

GENOA TOWNSHIP

GENOA TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
JULY 20, 1999
WORK SESSION
6:30 P.M.
MINUTES

JUL 23 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, Barbara Figurski, Jim Mortensen (arrived at 6:50 p.m.), Gary McCririe and Bill Litogot. Also present was Michael Archinal, Township Manager; Caryn Champine from The Strader Group; and Melissa Talley from McNamee, Porter, & Seeley. 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 7:00 p.m. **Moved** by Pobuda, supported by McCririe to approve the Agenda with the deletion of the approval of the July 12, 1999 meeting minutes, as the minutes were just distributed at the meeting and they did not have the opportunity to review them. **Motion unanimously carried.**

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

- 1) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #1..REVIEW OF SITE PLAN APPLICATION, SPECIAL USE APPLICATION, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND SITE PLAN FOR A PROPOSED 45,500 SQ. FT. INDUSTRIAL LEASE SPACE AND PLACE OF BUSINESS FOR PLAGENS & ASSOCIATES LOCATED ON 5.15 ACRES ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF STERLING DRIVE, SECTION 15, PETITIONED BY BRIVAR CONSTRUCTION. (Tabled from July 12, 1999 meeting)
 - A. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING SPECIAL USE APPLICATION.
 - B. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING IMPACT ASSESSMENT.
 - C. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING SITE PLAN.

Mr. Stanley Brish from Brivar Construction introduced Mr. Jim Spurr, also from Brivar. Mr. Brish stated his client, Mr. Mark Prince, is out of town and was unable to attend the meeting. Mr. Brish stated they are wishing to construct a 45, 584 sq. ft. multi-tenant industrial building. He presented the building materials: decorative split-faced and scored block, and masonry with synthetic plastic. Elevation drawings were presented, too. He stated they have reviewed the comments from the planner and engineer and believe they have addressed them. He noted that not including the legal description was an oversight, and it has been included in a revised set of plans.

Chairman Colley asked about the view from Dorr Road.

Mr. Brish stated there is another lot between them and Dorr Road. The building shouldn't be seen much from Dorr. He noted that it will be a very upscale industrial building. Mr. Prince's business provides surgical products (helmets, lights, etc. in operating rooms).

The Strader Group letter, dated June 25, 1999, was reviewed by Ms. Caryn Champine. She noted that the special use was required because of the size of the building. Items 1-3 in the Summary were addressed. The Commissioners discussed item #4 (grading/preserving natural vegetation). They agreed a solution would be to restrict any clearing to provide vegetation preservation within the 40' setback, except around a portion of the detention area. The dark line depicted on the grading plan should be the limits of the clearing.

Commissioner McCririe stated he felt there should be more plantings around the detention area on the south and east corner of the site. It was agreed that buffer zone "C", excluding bushes, should be required.

Item #5 in the letter is shown on sheet 2/3 of the site plan. Mr. Brish agreed to items #6 and 7.

Commissioner Pobuda asked about the truck traffic.

Mr. Brish answered there is more than adequate space for trucks to maneuver around the building.

Regarding the parking lot island (item #8), the Commissioners agreed that three canopy trees provided in the hydroseed area on the east side would be acceptable. Because of the winters (snow, salt, etc.), they felt any bushes or other plantings in a wider island would not survive. With other proposed plantings on the east, they felt this would be acceptable.

Mr. Brish agree to meet the ordinance regarding foot candles and a note will be provided on the site plan. He stated item #11 regarding special land use approval of future tenants is addressed in Section E of the Impact Assessment. After discussion, the Commissioners agreed that the waste receptacle enclosure could be wood (item #12).

Ms. Melissa Talley stated most of the items in the McNamee, Porter & Seeley letter of 7/6/99 have been addressed. Apparently, the slope of the parking lot has been addressed, but she has not seen the new information yet.

Chairman Colley made a call to the public at 7:40 p.m. with no response.

It was noted that the Impact Assessment needed to include language regarding dust control during construction, and there is a typographical error on the front page: Mark Prince's name is misspelled.

Chairman Colley asked about the correspondence from the Fire Marshall regarding an 8" water line with hydrants on Sterling Drive. It was noted that this could not be required as they are not in the township's water district.

