

GENOA TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
JUNE 28, 1999
WORK SESSION
6:30 P.M.
MINUTES

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, Gary McCririe, Jim Mortensen and Jerry Joseph. Also present were Michael Archinal, Township Manager; Caryn Champine and Jeff Purdy from The Strader Group; and Melissa Talley from McNamee, Porter & 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 Bill Colley at 7:07 p.m. **Moved** by Pobuda, supported by Joseph to approve the Agenda as presented. **Motion unanimously carried.**

Chairman Colley noted that the Board will not begin any new business after 10:00 p.m.. He made a call to the public to discuss items not on the agenda.

Mr. Steve Andersen stated he is the owner of parcel #11-13-200-012, immediately east and adjacent to the St. Joseph Mercy rezoning request. He has talked with township staff and was advised to come to the meeting to get the Commissioners' opinions on the future best use for his property. Currently, there is apartment housing there with six units. It is currently zoned single residential. He felt the best use would be to rezone it to OSD. OSD is contiguous to the south. He just wanted some input from the Commissioners.

The Commissioners agreed that OSD would make sense in that location. They would be willing to consider it if more detail were provided.

Mr. Andersen thanked the Commissioners for their input and stated he would be back sometime in the near future to make the request.

Mr. David Beschke of Equinox stated there is a 47 acre parcel, near the Mid-town Market, which is zoned OSD, but as he understands it, it has a "PUD overlay". He is looking at developing an office complex there. About one-half of the parcel is wetlands. He distributed conceptual drawings to the Commissioners. The complex would have one-acre lots with 100' of frontage, about 24 units. He was looking for opinions from the Commissioners on such a project.

Mr. Purdy explained that this parcel is in the Master Plan as residential (2-4 units/acre). Apparently, it is part of the Champion Chevrolet PUD. This mix-use PUD was developed several years ago, and the agreement does not address this particular part of the parcel with much specificity. The PUD Agreement includes lots of detail for the car dealership, but not much else for the rest of the site. He recommended treating any application for this site as an amendment to the PUD site plan.

Mr. Archinal noted that in researching this site, apparently, an office/campus-type setting was originally conceived for this area.

Mr. Earl Meyer, who has an option on the property, stated he had originally thought about putting detached homes in the \$200,000-250,000 range on the site. He still is not totally convinced that an office center would fill up. What about a mix-use? What about residential?

Commissioner McCririe stated he has taken part in several meetings for this site and as a result of those meetings, he envisioned one or two large office buildings on this site, not 24 small ones. He didn't feel the proposal, as presented, was compatible with the development that is going in along Grand River. Also, he wouldn't be overly enthused with a very dense residential development there.

Several Commissioners felt they could go either way: office or residential. They suggested Mr. Meyer bring back a residential plan to see what that might look like. Chairman Colley noted that he would not be in favor of light industrial mixed with residential and commercial, however.

Mr. Beschke thanked the Commissioners for their input, and with no other comments, Chairman Colley closed the call to the public.

- 1) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #1...REVIEW OF A REZONING APPLICATION TO REZONE PROPERTY FROM AG (AGRICULTURAL) TO CE (COUNTRY ESTATES) AT 2627 CHILSON ROAD, SECTION 17, PETITIONED BY JON SHERMAN. (TABLED FROM PREVIOUS MEETING.)

- A. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING IMPACT ASSESSMENT.
- B. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING REZONING REQUEST.

Mr. Jon Sherman from The Michigan Group stated the owner, Mr. John Owen, wishes to rezone the parcel from AG to CE in order to split the property which is about 13 acres. They have done the perks and it is suitable for septic.

Mr. Purdy briefly reviewed The Strader Group letter of 6/23/99. He noted that both AG and CE districts are consistent with the Master Plan. AG is a 10-acre minimum. CE is a 5-acre minimum. In his opinion, the rezoning would be consistent with the Master Plan.

Ms. Melissa Talley stated there were no major engineering issues.

The Commissioners briefly discussed the permitted uses of AG vs. CE. It was noted that farm operations are permitted in the AG only. In the CE district, there must be five acres for the first horse, and 1 1/2 acres for each horse thereafter. In other words, the existing home (parcel C-1) could have one horse; parcel C-2 could only have two horses.

Mr. Owen stated he understood this. Also, he plans to get rid of his livestock

Chairman Colley noted that CE is across the road from this site and would be contiguous with this parcel. He made a call to the public at 7:35 p.m. with no response.

