviewed The Strader Group letter of 10/18/99. She noted the special use is required for outdoor storage and boat repair. The Planning Commission may allow the use of gravel for the storage area instead of the required paving.

Commissioner McCririe asked about signage on the storage buildings. He would not be in favor of that.

Mr. Barnwell stated a sign is proposed on the southwest facing I-96.

Commissioner Figurski voiced her agreement with Commissioner McCririe.

Mr. Purdy noted they have a wall sign on the service building already. A second sign would not be permitted. The Commissioners agreed that there will be no signage on the storage buildings.

The Commissioners discussed more trees along the northern portion of the detention basin. Chairman Colley stated he would be willing to waive more trees in the detention area for some larger trees on the berm to screen the residents on Gray Road better. It will take a long time for those trees to grow. There is lots of vegetation there, but it is all deciduous and will not be there during the winter months. He would suggest that 50% of

the landscaping on the berm be a larger variety, 15' tall. The Commissioners agreed with his suggestion.

The Commissioners noted that Mr. Mitter would be required to put up a performance bond for a 5' sidewalk along Grand River. Regarding lighting, the Commissioners noted the storage buildings will not be internally lit. Wall-mounted lighting must be down shielded.

Ms. Talley reviewed the McNamee, Porter & Seeley letter of 9/30/99. The newest set of plans appears to have addressed most of her comments. Bumper blocks are proposed around the parking area. She noted that this will help with the sheet flow to the basin. The Commissioners agreed that the proposed bumper blocks were acceptable. She asked that the petitioner participate with the township on the easement along the frontage to install and maintain a water main. The access road needs sedimentation control during construction. Curb and gutter is required along the proposed driveway improvements, except where bumper blocks are proposed. The Planning Commission cannot waive curb and gutter requirements. The petitioner would have to seek a variance from the ZBA. The Commissioners did not have a problem with having no curb and gutter per the plans.

Chairman Colley came back to the access drive issue, stating that upon hearing all the residents' comments, he wasn't convinced that it should be required. He thought it would be prudent to get the fire chief's opinion.

Commissioner McCririe disagreed and felt it should be required. He stated it made good planning sense to have another access to the site for emergency situations. It will be gated. There is only one access to the site, which is 30' wide, and if a boat or car is parked there, the fire equipment would have a tough time getting back there. The fire department reviewed the plans and approved them as is, although they did not make any specific comments about the access.

Commissioner Pobuda voiced his agreement with Commissioner McCririe's comments.

It was suggested that topsoil be placed over the gravel so that grass could grow to give it a more natural appearance and help discourage its use. Mr. Barnwell agreed to this.

Lastly, Ms. Talley noted the connection fees, based on \$3,100/REU for 20.18 REU's for a total of \$62,558.

The Commissioners discussed possible ways to mitigate the noise. Mr. Mitter stated his dynode equipment is portable and does not run on a daily basis. He is willing to research what he can do to help contain the noise. The bay doors are usually open during the summer.

Mr. Purdy referenced Section 3.56 Site Performance Standards regarding the decibel levels allowed. The Commissioners agreed that Mr. Mitter would have to somehow meet

the requirements, whether its cooling his building another way while keeping the doors closed, or providing some type of sound barriers.

Moved by McCririe, supported by Litogot to recommend to the Township Board approval of the special use application for Wonderland Marine West for the outdoor storage with the following conditions:

1. The petitioner shall sign the application for special use.
2. Conditions contained in Article 12 have been met.
3. No customers or public shall access the rear portion of the site behind the service area.
4. The surface of the storage area is acceptable as gravel, provided normal and customary dust control measures are maintained.
5. There shall be no additional signage on any of the outdoor storage buildings.
6. Landscaping contained on the berm on the west side of the storage area adjacent to Gray Road shall contain plantings, of which 50% shall be a minimum of 15' tall.
7. There shall be no parking along any of the access roads.
8. There shall be no repair of any boats outside of the new repair facility as shown on the plan.
9. Any activities that would create decibel levels greater than 65 at the property line shall be conducted entirely inside the building with all the doors closed.

