

GENOA TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
JULY 12, 1999

The work session was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

Members present: Bill Colley, Gary McCririe, Bill Litogot and Jim Mortensen. Also present were Township Manager, Michael Archinal; Jeff Purdy and Caryn Champine from The Strader Group; Melissa Talley from McNamee, Porter & Seeley

No formal action was taken, and the work session was adjourned at 6:50 p.m.

GENOA TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING
JULY 12, 1999

The regular session was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Bill Colley. Move by Figurski, supported by Litogot to approve the agenda. Motion carried unanimously.

A call to the public was made. Robin and Bob Dymond responded concerning splitting off a two acre parcel from their ten acres. Mrs Dymond questioned possible rezoning since their property is presently zoned CE, but surrounded by RR. The request was denied by the ZBA. The future master plan calls for 2 acre lots throughout the area. They would like feedback from the Planning Commission. Colley stated the situation will be brought up at the next staff meeting.

Dave Beschke of Equinox stated that he owns a 47 acre parcel, currently zoned office PUD. The master plan shows single residential/2 acre lots which would fit in better with adjacent properties. Mr. Beschke presented a preliminary plan proposing 49 units. There is a requirement of 1500 square feet of park space per unit which is shown. Colley said he would support residential vs office. McCririe said the PUD states what has to be in the plan to preserve the natural features. He expressed concern about potential for using all the high ground and leaving wetlands as open space. Other useful land must be set aside as park area.

Chairman Colley closed the call to the public.

- 1) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #1..REZONING APPLICATION, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT, TRAFFIC STUDY, PUD APPLICATION AND CONCEPTUAL PUD PLAN TO REZONE PROPERTY FROM RR/GC to RPUD, IN SECTIONS 5, 94.53 ACRES ON THE NORTH SIDE OF GRAND RIVER WEST OF LATSON ROAD, PETITIONED BY THE SELECTIVE GROUP/DART (Tabled from a previous meeting)
 - A. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING IMPACT ASSESSMENT
 - B. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING REZONING REQUEST

Chris Lyngso from Boss Engineering introduced Steve Friedman from The Selective Group and Dave LeClair from Boss Engineering. As instructed from a previous meeting, he displayed a parallel plan to look at density with UR single family 18,000 square foot lots and MDR townhouses at eight units per acre. He also presented the previous site plan. It would be completed in general conformance with the previous plan. This plan has 72 lots to be developed. It demonstrates the maximum number of lots that could be developed, although not attempting to demonstrate the worst/highest density for the site. A second parallel plan was displayed which contained 77 lots. The PUD plan would be a development of 98 single family lots in the south and 64 detached private home lots in the

north. There would be a single entrance on Grand River. The parallel plan would connect to the east to the Rolling Ridge subdivision with an
PLANNING COMMISSION
July 12, 1999

outlot in the northeast corner for detention facilities. Parallel plan would have greater impact on natural features and wetlands. Much more lot area is covered; much less control over open space. 18,000 square foot lots are lotted out to the wetland area. There would be a loss of the donation to open space park area.

The conceptual PUD plan with 98 lots presented for consideration provides a much larger open space area than would be required as zoned in the master plan. In both plans there is a parcel in the southeast portion that will remain zoned commercial for future development. The 98 lots are actually to be developed with building envelopes approximately 50 feet wide and 60 feet deep. There would be a playground area in the center and large, contiguous open spaces which are comprised of existing wetlands and upland open space. There would be detention facilities isolated in areas as demonstrated and existing trees along the slope to the wetland would be preserved.

Jeff Purdy commented on the parallel plans presented. With the transfer of densities from multiple family to single family it is important to continue achieve the benefits that go with a PUD. A critical concern is preserving the bluff along the north side of the property. They are requesting a number of variances in the multiple family component. The PUD agreement needs to incorporate such things as sidewalk waivers, road width waivers, setback waivers, etc. We need to look at natural features protection and how many waivers we are willing to give them in the multiple family area.

Melissa Talley stated that improvements to the entrance at Grand River need to be included in the PUD agreement. The owner needs to agree to make any improvements at that intersection, suggesting acceleration or deceleration lane. They need to get a revised traffic study.