Moved by Mortensen, supported by Pobuda to recommend to the Township Board the approval of the Impact Assessment dated 6/15/99. **Motion unanimously carried.**

Moved by Mortensen, supported by Pobuda to recommend to the Township Board the approval of the rezoning request for parcel #11-17-300-005, from AG to CE as the rezoning is consistent with the Township Master Plan. **Motion unanimously carried.**

It was noted that approval of the rezoning request does not necessarily approve the drawing submitted with the application.

- 2) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #2...REVIEW OF A 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 PREVIOUS MEETING.)

- A. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING IMPACT ASSESSMENT.
- B. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING CONCEPTUAL PUD PLAN AND AGREEMENT.

C. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING REZONING REQUEST.

Mr. Chris Lyngso from Boss Engineering introduced Mr. Steve Friedman from The Selective Group. Mr. Lyngso stated the Landscape Plan, Open Space Plan, PUD Plan and Existing Conditions Plan were all included in the Commissioners' packets. He stated the parcel is currently zoned Rural Residential (RR) with a small strip along Grand River that is zoned General Commercial (GC). There is a small area in the center of the development which is unavailable for purchase which is zoned RR. They are proposing to develop 98 single family detached condominiums under PUD-UR (Urban Residential) and some duplex units under PUD-MDR (Medium Density Residential) at the southern portion of the parcel. The most northern section of the parcel would remain RR. One access along Grand River is proposed, as well as a stub in the northeast corner to the Rolling Ridge development. The roads will be 66' and dedicated to the Livingston County Road Commission. He has had several meetings with the Road Commission and they are willing to accept the 700' cul-de-sac, as Char-Ann is a private road and cannot be connected at this time.

Mr. Lyngso stated that in the PUD, the wetlands have been preserved and the impact on the woodlands has been limited. The existing zoning would allow for an increased density which would have a significant adverse impact on the site, especially the area fringing on the wetlands. A PUD Agreement, on the other hand, could specifically spell out what can and cannot be done in these areas. Also, he noted the 27' wide pavement helps in reducing the amount of impervious surface which reduces the amount of detention area. The plan shows the building envelopes having 20' spacing between them which is consistent with the Rolling Ridge subdivision. A reduction in the rear yard setbacks is proposed along the perimeter of the development and in the interior of the blocks. Sidewalks are only on one side of the street, connecting to the Rolling Ridge sub and Grand River.

The multi-family portion of the development is approximately 14 acres and located in the southeast section. A duplex product is proposed with two units/building. This gives more of an appearance of a residential community rather than an apartment complex. Private roads are proposed in this area. A landscaped buffer is proposed on the south and east sides. The developer wants about 2 1/2 acres of the site near the Grand River access (southwest portion of MDR) to be developed at a later date. A small, office park-type setting is envisioned.

Chairman Colley asked if the developer had prepared a parallel plan on how it would look if developed as zoned? He stated he had a problem with all the proposed setback variances. The wetlands will dictate what is developed and what is not. He had the feeling that this development was too dense. The Township doesn't seem to get too much in return. 98 lots with all the setback variances seems excessive. He'd be interested in seeing the numbers on a parallel plan.

Mr. Lyngso noted that with the conventional zoning, the lots could go down to the bluff and require much more extensive clearing. Also, there could be more walk-outs. It would also be possible to petition the MDEQ to cross some wetlands and put in more lots there.

Mr. Friedman stated that, indeed, with conventional zoning, a parallel plan would show a lower density in the single-family portion of the development. However, he could go with a much higher density in the multi-family area. He could make his numbers work in the multi-family by putting in a more dense, apartment-like complex. However, his intent is to have a plan that would have the lots capitalize on the strengths of the site, which are in the northern section (single-family portion).

Commissioner McCririe noted that if a parallel plan would come back with a slightly less density, he believed there is an argument to be made to grant the development some additional density in order to get better buffers, etc. through a PUD. However, he didn't know if UR zoning should be a given at this point.

Mr. Purdy reiterated that the MDR portion of the project is below the allowed density. The applicant could put a number of additional units in that area. As a proposed PUD, some of the density from MDR will be transferred to the UR portion of the project.

Commissioner McCririe agreed that a ranch-style duplex is more desirable than a three-story apartment building in the MDR section.

Mr. Purdy did note, however, that he has concerns with some of the setbacks, especially in the MDR. Some of the front-yard setback deviations in the single-family make more sense as they will be moved off the forested parts of the parcel.

Mr. Friedman noted that in the multi-family, he could get 120 units of a different housing product on that parcel. However, he wants to have a minimal impact in this area. They will be marketing to empty-nesters in this area. He noted that in the meetings with the township he has had, he never got the impression that his single-family numbers were way out of line. He thought he was heading in the right direction. He has given up units in the multi-family to get a very consistent single-family product, similar to what has been approved at Rolling Ridge.