Moved by Litogot, supported by McCririe to recommend to the Township Board approval of the special use application, dated 6/2/99, for the Prince Technical Park, to allow the construction of an industrial building not to exceed 45,584 sq. ft. **Motion unanimously carried.**

Moved by Figurski, supported by Litogot to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment, dated 7/20/99, with the correction of the typographical error on the front page (Mark Prince), and language regarding dust control measures. **Motion unanimously carried.**

Moved by McCririe, supported by Litogot to recommend to the Township Board approval of the site plan for the Prince Technical Park with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the special use permit.
2. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as modified by motion this evening.
3. Township engineer review and approval of all plans and specifications.
4. The colors and materials, as presented, are acceptable and shall be present at the time of submittal to the Township Board, and become the property of the township.
5. The legal description shall be attached to the plans prior to submission to the Township Board.
6. The tree line on the rear and south side of the site, depicted on page 2/3 as being preserved, shall have a note added that there shall be no clearing or disturbance of the vegetation whatsoever; and, the petitioner shall add buffer zone "C" landscaping treatments on the south and east corner of the parcel surrounding the detention pond, excluding from the zone any shrubs.
7. Petitioner shall pave the parking and driveway areas up to the right-of-way line.

8. Petitioner shall provide inclined approaches for the barrier-free parking.
9. Three (3) canopy trees shall be added on the east property line adjacent to the parking area and depicted on the plan prior to submission to the Township Board.
10. The wood dumpster enclosure, as presented, is acceptable.
11. Petitioner shall maintain .1 ft. candle maximum at the property line and that shall be noted on the plans.
12. Petitioner shall receive the approvals of the Livingston County Road Commission, Livingston County Drain Commission and the Livingston County Health Department.

Motion unanimously carried.

- 2) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #2...REVIEW OF A SITE PLAN APPLICATION, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND SITE PLAN FOR A PROPOSED APPLEBEE'S RESTAURANT ON THE EAST SIDE OF GRAND RIVER AT THE ENTRANCE OF MEIJER'S, SECTION 04, PETITIONED BY APPLEBEE'S. (Tabled from July 12, 1999 meeting)
 - A. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING IMPACT ASSESSMENT.
 - B. DISPOSITION OF SITE PLAN.

Mr. Griffin Weyforth, Architect and Site Development Manager for Applebee's, stated they are proposing a restaurant ("145 Cedar Model") on the east outlot at the Meijer's Grand River entrance. It is part of the Lorentzen PUD. The proposed restaurant is the second smallest of their four restaurant models. There will be a 145 seating capacity with 96 parking spaces. The entrance will be off the "Meijer's Road" entrance. They have left room for possible future expansion on the east side.

Commissioner Pobuda expressed concerns about possible expansion and parking.

Commissioner Litogot asked how the size of the restaurant is determined? Do they think they will be expanding?

Mr. Weyforth answered they have other restaurants this size and they do not need to expand them very often. Extensive studies have been done on the market in this area and this size was deemed to be best suited for the market. In such cases in the past, usually a second restaurant is opened in another location rather than adding on. But, they did want to leave room, just in case. He noted that any expansion would need to come back before the Commissioners for site plan approval.

Commissioner McCririe noted that given the lot size, he felt it unlikely that an expansion would ever be proposed.

Ms. Champine reviewed The Strader Group letter of July 7, 1999. Mr. Weyforth stated the islands and unpaved surfaces will be labeled on the revised prints before submission to the Township Board. Regarding the lighting, Commissioner McCririe stated he thought lighting was not required in the PUD unless adjacent to the sidewalks. He also noted that the PUD requires channel lettering, not neon. After discussion, the Commissioners agreed that the wall signage, as proposed, would be acceptable, but the size (sq. ft.) would have to meet the ordinance.

The Commissioners discussed the pedestrian pathway. The plan does not provide pedestrian access from the adjacent Meijer site. Chairman Colley stated he would be in favor of a sidewalk along the access drive.

Mr. Weyforth stated Meijer owns the property of the access drive. They would be required to make "off-site" improvements.

Mr. Archinal noted that they are already making "off-site" improvements.

Commissioner McCririe read from the PUD Agreement which stated a pedestrian network shall be constructed at each phase of the development as each phase is being constructed.

Chairman Colley noted that when the original PUD was approved, there was only one property; if Meijer is going to start splitting for outlots, then he strongly felt a pedestrian pathway needed to be constructed. He acknowledged that the petitioner will have to go back to Meijer and talk with them to get this accomplished. The rest of the Commissioners agreed that a 5' pedestrian walkway would be required and the lighting of such should be kept consistent.