McCririe asked the petitioner what they are seeking at the meeting. Any action at this meeting on a recommendation regarding rezoning needs to have all points of the PUD negotiated. All road information, setbacks, and specifically density have to be addressed. The PUD agreement submitted at the previous meeting was significantly deficient. A revised PUD agreement, including all terms that have been negotiated at the time of the rezoning, has to go with the site plan to the township board. All terms include density, number of single and multiple family units, width of the roads, improvements to roads, improvement to intersection, setbacks, sidewalks, variances, etc. That is the rezoning document.

LeClair conferred that they are not prepared and do not know what those specifics are.
Friedman stated they do not know what to put in the document.

McCreary explained that the project is a good one, but the commission must have a final document with the proper changes that are made before it is sent on. The planning commission is the recommending body. The process calls for multiple meetings. You bring the plan, we look at it and review changes that need to be addressed. You make the changes and come back again. Negotiations go back and forth. We need to see the final document. This was discussed at the last meeting when we requested you submit a parallel plan. Now that we have seen the parallel plan, and the consultants have reviewed it, we can discuss the merits of the PUD. We have to determine if we agree collectively to grant the variances you are requesting.

Litogot referred to the minutes of the June 28 meeting, pointing out that it was stated numerous times things that needed to be included in the PUD and brought back at this meeting

Purdy restated requirements of the PUD. He confirmed the office use is permitted in the commercial district, and this needs to be included in the PUD. State number of dwellings (64) allowed in the duplex phase.

Figurski noted that there were three sections of duplexes in the first submittal and now there are four. This takes

away green space. Lyngso explained a reconfiguration changing the number of units from 72 to 64 and addition of the office area. They will be ranch style duplexes with an option to add a loft, making a 1½ story unit.

PLANNING COMMISSION

July 12, 1999

Purdy stated there are 98 single family units. We want to make sure the units are pulled off the bluff sufficiently and, re tree rows, there are some areas at the east side (units 17 - 10) that are close to the bluff area. We would like to see the enveloped pulled back. Starting with 17, 16 and 15, they are getting into the trees. The road can be shifted down.

Friedman showed that 12 - 17 will have walk-out or garden style basements. We can construct the houses with this type of basement without causing a great impact on the embankment. 10 & 11 will have walkouts on three sides. Purdy emphasized the importance of keeping construction away from the bank.

LeClair stated they would not have the ability to go to the north. Limitations can be put in the deed restrictions.

Colley said limiting disturbance in the area of construction is important.

Mortensen expressed concern about having 98 units on this property which is 50% more homes than the ordinance allows by calling it a PUD. Further concern was the number of variances.

Figurski expressed concern about the quantity of trees that will be cut down, a problem that occurs repeatedly.

McCrie asked if deed restrictions would spell out that the home owner, or anyone else, would not clear any trees outside the building envelopes.

Friedman stated that there are no deed restrictions at this time, but it would be possible to include an ordinance stating if a homeowner wanted to put something in the back yard that would require taking trees out, they would have to appeal. The developers want to clear the area for ten to twelve feet outside the building envelope. The side yards between the buildings will have to be cleared.

McCrie suggested in the PUD agreement, there be language that says there will be no disruption to the vegetation outside the building envelope depicted on the plan. The concerns of this body as to the clear cutting would be addressed.

Friedman requested more flexibility for the homeowner by allowing 10 to be cleared outside the building envelope. McCrie responded that the agreement was the trees would not be cut outside the envelope; therefore, the buildings would be put at the front of the envelope to accomplish this.

Purdy asked about lot #38 at the end of the cul-de-sac. There is a requirement for a stub road for an out lot. It could be used for a utility easement or a pedestrian connection. LeClair said they do not plan to connect to Char Ann which is a private road, and they do not plan to include it. Purdy requested moving lot #38 66 feet south to provide an opening at the end. Unit 52 is in a location that would provide open space corridor to all open space in the southwest part of the project. Now there isn't any access to the open space. A person would have to go between side yards of the unit. Open space needs to be accessible. He suggested moving 52 to the right or left, or taking it out.

Friedman said there is room (30 feet). They would put an eight foot wide hard surface path with landscaping on both sides. There would be ten feet on each side of the path. Create a corridor 20 feet wide and put a split rail fence there to define it. There would be a total of 40 feet between buildings.