Chairman Colley noted that the PUD Agreement is lacking important information, too.

Mr. Purdy stated he felt the following needed to be addressed before any action is taken:

- Demonstrated benefits of a PUD must be included in the PUD Agreement.
- In area of units #10-15, try to minimize the encroachment of the woodlands.
- An outlot/stub to the west is important.
- Recreational area is vital and needs to be indicated on the PUD Concept Plan.
- Sidewalks should be included on both sides of the road.
- PUD Agreement needs more natural features protection and should prohibit

boat access to Earl Lake.

-The office concept in southwest section of MDR needs to be clearly defined in the PUD Agreement, as well as the architectural standards for same.

Chairman Colley stated that upon hearing the density trade-offs from MDR to UR, as explained by Mr. Purdy, it makes more sense to him now.

Mr. Purdy stated he did not get the feeling that this development was too dense, but it needs more environmental protection measures, especially in the north.

Ms. Talley stated most of her comments in the review letter of 6/23/99 are PUD comments. However, traffic impact study revisions are needed. Also, she noted that the County is going in the direction of having permanent temporary sedimentation basins.

Chairman Colley made a call to the public at 8:32 p.m.

Mr. Todd Smith stated he was representing the Lorentzen property (ChemTrend) to the west of the parcel. He stated they are favorable to moving the residential area as far away from ChemTrend as possible.

Mr. Paul Schmitz of Char-Ann Lane voiced his concerns with the density of this project. He was concerned with only having 20' between houses, as well as the traffic that will be generated from such a large project. The adjacent parcels on Char-Ann and to the west are two-acre, six-acre, and even some 10-acre parcels. He felt the project was just too dense. He also was concerned with the condition of Earl Lake and possible jet-ski traffic coming onto the canal and ponds.

With no other comments, Chairman Colley closed the call to the public at 8:36 p.m.

Mr. Purdy noted that a parallel plan would better illustrate the setback modifications, too.

Commissioner Joseph stated he would like to see a parallel plan.

Commissioner Mortensen noted that from his perspective, there may not necessarily be a "one for one trade" on the density.

Commissioner Figurski stated she would also like to see the proposed small office area better defined.

Commissioner Pobuda stated he would like to see the recreational areas better defined, too.

Moved by Pobuda, supported by Mortensen to table The Selective Group/Dart rezoning application at the request of the petitioner. **Motion unanimously carried.**

- 3) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #3...REVIEW OF A REZONING APPLICATION AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT FOR ST. JOSEPH MERCY HEALTH SYSTEMS TO REZONE 78 ACRES, LOCATED ALONG THE NORTH SIDE OF GRAND RIVER BETWEEN HACKER ROAD AND EULER ROAD, SECTION 13, FROM PRF TO MIXED-USE PUD. (TABLED FROM PREVIOUS MEETING.)
- A. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING IMPACT ASSESSMENT.
 - B. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING CONCEPTUAL PUD PLAN AND AGREEMENT.
 - C. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING REZONING REQUEST.

Ms. Linda Grosh, 5301 East Huron River Dr., Ann Arbor, stated several changes had been made to the site per the comments of the Planning Commission from the last meeting. The traffic study is complete. The entrance point at the west has been moved so that it now lines up across from the Brighton Health Club drive. They have agreed to putting in a traffic light, if one is deemed necessary in the future. They also have agreed to update the traffic study at each phase of development. The final PUD site plan will have to address all traffic concerns.

Mr. Bud Lauderbach, also from St. Joseph's, gave a brief description of the intent of the assisted living complex. He stated they have determined that there is a definite need in the area for such a complex. He noted that such complexes are very quiet, and generate limited traffic as the occupants don't own automobiles.

Mr. Robert Piatek, MAS Associates, presented a preliminary conceptual drawing of what the assisted living might look like. It would be a two-story building, having 90 units, and 94,000 sq. ft. The building would be pulled back from the abutting residential and a 75' buffer would be provided on the north and east. The building would take on the character of a larger residential building. The 75' buffer would maintain the existing large trees and be supplemented with "buffer zone A" requirements of the ordinance.

Chairman Colley stated that he felt this was one of the best uses that could be put next to a residential development because of the extremely low-key and quiet environment that such developments have. The only issue for him is obscuring its view. He felt there should be specific language in the PUD Agreement that clearly indicates the protection of the residents to the north and east. He also felt the assisted living building was a good transition building for what was proposed to the south.