Motion unanimously carried.

Moved by Pobuda, supported by Litogot to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment for Wonderland Marine West, dated revised 10/15/99. **Motion unanimously carried.**

Moved by McCririe, supported by Pobuda to recommend to the Township Board approval of the site plan for Wonderland Marine West, dated 10/18/99, with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the special use application as recommended by motion this evening.
2. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as recommended by motion this evening.
3. Township engineer review and approval of all plans and specifications.
4. Conservation easement, as presented, shall be recorded prior to any activities commencing on the property.
5. Building materials, as presented, are acceptable and shall be present at the time of the hearing before the Township Board, and shall become the property of the township. The storage buildings shall match in color

- the existing storage building.
6. There shall be no lighting on the interior of any of the storage buildings.
 7. There shall be no public address system contained on the premises.
 8. The petitioner shall install, and/or provide a performance bond, for the installation of a 5' cement sidewalk along the Grand River frontage.
 9. The petitioner shall cooperate with the township with the establishment of the necessary easements along Grand River for municipal water.
 10. The petitioner shall not discharge any water softener(s) into the township sewer system and shall only use potassium in lieu of salt.
 11. Curbing shall be required along all paved parking areas.
 12. REU calculations for the parcel which the petitioner acknowledges, are 20.18 at a rate of \$3,100 for a total of \$62,558, subject to final audit by the township engineer and staff.
 13. The emergency drive off of Gray Road shall never, ever be used for any purpose other than emergency vehicle access and there shall specifically be no deliveries, employee use or public use of that emergency drive. Further, the petitioner shall construct the area west of the fence in a manner as to accommodate the growth of grass on top of the driveway to mask its appearance. This area shall be maintained as to provide continual emergency access.
 14. The gate at the emergency access driveway shall be continually locked.
 15. Petitioner shall, if reasonable, relocate the driveway south on Gray Road so as to accommodate the preservation of the existing oak tree.

Motion unanimously carried.

Moved by Mortensen, supported by Litogot to recommend to the ZBA approval of the elimination of the curbing on the interior paved parking area of the site, as presented, for Wonderland Marine West. **Motion unanimously carried.**

Mr. Mitter reiterated that he will try to enhance the existing landscaping on Grand River.

The meeting was recessed at 9:25 p.m. and reconvened at 9:30 p.m.

- 3) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #3...REVIEW OF A REZONING APPLICATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT TO REZONE OSD-PUD (OFFICE SERVICE DISTRICT/PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT) TO UR-GCD (URBAN RESIDENTIAL/ GENERAL COMMERCIAL DISTRICT) ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF GRAND RIVER, WEST OF GRAY ROAD, SECTION 34, PETITIONED BY BROOKSIDE DEVELOPMENT.
 - A. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING IMPACT ASSESSMENT.
 - B. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING REZONING REQUEST.

Mr. Purdy stated the site is 52.1 acres. The petitioner wishes to rezone the site to UR for a large portion and a small portion fronting on Grand River to commercial. UR is consistent with the Master Plan if both sewer and water are provided to the site.

Ms. Talley noted that water for that area is in the design phase. A second public hearing must be held, which will most likely take place in January, 2000.

Commissioner McCririe noted that UR in the ordinance requires water and sewer. If for some unknown reason, water is not made available to the site, the applicant would have to change their project's density.

Chairman Colley stated that any approval for the rezoning does not give approval to the site plan.

Regarding the commercial fronting Grand River, Mr. Purdy stated the GCD commercial designation would likely have a greater impact to traffic and the environment that would be incompatible with the area. However, uses permitted in the NSD designation are compatible with the surrounding character of the area and would serve many of the nearby residential neighborhoods. NSD would permit use of the site for low intensity commercial activity.