Purdy pointed out that in the single family envelopes, they are not wide enough for side entry garages. He suggested garages be set back and porches added to the front of the houses to improve the aesthetics of the street scene. Friedman said he

would prefer to keep the garages flush with the front of the house to reduce depth.

Purdy referred to setbacks. The June 23 report, page 5, had a table depicting setbacks. Single family request 22 foot front yard, 10 foot side yard, and 34 foot rear yard. This would be 20 feet between buildings.

PLANNING COMMISSION

July 12, 1999

McCririe stated most are not backing up to one another so rear yards are an unknown continuing into open space. The concern are inside the road (85 - 98).

Purdy said the concern with larger rear yard setbacks would be with those lots that back up to a perimeter of the development. Lots 37 - 39. McCririe added that #8 #9 would be included, and larger setbacks on these are included.

Purdy questioned lots in the middle (64 - 77) which back up to undeveloped parcels with two homes. Friedman said the envelopes are 50 x 68 and the structures will range 48-52 max. McCririe stated that the developer will spell out in the document which lots the 30 foot variances would be requested and that the buildings will be moved to the front of the building envelope. Spacing between houses

Purdy stated the site condominium lots were spaced 30 feet. The detached condominiums were spaced 20 feet. The request

for MDR front yards to be reduced from 35 to 30 feet and be measured from the curve of the road. They are requesting the spacing between buildings be reduced from 30 to 20 feet and also that rear yard setbacks be reduced from 30 feet to 20 feet. Colley stated that this is too much; there are too many requests.

Friedman said that what is being given up in the rear setbacks is gained in a change from a two story blunt face to a product that has a garage with a courtyard that is set further back, and a 1½ story structure. In the front, we are maintaining adequate driveway to keep vehicles off the street.

Purdy said a lot of sidewalks throughout the duplex phase were eliminated because the frontyard setbacks were so shallow. There wasn't room to get a sidewalk and a driveway and a front porch. Colley questioned the necessity of the density. Friedman said they could achieve the same density with a slightly modified product. The product presented has been used beforehand has been well received. If there are too many requests for variances, he can go back to the drawing board and create a different type of product. He would not reduce the density.

Colley said he is not comfortable with the request for 10', 10' and 5' variances on setbacks. Friedman stated the number of variances should not be an issue. The issue should be based on granting variances and being comfortable with what is presented after the variances. Colley explained that the commission is only looking at squares on a piece of paper, and they need a lot more information. There is no way to know what that will look like.

Figurski stated the plan is too dense. The road should be pulled away from the wetland. There will be too many trees cut down. There should be fewer homes.

Colley said there needs to be more green space. It appears there is no green space around the units.

Purdy said they are asking for a modification to the sidewalk requirement. They have a single sidewalk that goes along the road in the duplex section, and they have a sidewalk only one side in the single family component. The ordinance for any high density project such as this requires sidewalks along both sides of all streets. He said he would not support any variance to the sidewalk requirement in the single family section. Friedman stated he did not think the sidewalks were necessary, but if the commission desired them on both sides in the single family, they could do that. In the multi family he definitely sees no benefit. There is a collector sidewalk available for people to congregate get on the major sidewalk system. Colley said he would like to see sidewalks on both sides throughout single family.

Purdy stated they are proposing 27 foot wide roads, and the ordinance calls for 30 foot. McCririe said the road

commission has said 27 feet is acceptable. On street parking is not going to be allowed, although it will probably occur. The township board feels the increased road width is not enough of a benefit; they want to see less pavement.

Purdy said a final subject to be addressed in the PUD agreement would be preserving natural features, limiting tree clearing, and addressing riparian access to the canal that leads to the lake. McCririe said he feels there is no reason for anyone in the

PLANNING COMMISSION

July 12, 1999

development to have access to Earl Lake. Such language should be contained in the PUD. The language necessary for preservation of the wetlands is also necessary, and conservation easements that are necessary. We need to spell out exactly

what is going to happen in the open spaces. What paths, playground or picnic equipment needs to be included.

Purdy added that any utility or transportation easements need to be included.

Melissa Talley referred to McNamee letter of June 23. A revised traffic impact study needs to be done to determine what needs to be done to the entrance.

Chairman Colley opened the Public Hearing.