Mr. Weyforth stated the photometric grid would be revised, and a shared access agreement would be provided.

Ms. Talley reviewed the McNamee, Porter & Seeley letter of July 7, 1999. She stated most of the comments have been addressed.

Chairman Colley made a call to the public at 8:15 p.m. with no response.

Regarding the monument sign, Ms. Champine noted that only 6' in height is allowed. They are proposing 9 1/2'. They would need a ZBA variance. The maximum square footage allowed is 60. They are proposing 72 sq. ft. Mr. Weyforth stated that they do have another corporate sign which is only 54 sq. ft. They could go to that, but they would still need a height variance.

Chairman Colley asked about the letter from the Fire Marshall (dated June 11, 1999) requesting an additional fire hydrant.

Ms. Talley stated she would need to review the Meijer plan to see exactly where their hydrants are located.

Moved by Mortensen, supported by Pobuda to recommend to the Township Board the approval of the Impact Assessment for Applebee's, dated 6/4/99, revised 6/21/99. **Motion unanimously carried.**

Moved by McCririe, supported by Litogot to approve the site plan for Applebee's with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as presented.
2. Township engineer review and approval of all plans and specifications.
3. Materials and colors, as presented, are acceptable and shall be present at the time of presentation to the Township Board and become the property of the township, including one color photo presented this evening.
4. All landscaped islands shall be properly labeled prior to submission to the Township Board.
5. Petitioner shall provide an access agreement for the driveway between their development and the Shell Oil station satisfactory to the township engineer.
6. Petitioner acknowledges and accepts the REU calculations for sewer and water as presented in the township engineer's letter dated July 7, 1999.
7. Petitioner shall maintain a .1 foot candle at the property line.
8. All signage on the site shall conform to the township ordinance and PUD Agreement Section 7.2.
9. Subject to the final dispensation of the Fire Marshall's recommendations for placement of additional hydrants.
10. All landscaping within the site shall be native species.
11. Petitioner/property owner shall cause a 5' sidewalk to be constructed from their access road to the interior sidewalk along the loop road with the requisite landscaping lights as called for in the PUD Agreement.
12. Note #17 on sheet C2.1 shall include language that dust control measures will be maintained during construction.
13. All rooftop equipment shall be screened so as to not be visible from the site or adjacent properties.

Motion unanimously carried.

The meeting was recessed at 8:45 p.m. and reconvened at 8:50 p.m.

- 3) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #3...REVIEW OF A SITE PLAN APPLICATION, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND SITE PLAN FOR A PROPOSED BOB EVANS RESTAURANT ON THE SOUTH WEST QUADRANT OF GRAND RIVER AND LATSON ROAD, SECTION 00, PETITIONED BY BOB EVANS. (Tabled from July 12, 1999 meeting)

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

Mr. Tyler Abram of Bob Evans introduced Ms. Mary Jean Beamon from MS Consultants, Inc. Mr. Abram stated he has the review comments from the planner and engineer and he didn't see any significant problems. They are proposing an 130 seat restaurant on outlot #3, part of the Wal-Mart development. The hours of operation will be Sunday through Thursday, 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m., and Friday and Saturday from 6:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m. or possibly 12:00 midnight. He presented the building materials, as well as elevation drawings and sign detail. The front elevation would face Grand River. The "Carry Home Kitchen" side of the building faces Latson Road. A monument sign is proposed on the northeast corner on Grand River.

Commissioner Pobuda questioned whether the colors were "earth-tone enough" to meet the requirements? He wondered if they were deviating too much.

Mr. Abram noted that the "Bob Evans red" color is only on the roof. The building is brick.

Commissioner Litogot noted that the color is better than the "NAPA blue" and the building gives some character to the Grand River corridor. He didn't have a problem with the building materials or colors.

Commissioner McCririe agreed. He felt the township has an overall picture of how the corridor should be developed. It is more of a theme or feeling, rather than a particular color. He didn't find the building objectionable. He felt the architecture was important.

Mr. Archinal noted that the canopies cannot be back-lit.

Ms. Champine reviewed The Strader Group letter of July 8, 1999. Items #1 and 2 have been addressed. Mr. Abram provided a detailed light pole diagram. Ms. Champine and the Commissioners agreed it was acceptable. The ornamental lighting is noted on note 17 on sheet C1. Sign details have been provided. Ms. Champine noted that the PUD Agreement calls for use of the open space throughout the PUD. She recommended a small gathering area with benches, etc., where appropriate, as well as pedestrian connections.