Commissioner Mortensen asked if the Township notified people within 300' of this development?

Mr. Archinal answered "Yes" they had been notified. In fact, he was surprised that nobody was in attendance as he had a few phone calls about the project.

Commissioner Mortensen conceded that he was willing to "fold his tent" on his objections to the assisted living, as long as there is significant protection from its view for nearby residents.

Commissioner McCririe stated he felt that could be achieved. He felt the complex would be a real asset to the community.

The Commissioners agreed that the buffer on the north and east sides should be 75' wide and landscaping requirements should be "buffer zone A" from the ordinance, on a 6-8' high sculptured berm interspersed amongst the existing trees. The petitioner agreed to this.

It was noted that the assisted living building parking lot is on the opposite side of the building from the neighboring residential. Lighting should not be a factor.

Mr. Purdy suggested the sample assisted living elevation drawing become part of the PUD plan as an example.

While Commissioner Mortensen conceded his objections to the building height for the ambulatory facility, it was noted that the height of the assisted living complex needed to meet ordinance requirements.

Commissioner Figurski noted that the Impact Assessment needed to address dust control during construction; a list of all hazardous materials that may be on site needed to be included (PIP Plan); and more traffic information was needed in appendix 4.

Chairman Colley made a call to the public at 9:20 p.m. with no response.

The Commissioners agreed that this should be an approved use designated in the PUD Agreement, and not require a special use. It was noted that a natural features analysis was still needed.

Moved by Pobuda, supported by McCririe to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment for St. Joseph Mercy, dated May 26, 1999, with the following changes:

1. Item D, next to last paragraph: include "**with special attention paid to dust control on the site at all times.**"
2. Page 7, item H: a PIP Plan needs to be attached.
3. Appendix 4: needs additional information on the traffic study.

Motion unanimously carried.

Moved by McCririe, supported by Pobuda to recommend to the Township Board approval of the conceptual PUD plan and agreement for St. Joseph Mercy, with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as modified by motion.
2. The assisted living portion of the development shall be limited to 90 units and an approximately 94,000 sq. ft. building, with a 75' buffer on the north and east sides with landscaping plantings equivalent to buffer zone A as contained in the Township zoning ordinance; and further, a 6-8' sculptured berm shall be constructed interspersed amongst the existing trees on which landscaping shall be planted.
3. All drawings presented this evening shall be attached to and become part of the PUD Agreement as examples.
4. All buildings, with the exception of the ambulatory and office building, fronting Grand River shall meet all conditions of the Township zoning ordinance.
5. The ambulatory and office building facing Grand River shall be allowed the following deviations to height requirements:
 - a. 37' maximum on physicians' offices side
 - b. 42' maximum on surgery side
 - c. the tower maximum will be 46'1" in height
6. The health care center shall be designated as an allowable use for the purposes of this PUD.
7. The petitioner shall provide an updated traffic study at each phase of development, and at such time, if it is the determination by the Township and Livingston County Road Commission a traffic signal is warranted and needed, the developer shall fund the installation of said signal and other traffic mitigation measures.
8. Petitioner shall supply a natural features plan to be included with each individual site plan.
9. A pedestrian circulation plan shall be submitted connecting the various users with each individual site plan.
10. The PUD shall provide for banked parking to be constructed when determined necessary by the Township Manager.
11. Signage within the development shall be limited to 72 sq. ft. in area per phase.
12. PUD Agreement changes shall include:

Section 2.1: Delete "**....or other residential uses.**"

Section 2.4: Revise per the comments in The Strader Group letter of 6/2/99.

Section 3.1: Revise per the comments in The Strader Group letter of 6/2/99.

Section 3.2: Add the words "and approved" to the following "...access points utilizing safety standards established **and approved** by the Township and Livingston County Road Commission."

Article 3: Revise per the comments in The Strader Group letter of 6/2/99.

Section 3.4: Revise per the comments in The Strader Group letter of 6/2/99.

Section 4.2.4: Language should be included that storm water control devices will be designed so as to not need any fencing.

Section 4.3: Delete "...individual lot owners..." and better define maintenance.

Section 5.1: Revise per the comments in The Strader Group letter of 6/2/99.

Section 5.1.1: Change to read "**Pitched roof buildings are required.**"

Sections 6.1 and 6.2: Include language that the developer shall pay REU and connection fees as required by the Township.

Motion unanimously carried.

Moved by McCririe, supported by Joseph, to recommend to the Township Board the approval of the rezoning request for St. Joseph Mercy Health Systems, approximately 75 acres in Section 13, from PRF to Mixed-Use PUD.