Fred Bonine, resident of Earl Lake, expressed concern with density and the impact on the people who will live there. 98 residences are proposed on what amounts to probably much less than 94 acres of usable land. Sites and sizes of the parcels

need to be addressed. 70 foot wide lot is small. Where this was allowed in another area has resulted in all people remarking on what a mistake it is. Dedicating wetlands does not really contribute to the well-being of the people. It is important to look at the slope as you have done. The open space must be protected.

Frank Detterbeck asked about impact on Char Ann Drive. Colley stated there will be no impact on that drive from this project.

Sue Boss also expressed concern about Char Ann Drive and asked if trees would be added to property line on lots 38 and 39. She asked about lighting.

Colley asked the developer about lighting. Friedman stated there would be lighting in the entryway up to the first single family unit. The balance of the sight would be lighted with garage and porch lights. Colley said the lighting plan needed to be included in the PUD. McCririe requested that no lighting be provided in the playground area as not to encourage any late light activity there. A playground is used during daylight hours.

Colley pointed out there is a mixed vote, and two members are missing. In # 86 to #98 probably half a dozen homes need to come out due to preservation of the trees and wetland. Possibly reduced density in the multiple family because of all the variances that are going to be requested. The total numbers are not necessarily wrong, but the density as proposed impacts other areas of the site. The developer needs to come back prepared to address the issues.

McCririe suggested there would be more support from the commission if the developer would reduce the numbers. There was a trade in density from multiple for density in the single family. We have a better product in the multiple family portion. I see no significant difference between 90 and 98 houses. I feel the impact would not be noticeable.

Moved by McCririe, supported by Figurski, to table the Selective Group/Dart rezoning application at the request of the petitioner. Motion carried unanimously.

2) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #3..REVIEW OF A SPECIAL USE APPLICATION, ENVIRONMENTAL

IMPACT ASSESSMENT, AND SITE PLAN FOR SPECIAL USE APPROVAL FOR A NEW AND USED CAR DEALERSHIP AT 4300 EAST GRAND RIVER, SECTION 09, PETITIONED BY SATURN RETAIL OF MICHIGAN. (Tabled from a previous meeting)

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

PLANNING COMMISSION
July 12, 1999

Brent Levanway from Boss Engineering introduced Karen Norris from Saturn Corporation, Holly Maletski from General Motors Real Estate Division, Joe Zablotny from L & A Architects. He gave a general introduction of the project and surrounding properties. He stated that after meeting with the township staff, after the first meeting, there have been substantial revisions to the plan. The 48-inch walnut will be preserved and will become the focal point of the development.

The driveway will be west of it. A number of other trees on the site will be preserved including two 8-inch walnuts, a 15-inch maple and a solid tree row on the west boundary of approximately 30-foot evergreens which will be extended. All parking along the frontage of Grand River has been removed. There will be six display pods on which will be displayed one vehicle which will be set back some distance from the right-of-way. There will be no cars along Grand River.

Colley asked about area south of display pods. There are access and movement aisles. There will be a handicapped display set back from the movement aisles and a landscaped island with parked cars behind them. On the far west side of the property there will be display pod, landscaped area, and used cars behind that. There will be no used cars along the northern side. The westerly two pods will be raised slightly because the grade drops to the northwest. There will be a retaining wall around those. The easterly ones will be slightly above grade with landscaping all the way around.

McCrie asked how they plan to prevent customers from parking along Grand River. Maletski explained that most customers look for designated parking spaces which will be provided on the west side for new car customers, and at the rear for service customers. Colley stated the green belt might be extended along the frontage serpentine since there is no parking, and it would seem that much maneuvering space is not necessary. Levanway responded that they tried to create character and depth by staggering pods with landscaped area. New car delivery drop-off area is necessary.

Regarding the McNamee letter of July 6, the detention pond and storm water management issue. The site slopes from south to northwest corner of Grand River by the Detroit Edison property. To avoid putting the pond along Grand River, it has been located it on a higher part of the side. There will be storage within the storm sewer pipe that will go out to Grand River. The remaining 2/3 of the site will drain back to a retention pond at the southeast corner of the site. Items 1-6 relate to storm water management. Talley said she would like to see some calculations because the invert at northwest corner is lower than the rest, so some flooding will occur at high storm even though there is a restricted outlet. Calculations would show impact of the water and how far it will go onto the adjacent Detroit Edison property. It should not spill out on Grand River or run to the west.