Mr. Abram stated they would discourage benches and seating in the parking areas because of the liability factor. A waiting area with seating is provided at the front of the building within the porch area.

Commissioner Pobuda asked about areas for restless children.

Mr. Abram stated the newer restaurants have larger waiting areas in the lobby that will provide ample space for children.

Commissioner McCririe stated the PUD Agreement addresses parking on Grand River. Is a hedgerow required there? He noted the berm is only 24". The PUD requires it to be 3' high. The Commissioners and Mr. Abram agreed that the landscaping as proposed is acceptable, but the berm needs to be higher.

Ms. Talley reviewed the McNamee, Porter & Seeley letter of July 6, 1999. She stated they are mostly construction details. She noted the REU requirements are in her June 16, 1999 letter.

Commissioner Pobuda asked about delivery times.

Mr. Abram answered they expect about two semi-truck deliveries/week, in the early morning only on weekdays. It is based on the operation of the restaurant and the delivery routes.

Commissioner Figurski noted that sheet C1, note #18 needs to be corrected (monument sign is not 60' high).

Commissioner Litogot wanted clarification that the monument sign will not be on the berm.

Mr. Abram stated they will have to check that it will be at grade. It is partially on the berm. They just want to make sure it is not in the valley.

Chairman Colley made a call to the public at 9:35 p.m. with no response.

Mr. Archinal suggested having the Fire Marshall talk to McNamee, Porter & Seeley on the fire hydrant questions.

Commissioner Figurski noted that the hours of operation needed to be included in the Impact Assessment, as well as language for dust control measures.

Moved by Litogot, supported by Pobuda to recommend to the Township Board the approval of the Impact Assessment for Bob Evans with the inclusion of the hours of operation and language for dust control measures. **Motion unanimously carried.**

Moved by McCririe, supported by Litogot to approve the Bob Evans site plan, dated received 6/23/99, with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as recommended by motion this evening.
2. Township engineer review and approval of all plans and specifications.

3. Petitioner shall add light fixture cut sheet to the plans prior to submission to the Township Board.
4. Petitioner shall maintain a .1 foot candle light level at the property lines.
5. Awnings shall not be back-lit.
6. The landscaping as depicted on the plan is acceptable, but the mound shall be three feet.
7. Petitioner acknowledges and accepts the REU calculations in the township engineer's letter of June 16, 1999.
8. All roof-top equipment shall be screened as to not be visible from this site or other sites.
9. Monument sign along Grand River shall be placed at the same grade as the top of the curb of Grand River and meet the conditions of the PUD Agreement.
10. The materials and colors, as presented, are acceptable and shall be present at the time of submission to the Township Board and become the property of the township.

Motion unanimously carried.

- 4) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #4...REZONING APPLICATION, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT, TRAFFIC STUDY, PUD APPLICATION AND CONCEPTUAL PUD PLAN TO REZONE PROPERTY FROM RR/GC TO RPUD, IN SECTION 5, 94.53 ACRES ON THE NORTH SIDE OF GRAND RIVER WEST OF LATSON ROAD, PETITIONED BY THE SELECTIVE GROUP/DART. (Tabled from July 12, 1999 meeting)
 - A. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING IMPACT ASSESSMENT.
 - B. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING REZONING REQUEST.
 - C. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING PUD AGREEMENT.
 - D. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING SITE PLAN.

Mr. Dave LeClair of Boss Engineering introduced Mr. Steve Friedman, owner. He noted they had made several changes to the site plan since the last meeting. Most notably, they pulled back the property line on the west adjacent to the GC parcel (making that parcel 2.1 acres) and in doing so, were able to increase the setbacks in the multiple-family portion of the development. In the single-family portion, sidewalks have been included, additional space was added between lots #51 and 52, lights were added to the entrance, and a tree preservation area was added.

Mr. Friedman noted that if the Commissioners were more comfortable with a different zoning designation, rather than GC, for that small portion of the development, he would be willing to discuss it.

Commissioner McCrie stated that he just doesn't want to see a convenience store or gas station, or the like, going in there. He asked if Mr. Friedman would object to an office zoning (OSD)?

Mr. Friedman answered he would not have a problem making it OSD instead of GC.