A representative from Brookside Development stated he had talked with both the planner and Mr. Archinal and has no problem with going to the NSD designation.

Ms. Talley stated the petition meets the needs for the rezoning (access, drainage, utilities, etc.). She had no further comments.

Chairman Colley noted that there were no persons left in the audience to speak to this issue.

Moved by Pobuda, supported by Litogot to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment, dated received 9/1/99. **Motion unanimously carried.**

Moved by McCririe, supported by Mortensen to recommend to the Township Board approval of the rezoning request by Brookside Development, from OSD/PUD to UR for the area depicted on the plan having an acreage of 43 acres, more or less. **Motion unanimously carried.**

Moved by McCririe, supported by Litogot to recommend to the Township Board approval of the rezoning request by Brookside Development, from OSD/PUD to NSD for the area fronting Grand River, as depicted on the plan, having an acreage of 4.85 acres, more or less. **Motion unanimously carried.**

- 4) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #4...REVIEW OF A SITE PLAN APPLICATION, SITE PLAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR A

PROPOSED RIVER BEND OFFICE CENTER, LOCATED AT 3.19 ACRE SITE ON THE EAST SIDE OF GRAND RIVER AVENUE, WEST OF HACKER, PETITIONED BY RICHARD GRIFFITH/DESINE, INC.

- A. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING IMPACT ASSESSMENT.
- B. DISPOSITION OF SITE PLAN.

Mr. Wayne Perry of Desine Inc. stated the owner, Mr. Griffith, would like to add a new building in the northwest corner of the site and expand the existing building to the east. The existing detention facility will be relocated to the rear. Additional parking is provided and proposed grading improvements to the entrance on Grand River are included. He presented the building materials and colors, which will be the same materials and colors as the existing building.

Commissioner Pobuda asked if their research shows that they can fill these office buildings?

Mr. Perry answered "Yes." These are not large office buildings.

Chairman Colley stated he was in favor of the project, but was not particularly excited about the design of the buildings. It seemed to be a big rectangle to him. With the site being on Grand River, he would like to see some architectural elements to give it more character. He noted the Commissioners have been working real hard to create nice buildings along Grand River.

Commissioner McCririe stated he couldn't see taking a building that is too dramatically different in architecture and putting it on the same parcel as this existing building.

Chairman Colley stated they are using very nice materials, but more "relief" to the buildings is needed.

Commissioner Litogot stated he felt there were too many issues to be addressed at this time. More work is needed before "re-hashing" everything out.

Moved by Litogot, supported by Pobuda to table River Bend Office Center, so they can meet the requirements in The Strader Group and McNamee, Porter & Seeley letters, and to provide a new design for the second building. **Motion failed (3 yes, 3 no with Colley, McCririe, and Mortensen dissenting).**

Ms. Talley reviewed the McNamee, Porter and Seeley letter of 10/5/99. She asked if the finished floors will match up? (Answer: "Yes.") Will the grade stay the same or will it get steeper? (Answer: "It will actually get flatter.") Also, she stated it would be helpful to see how the contours will tie in.

Ms. Champine reviewed The Strader Group letter of 10/7/99. A variance is required from the ZBA to expand the non-conforming building. The existing building is only 35' back from Grand River.

The Commissioners agreed they did not have a problem with the expansion, but the applicant needed to get ZBA approval.

Mr. Perry stated the main remaining issue in the planner's letter was the two additional landscaping islands in the rear parking. The Commissioners briefly discussed it and agreed the landscaped islands would not be necessary.

Chairman Colley again noted that there were no persons in the audience for a call to the public.

Moved by McCririe, supported by Mortensen to table River Bend Office Center. **Motion carried (4 yes, 2 no with Pobuda and Litogot dissenting).**

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

There was no Planner's Report.

Moved by Litogot, supported by McCririe, to approve the minutes of the October 11, 1999 meeting with minor changes on pages 1, 2, 5, 13, and 16. **Motion unanimously carried.**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dia M. Moulton
Recording Secretary