LaVanway noted that #8 on the McNamee letter is incorrect and should read "FILL TO 1006". #9 is a statement regarding sodium and chloride discharge limits. That will be addressed on construction plans. #10 water main connection detail will also be addressed before submitting a permanent plan.

Regarding the Strader letter of July 7, under the Special Land Use Review, LaVanway said he had addressed the tree issue. They will maintain as many trees on the site as possible. A number of small trees and shrubbery around the house will be transplanted by the present owners. Vehicles parked in the lot qualify as outdoor storage and require SLU. The existing home belongs to the Evans and is not part of the sale to Saturn.

Colley asked why there were six display pods. LaVanway said it was a number they felt comfortable with that would blend with the landscaping and fit into the frontage. The intent is to draw people into the dealership.

McCririe asked about the automobiles depicted adjacent to the front of the building. LaVanway said they are outside. McCririe stated thirteen automobiles are actually being displayed outside.

Colley stated it was important to discuss the materials of the building, a graphic display of how the front of the building will be perceived from Grand River. LaVanway showed a rendering of the dealership from Grand River. Not all trees are shown. There are three more canopy trees on one side and eight on the other.

PLANNING COMMISSION

July 12, 1999

Colley said that at the staff meeting regarding the project there were two considerations. One was to change the building to have a pitched roof to be more in accordance with corridor plan and keep the rest of the plan the same. An alternate would move all vehicles off Grand River and landscape the frontage to soften the impact of the modern style building and reduce the visibility from Grand River on the east.

Mortensen asked about overhead doors. The doors will be facing westerly with extensive landscaping on the west side. There will be 10 foot tall evergreens extending just to the back of the northwest display pod.

Zabotny presented color samples of split face block and metal. Photometric study was done. Pictures of the Clarkston dealership were presented. The light fixture is attached to a pole and there are lights attached to the building. The exterior parking lot lights will be turned out when the facility closes. The latest will be 9 p.m. There will be a security light on the back of the building. The lights on the pods are mounted at ground level. One or two may be lit at night at ½ power for security. Purdy stated foot candles should be limited to .1. Colley expressed concern with brightness of lights on Grand River causing a nuisance to traffic. Purdy said a concern would be halo effect from spotlights on the cars in front. Colley stated 80 foot candles would be a sufficient amount of foot candles. 80 foot candles on pods is well above what is required in the ordinance and will create a nuisance. Purdy stated the night security lights can be no more than .1 foot candles at the property line, and no more than 20 foot candles at any location on the site.

Purdy mentioned additional landscaping required as per the ordinance - six shrubs along the west side of the site, three additional trees along the rear, and two trees at the front. The landscaped islands in the parking lot must have rounded edges and should be two feet shorter than the parking spaces. Sidewalk along the side of the building should be seven feet wide. Two signs are proposed in the front, and one sign is permitted. LaVanway said they will ask the ZBA for an additional sign because they need one sign for Saturn and one sign for used cars.

Purdy stated the other comments have to do with preserving the trees on the site and the architecture. They encourage brick buildings and pitched roofs. There is no additional landscaping provided. They actually need to add more.

Chairman Colley opened the Call to the Public.

Urana Evans, present owner of the property, stated she knows every tree and every shrub on the property. They are trying to find someone who will move the house which is totally the Evans' responsibility. She commented on Saturn and on the landscaping.

Doral Vitale asked about trees between the service garage and the driving range. He was assured the area, which is the rear property line, would be screened by 15 trees and over 40 shrubs.

Colley closed the Call to the Public

Colley asked if there will be any roof top equipment. There will be none.

Mortensen expressed concern that the roof is not pitched. McCririe said he is not in favor of that type of architecture being located in that location. The architecture presented does not meet the spirit of what we try to develop along Grand River. Colley stated he has no problem with what has been presented.

Moved by Mortensen to recommend approval of the Special Use Permit for Saturn Retail of Michigan. McCririe supported for discussion stating the motion is for outdoor storage of new and used vehicles for sale. The motion was amended. The motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Figurski, supported by Litogot to recommend approval of the Revised Impact Ass dated 6/23/99, with the PLANNING COMMISSION
July 12, 1999

following contingencies: Under "G" that statement "35 gallons per day" be revised to include car wash facility use; under "H" note that the PIPP plan dated 6/23/99 is attached to the Impact Assessment. Colley suggested a statement be included under "G" specifying any restrictions regarding the car wash.