The Strader Group letter of July 20, 1999 was reviewed. Mr. Friedman and the Commissioners agreed to the exclusions in item #1 with the following changes:

1. Add to "a." -financial institutions **if accessed off the internal roadway.**
2. Delete letter "c."

Regarding the garages in the UR portion, Ms. Champine recommended setting a limit of how far a garage can project in front of the home. The Commissioners and Mr. Friedman agreed that 6' would be acceptable. This would allow some creativity with porches, etc.

Mr. LeClair stated the 1 1/2 story units in the MDR section would be not less than 1,400 sq. ft.; but the ranch-style units would be a little smaller, at not less than 1,300 sq. ft. He asked the Commissioners for their approval of this. The Commissioners agreed and noted that this would need to be changed in the PUD Agreement, section 2.2.

Regarding section 3.2 of the PUD Agreement, the Commissioners wanted language to be included that the developer would pay for any improvements along Grand River if the revised traffic study shows they are needed. Mr. Friedman agreed.

Commissioner Pobuda voiced his concern with the lack of details for the play area.

Mr. Friedman stated he envisions a variety of products going in the play area. They have budgeted \$30,000-35,000 for this.

It was noted that in section 9.1 of the PUD Agreement, under "PRESERVATION ZONE B", clearing of trees that are greater than 8 inches in diameter shall be prohibited.

Commissioner Figurski did not feel comfortable with the wording in section 9.2 regarding riparian rights. She felt it was somewhat ambiguous. Mr. Friedman agreed to the following changes:

- "9.2 The proposed site encompasses portions of open water contiguous to Earl Lake. The proposed PUD will offer no access of any kind to Earl Lake to its residents."

Commissioner Figurski also voiced her lingering concern about the density of the project. She also still had misgivings about some of the setbacks. Given the surrounding area, she felt the development was still too crammed.

Commissioner Mortensen agreed. He did not agree with putting 98 homes where there ought to only be 68 in exchange for not developing an apartment complex. He felt the development was a negative. He sees no benefit whatsoever to the township. He was not in favor of the plan.

Commissioner McCririe respectively disagreed. He stated he viewed apartments as transient, not usually as well maintained in the long term as owned property. He stated there is a pride in ownership. That is a big reason he is not in favor of seeing apartments there. He feels the township benefits in this way, as well as in the buffer zones and open space proposed. Also, he felt that with current real estate trends, most of the condos will be occupied by people 55 and over, who do not produce as much traffic either.

Commissioners Pobuda and Colley agreed with Commissioner McCririe. Condominium owners have rules and regulations that can be enforced. There will be more control over the aesthetics and the quality of life. The township benefits with a PUD.

Commissioner Figurski stated she would object a little less if the density in the single-family area was brought down. She would like to see at least lot #10 eliminated.

Mr. Friedman stated he didn't think it was necessary to reduce the density. He wouldn't object to eliminating "bogus" lots, but if you look at the plan, all of the lots are very nice, and very buildable. They protect the environment and fit well into the community.

Commissioner Litogot stated, he too, would like to see some reduction in density. He also would like more enforcement on the preservation of the natural features. He stated he was not in favor of the plan. He needed something more.

Mr. Friedman reiterated that he came in with a PUD plan for the benefit of the township, as well as himself. He could get the density he needs without the PUD.

Commissioner McCririe noted that the parallel plan lays out 70 lots in the single-family and 99 in the multi-family, for a total of 169 units. The PUD plan, as presented, has a total of 162 units. They are presenting less units than what could be in this project. Also, the slopes in the wetlands would not be as preserved in the parallel plan, as the lots could extend into the wetlands. There is a control measure in the PUD. There won't be a discernible difference in the amount of traffic generated either.

Chairman Colley stated the "gift" is the reduction in the density of the MDR and the quality of the development.

Mr. Friedman stated he would be willing to talk about more protection in any areas that the Commissioners are concerned about. He stated he doesn't arbitrarily agree to do something, and then just not do it. He wants a quality development, too.

Commissioner Litogot noted that the township has been "burned" in the past.

Commissioner McCririe suggested putting language into the PUD Agreement that the developer will pay to have the township engineer on site during all grading. In that way, natural features preservation can be better enforced. Also, would Mr. Friedman consider eliminating lot #10?

Mr. Friedman agreed to Commissioner McCririe's recommendation and agreed to eliminate lot #10.