Motion unanimously carried.

The meeting was recessed at 9:30 p.m. by Chairman Colley and reconvened at 9:37 p.m. by Vice-Chairman Pobuda.

- 4) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #4...REVIEW OF A SITE PLAN APPLICATION, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT, AND SITE PLAN FOR A PROPOSED 16,272 SQ. FT. CHEMUNG OFFICE CENTER, LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF GRAND RIVER AVENUE, BETWEEN GRAY ROAD AND I-96 EXIT RAMP, PETITIONED BY ADR CONSTRUCTION. (TABLED FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING.)

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

Mr. Bill Colley of BC Architectural Group introduced Mr. Dan Phillion of ADR Construction. Mr. Colley stated a 16,000 sq. ft. leasable building is proposed. It will house multi-tenants. The site slopes from the tree line to the wetlands area. The proposed building is located back far from the wetlands. Thus, a wetlands delineation has not been made. Most of the trees located in the developed area will have to be removed.

Some of the trees are not within the tolerances of grade and will not survive. They will transplant as many trees as possible.

Commissioner McCririe asked Mr. Phillion if he owned lots 2 and 3?

Mr. Phillion answered "Yes" and he is proceeding with acquiring lot #4.

Mr. Colley provided building materials. A red brick building with black shingles is proposed. There will also be white vinyl at the gables. There will be split-faced block at the bottom.

Ms. Champine reviewed The Strader Group letter of 6/23/99. Items #1, 2, and 3 have been addressed. Regarding item #4 (sidewalk), Mr. Colley noted that the property line and curb line are not parallel with Grand River. That is why the paths do not align. After discussion, the Commissioners agreed that the sidewalk was acceptable as proposed.

The detention pond is now a sedimentation basin. Mr. Colley stated that it could be rounded off to have more of a natural design (item #5 in the letter). Regarding item #6 (photometrics), the Commissioners and Mr. Colley agreed that a provision should be made that the petitioner will maintain a .1 ft. candle at the property line.

The loading is acceptable where proposed. Mr. Colley stated all HVAC units will be located in the basement. The Commissioners agreed additional screening would be needed for the transformer and condenser units.

The Commissioners decided that a wetland delineation would be needed (item #8).

Mr. Colley stated no sign detail has been provided as they have no tenants. He envisioned only having a low-profile sign, giving the name of the facility, with the tenants names on the building. He agreed that the sign shall meet the ordinance and match the building materials.

Ms. Talley noted that, in her opinion, the overall concept will work, but some issues need to be "fine tuned". She noted that item G in the Impact Assessment needed to be revised to show that sanitary sewer is available to the site. She noted that the schedule of REU's was included in her letter of May 19, 1999.

Vice-Chairman Pobuda made a call to the public at 10:04 p.m. with no response.

Moved by Figurski, supported by Joseph to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment, dated 4/15/99, for Chemung Office Center, adding:

1. Item E: Proper dust control measures shall be taken by the developer during construction.
2. Item G: Change to indicate that sanitary sewers are available on this site.

3. Item D: A wetland delineation study shall be made.

Motion unanimously carried.

Moved by McCririe, supported by Mortensen to approve the site plan for Chemung Office Center with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as modified by motion.
2. Township engineer review and approval of all plans and specifications.
3. Building materials, as presented, are acceptable and shall become the property of the Township.
4. Petitioner shall transplant any and all trees possible from the disturbed areas of the site to non-disturbed areas of the site.
5. The sedimentation pond shall be designed in as much of a natural manner as possible.
6. Site lighting shall be constructed as to maintain .1 ft. candle at property lines.
7. Petitioner shall provide a wetland delineation prior to submission to the Township Board, which shall be reviewed by the Township engineer.
8. Subject to the approval of the Livingston County Road Commission, Livingston County Health Department and Livingston County Drain Commissioner.
9. Petitioner shall add two arborvitae trees on the west side of the transformer to screen from adjacent property.
10. Any signage on the site shall be a maximum of 4', be of monument-type design, and utilize the same materials as the building.
11. Petitioner is aware and accepts the Township's calculations for REU's equating to approximately \$18,600 for sewer to site, subject to final audit by the Township and Township engineer.

Motion unanimously carried.

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

There was no Planner's Report.

Moved by Figurski, supported by Mortensen to approve the minutes of the June 14, 1999 meeting as written. **Motion unanimously carried.**

Mr. Archinal noted that the Township would be hiring, on a part-time basis for the summer, an EMU student (major in urban regional planning) to audit site plan compliance.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:12 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dia M. Moulton
Recording Secretary