McCririe suggested the Planning Commission not make a motion to recommend the site plan to the Township Board in that a different building with architecture more in keeping with the Grand River corridor plan would be more appropriate. If the petitioner is not willing to do that, he would make a motion recommending denial. Other commission members except Colley agreed with McCririe's statement

Zabotny asked if a pitched roof is an ordinance requirement. McCririe responded that the Grand River area corridor study encourages pitched roofs to be in keeping with character of the area. The ordinance allows this body to request certain architecture. Purdy said that when there have been flat roofs, the commission has looked for other architectural detail such as cornices or small pitches to give a topage to the building. Other details to enhance the building include entrance enhancement such as awnings across the front or sections with other details that break up the mass of the building and provide some interest.

Zabotny asked if brick is required. McCririe stated he is opposed to buildings that are strait split face. In response to a question as to the type of architecture suggested, the petitioner was given numerous examples of local buildings which are considered in keeping with the area.

Moved by McCririe, supported by Figurski, to table the site plan at the request of the petitioner, Saturn Retail of Michigan. The motion carried unanimously.

A 10-minute break was taken at 9:45. It was announced that the next meeting will be Tuesday, July 20, to hear Public Hearings 4, 5, and 6.

- 3) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #3...REVIEW OF SPECIAL USE APPLICATION, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT, AND SITE PLAN FOR SPECIAL USE APPLICATION, FOR PROPOSED GENOA AUTO MALL, SPECIAL USE IS FOR OUTDOOR VEHICLE DISPLAY AND STORAGE. PROPERTY LOCATED NORTH OF GRAND RIVER AND EAST OF LATSON ROAD, SECTION 04, PETITIONED BY JEANNE AUDETTE JONES.
 - A. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING SPECIAL USE APPLICATION
 - B. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING IMPACT ASSESSMENT
 - C. DISPOSITION OF SITE PLAN

Chris Lyngso from Boss Engineering introduced Doug Hamborsky, architect, Alan Bloom from Bloom, Chuck Bennett from Bloom, and Jeanne Audette Jones. Lyngso presented the landscape plan and the overall Lorenzen PUD plan. He

pointed out the location and adjoining property owners. The auto dealership will not front on Grand River but will be located north of three outlots.

The entire parcel will be owned by one owner (Ms. Jones) with a plan for the outlots to be use for auto service uses. The initial phase would be the construction of the display area which would be developed in a park-like setting. Ms. Jones would be moving Brighton Honda to the Genoa Auto Mall location, and Mazda sales would be in a separate building behind Honda. The remaining parcels would be split off, developed in line with auto use, most likely future dealerships, auto manufacturers. The parcel in the southwest corner for future development could be an auto wash and detailing facility open to the public, primarily servicing Ms. Jones and other dealerships.

Lyngso stated the Lorenzen PUD development of this area will trigger several key improvements. Ms. Jones received a copy

PLANNING COMMISSION

July 12, 1999

of a letter to the First National Bank outlining areas of responsibility for construction of surface features. Ms. Jones' commitment is to construct a detention basin. She would be responsible for construction of a service road from the eastern edge of the Edison corridor across the north side of the First Nat'l Bank, across the four acre parcel and the JMR Food site.

The water look is in place. Extension of the bike path will be constructed. Access to dealerships will be made to Grand River past the bank and extend to a center cul-de-sac during construction. The principal access will be a two-lane road meeting all road commission standards extending to a cul-de-sac to end at the northern edge of the Mazda dealership, and it will service future parcels.

There will be seven pods for vehicles, 4 vehicles in each pod from both the Honda and Mazda dealerships or other future dealerships. We need to have an area to expand so other dealerships have a place to display. The arrangement of the area preserves an open lot for free form display. The parking lot is well behind and will attract pedestrians from the adjacent restaurant and other businesses that area built. It will also cause people to park behind the building, so their cars will not be parked on the service road.

Colley asked why the parking lot was so large. Lyngso stated that Ms. Jones is active in the community and a well-known business owner in the area. She anticipates having charity functions in the area that she sponsors. There would need to be extra parking for the function. Colley remarked that it is a large lot not in the middle of a business and would be an attractive nuisance to the township. If 29 cars are not needed to be there, there is no need to provide 29 spaces.