Commissioner Litogot stated that with those changes, he would vote in favor of the plan, but he would keep a watchful eye on the development as it progresses.

Chairman Colley made a call to the public at 11:00 p.m. with no response.

Moved by Litogot, supported by Pobuda to recommend to the Township Board the approval of the Impact Assessment dated 6/9/99 for The Selective Group, with the following changes:

1. Page 5 - change number of duplex units to 64.
2. Section D - add language about dust control measures.
3. Section F - the traffic study should be attached.
4. Page 3, second paragraph - language should be changed to agree with the PUD Agreement.

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

Moved by Pobuda, supported by Litogot to recommend to the Township Board the approval of the rezoning of the Dart property, petitioned by The Selective Group, from RR/GC to RPUD per sheet 1 of 2, dated 6/9/99, revised 7/14/99. **Motion carried (5 yes, 1 no with Mortensen dissenting).**

Moved by McCririe, supported by Litogot to recommend to the Township Board the approval of the PUD Agreement, dated revised 7/14/99, Draft #1, between the Township of Genoa and The Selective Group with the following changes:

1. Section 1.4: Add to the last sentence "...developers of the Property **subject to the terms of the PUD.**"
2. Section 1.5 B: Add to the last sentence "...Ordinance and State Law **subject to the terms of the PUD.**"
3. Section 2.1: Change GC to OSD Office Services District with the following exclusions:
 - a. Banks, credit unions, savings and loans and similar financial institutions if accessed off the internal roadway

- b. Personal and business service establishments
- c. Commercial schools
- d. Conference centers
- e. Health clubs
- f. Hospitals
- g. Medical offices over 40,000 sf
- h. Professional offices over 55,000 sf
- i. Veterinary hospitals

4. Section 2.2: Change to read:

"UR/Urban Residential District - 97 maximum single family dwelling units similar in architectural style to those being constructed by The Selective Group in the adjacent Rolling Ridge Development with garages offset a maximum six feet from the front of the houses.

MDR/Medium Density Residential District - 64 maximum single family ranch or 1 1/2 story attached condominium units with not less than 1,300 s.f. of living space and attached two car garage, with brick fronts and horizontal siding as depicted on the drawing.

OSD/Office Service District - 2.1+ acre sites at the immediate northeast corner of the Grand River entrance to be built out in conformance with the current Genoa Township Zoning Ordinance and in compliance with the Grand River Corridor Study, prohibiting those uses as described in section 2.1 letters a through i.

5. Section 2.3: Change GC/General Commercial to OSD Office Services District.
6. Section 3.2: Add the following after the last sentence - "... to Grand River Avenue. **Any and all off-site improvements, such as acceleration and deceleration lanes and other mitigations necessary pursuant to the revised traffic study shall be paid for by the developer subject to site plan approval.**"
7. Section 6.2: Add to the sentence "...as shown on Schedule B **on both sides within the PUD.**"
8. Add a Section 7.2 to read: **The access point to the southern open space area between units 51 and 52 will provide enhanced treatment such as a small sign, plantings and split rail fencing to identify the open space for residents.**
9. Section 9.1 PRESERVATION ZONE B: Change "10 inches in diameter" to **"8 inches in diameter"**.

10. Section 9.2: Change to read **"The proposed site encompasses portions of open water contiguous to Earl Lake. The proposed PUD will offer no access of any kind to Earl Lake to its residents."**
11. Add a Section 10.4 to read: **The petitioner shall provide the necessary and requisite 4" high, orange, construction safety fencing, staked, and tree protection prior to any grading of the site, to be confirmed and approved by the township engineer; and the township engineer shall be present during the mass grading of the site to assure adherence to the limits of grading, cost of which shall be paid by the developer, in the areas of the preservation.**

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

Moved by McCririe, supported by Litogot to recommend to the Township Board approval of the site plan petitioned by The Selective Group, dated 7/14/99, with the following changes:

1. Lot #10 shall be eliminated.
2. Reference to the area adjacent to Grand River shall be changed to OSD instead of GC.

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

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

There was no Planner's Report.

The Commissioners discussed ideas for streamlining the approval process. It was agreed that applications must be complete and applicants prepared when coming to the meetings, or it just wastes everyone's time. In such cases they agreed that petitions should be tabled at the beginning of the meeting, at the time the agenda is approved, if incomplete.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dia M. Moulton
Recording Secretary