There would be low ornamental lighting throughout the area, and some security lighting. The PUD specifies the type of lighting fixture that can be used. Lights will be dimmed after 10 p.m. There will be a light about 100 feet from Grand River. There will be ornamental lighting along the 8 foot pedestrian path.

The building has been put at an angle to provide a more attractive view along the service road and the service cul-de-sac. The entrances to the service bay and the service garage will be on the back side away from Grand River. There would be some view from the service road. One overhead door facing Grand River is screened with evergreens in an island. There are a limited number of trees in the islands because of leaves or sap getting on cars. There will be a dense landscape buffer on the entire western property line. There is a remaining parcel zoned for office so there is no screening proposed on that line. There is additional landscaping at the entries. Ms. Jones is concerned about the amount of landscaping required and was assured that the requirements were in accordance with the ordinance. There are no canopy trees in the right of way in the service road. All trees in the back half of the property are to be cleared. There is a line of existing large trees between the dealerships so most of the trees will be cleared.

There are detailed building plans for the Honda facility now. There is less detail of the Mazda facility. There would be outdoor storage behind each of the buildings.

Mortensen asked what the petitioner was asking the commission to approve. Colley explained that without architecture on the Mazda building, that portion of the site cannot be approved. The petitioner would have to come back for the Mazda portion of the plan. Purdy said the commission would have to recommend to the township board to amend the PUD agreement. This use wasn't included in the PUD agreement. McCririe said the plan cannot go forward without the amendment to modify.

Hamborski presented the building materials as provided by Honda. The building is divided into a few core featuring elements, most noteworthy a metal kiosk. Window system is standard. The bulk of the wall material would be block with drivet facade. There would be architectural block along the base of the building. There is a feature band of ceramic tile that halos the perimeter of the front facade. Elevations were provided. There is one garage door facing Grand River which would be heavily landscaped. There will be a covered delivery area for new car purchasers. Another architectural feature is a wave on the front at the top. Floor plan was presented. There are some display areas in the front of the building for vehicles.

PLANNING COMMISSION
July 12, 1999

There is a flat roof, but the additional architectural features compensate.

McCririe stated not much of the building would be seen from Grand River. Purdy stated the PUD agreement spelled out specifics as far as building materials, that all buildings be masonry materials. Drivet could be accent material, but the building should be primarily masonry. McCririe quoted from the PUD agreement: "Section 7.1 says 'the architecture, building materials, colors and shapes of all nonresidential buildings shall be in substantial conformity with the guidelines set forth in the Grand River Avenue Corridor as adopted and as may be reasonably amended. Its intention is proposed to promote and encourage development that incorporates varying building lines, natural earth tone construction materials, and other elements contributing to upgrade the appearance'."

Jeff Smith said that before anything comes before the commission, Ms. Lorenzen reviews it. She looked it and thought that it was not in the spirit and intent of what we are trying to accomplish.

Purdy stated that "earth tone" colors were tans, brown, etc., not stark white. Everything but Sears in the PUD is brown or tan brick. Sears is earth tone color. White drivet is not in the spirit of the PUD agreement. Hamborski asked if taupe or tan or grey drivet would be acceptable. We have to meet the PUD.

McCririe said based on the drawings, they are going in the right direction. The service area is set back improving the front facade. There needs to be consistency. This isn't industrial, but commercial, so it is reasonable to expect an upgrade to the building. Bloom suggested using architectural block to break up the drivet. Colley stated there are better building materials. Drivet is alright for accent, but it is not good for a whole building. It stains, bleeds, emulsifies, and all kinds of things over a short period of time. Purdy encouraged more architectural block.

Colley asked about roof top equipment. Lyngso said they had not addressed that subject, but it can easily be concealed with the way the front elevation is developed.

Purdy referred to the Strader July 8 letter. A PIPP plan is required. Re tree clearing, concern about clearing vegetation. The PUD site plan assumed any development would preserve some of the trees to provide buffer from the residential. If all trees are cut on this site, we would have a difficult time protecting trees on the site between this and the residential. Trees should be preserved on the Mazda side as well as the adjacent site. As proposed, every tree on the Mazda site is to be removed. There should be a large enough greenbelt setback in front of the trees to protect the roots. The trees would protect residences from the lights.

McCririe stated future development needs to be discussed. It appears there is 90% lot coverage between pavement and

building and only 75% is allowed. The percentage must be verified. He questioned the necessity of having that much pavement. Jones replied that they need area for storage, rows of pads, sales customers, service customers. They want to avoid the frustration of coming into the dealership and not having a place to park. Lyngso stated there are more spaces provided than required. Purdy said 456 are provided and 228 are required. Colley suggested that some spaces could be banked for future use. Car dealerships often park cars in the driveways or in the street because they don't have enough room. Jones said that since they are off Grand River they expected more latitude. The business is seasonal, and they cannot control how many cars are there.

Purdy said to move lot lines north or parking south. The natural tree line on the north needs to be preserved. There needs to be a tree inventory to determine how far the parking should be moved. The PUD requirement re the southwest outlot would require 26 trees along the edges of the parking on the north and east side. An alternative would be to require one tree every 40 feet along the service road. Colley asked for details on the light fixtures.

There needs to be a lighting plan providing details of light fixtures and a photometric grid.
The bike path along Grand River Avenue should be specifically noted on the plan.

PLANNING COMMISSION

July 12, 1999

McCrie asked about necessity to construct service drive past the second entrance adjacent to JMR Foods. Purdy said that was according to the agreement. McCrie stated he could see no reason to do that now and asked if it could be done at a later time. It was agreed to hold off on putting in the road.

Talley referred to the cul-de-sac to the north - it would need an easement for ingress, egress. Need to see calculations for the detention basin and drainage. McCrie stated that presently the PUD the site drainage will be handled as the sites come along subject to the approval of the township. There is some indication of what will happen in that direction. It would not be good to have the runoff going to the property to the east which is going to be developed. Talley said the water connection has to be revised because of the revised building size. Utilities must be revised according to the proposed square footage of the building. The connection fee for the car wash needs to be established. The information on the car wash must be included in the Impact Assessment.

Chairman Colley opened the Call to the Public. There was no response.
Chairman Colley closed the Call to the Public.

McCrie asked if it was the intention to create three lots out of the one on Grand River. That was not the discussion in prior meetings. I did not contemplate two additional users on Grand River. I also didn't contemplate 27 cars on display and 6 signs on display there. The PUD specifically does not allow that many signs. Purdy said the outlots would be about half the size of the restaurant. Colley brought up the loss of any large green space along Grand River. He also said it would help to further screen the auto mall area.

Jeff Smith said there have been requests for more small services that would be priced out of the market place.

Colley asked if there were plans to develop the lots.

McCrie stated that the question before the commission is in consideration for the change to the PUD from what was contemplated to what is proposed. The trade was going to be the landscaped area fronting Grand River. The idea was to soften the view along Grand River. The idea of having an auto mall is superior to having ten dealerships up and down Grand River. This is more intense than we expected in the trade. Colley said the discussion is about allowing the rezoning to happen in the PUD with a tradeoff to soften the view on Grand River. There needs to be a plan that includes landscaping in the lots and still allows development in the future. McCrie stated that the idea was that there were not going to be a lot of buildings along Grand River. We contemplated three businesses in the area. He suggested the petitioner produce an alternate plan.

Jones stated the number of cars displayed will change according to the market and the number of dealerships. 28 cars would be there if the automart was full. Colley said he would like to look at the long range plan.

Colley stated that there could not be as many signs as proposed. There need to be more trees along the frontage. Signage does not bring people in to the automal. You need one well designed sign in front identifying the automal. The designations of who is who would be internal. Purdy said signage must be addressed in the PUD agreement. This section of the PUD will be modified. One sign is allowed. The township is strong in the feeling to keep it that way.

Mortensen said he would like to see more clearly what the pods will look like. He requested a rendering.

Lyngso stated a 30 foot high sign is proposed. McCririe referred to the PUD agreement with Lorenzen stating the sign has to be no higher than six feet and no larger than sixty square feet.

It was moved by Figurski, supported by Litogot, to table the Genoa Auto Mall rezoning application at the request of the petitioner. Motion carried unanimously.

PLANNING COMMISSION

July 12, 1999

The meeting was adjourned at 11:50 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Kathy Robertson
Recording Secretary