



- Molly Phillips, the DDA Treasurer, gave a really good presentation on the short and long-term finances of the DDA.
- Lastly, the 2022 DDA budget, previously approved by the Township Board, was reviewed for final approval.

George Weber – Township Board of Trustees

- No update.
- The last Trustee meeting was held prior to our special Planning Commission meeting.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, any updates with Building, Engineering or anything else you'd like to share?

Dave Campbell – I did give both the Township Engineer and the Building Official the night off based on our agenda. The Building Official stated that, given the time of year, the number of permit applications are winding down due to weather. Open permit applications are being buttoned up. Things are going relatively smoothly in the Building Department.

### **E. PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA**

**Vice Chairperson Parel opened to Public Discussion of Matters Not on the Agenda.**

Chairperson Parel – This is an opportunity for anyone to come up and speak on anything for which there is no public hearing currently scheduled tonight.

Dave Campbell – There may be some folks who want to discuss the proposed Valvoline project. That project is not on tonight's agenda. It will likely be on the January 10<sup>th</sup> agenda and if so, there will be a public hearing.

This is a public meeting and the public is welcome to discuss any topic that they feel is important.

Chairperson Parel – So there will be an opportunity at the January meeting if people want to discuss the Valvoline project.

Dave Campbell – That would be a formal public hearing and a notice will be in the Oakland Press 15 days prior to the meeting. In addition, every property owner within 300' of the subject property would receive a notice letter. Valvoline is also required to put a sign up in front of their site, notifying the public of a rezoning that's being proposed.

Chairperson Parel – And we received a couple emails on that project.

Dave Campbell – We did. At least two emails were sent to me and Paula, and we forwarded them to the Commissioners.

Chairperson Parel – Will those be read into the notes at the next meeting?

Dave Campbell – Yes, I intend to include those as part of the public hearing on January 10<sup>th</sup>. I would also note that none of our items on the agenda tonight are scheduled for a public hearing. So, if there's any item on the agenda that is of interest to anyone, now would be the opportunity to speak to that item.

There were no comments.

**Vice Chairperson Parel closed Public Discussion of Matters Not on the Agenda.**

**F. TABLED ITEMS**

**REMOVE FROM TABLE TO ACCEPT WITHDRAWAL OF PETITION**

**MOTION** by Weber, seconded by Winkler, to remove Item PCZ21-01, Clover Communities – Conditional Rezoning, from the table.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Weber – And maybe just for the public here tonight, this was a senior living center that was being proposed for Oakley Park. It did not meet our zoning requirements in terms of density. After discussion, the applicant has decided not to move forward.

**ITEM F1. PCZ21-01 – CLOVER COMMUNITIES – CONDITIONAL REZONING**

Clover Communities Commerce LLC of Williamsville, NY is requesting a Conditional Rezoning of two parcels of land consisting of 8.3 acres from TLM (Technology & Light Manufacturing) to TLM within the HRC (Haggerty Road Corridor) Overlay for a new 119-unit senior independent living development located on the south side of Oakley Park Road, between Martin Rd and Haggerty Rd.  
Sidwell No.'s: 17-24-201-008 & 17-24-201-009

**MOTION** by Weber, supported by Rebeck, to accept the withdrawal of the petition, per the request by the applicant, for Item PCZ21-01, Clover Communities – Conditional Rezoning, regarding Sidwell No.'s: 17-24-201-008 & 17-24-201-009

**G. OLD BUSINESS**

None.

**H. SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

None.

**I. NEW BUSINESS:**

**I1. PSP21-15 DREAM DENTAL ADDITION**

Dr. Patrick Qatsha is requesting approval of a site plan for an addition onto the existing dental office located at 9600 Commerce Road. Sidwell No.: 17-11-176-005

David Campbell, Planning Director, gave a review.

Property Owner, Dr. Patrick Qatsha, DDS, Dream Dental Group, 9600 Commerce Road, Commerce Township, MI, was present along with his Project Architect, Tom Jacobs of Lindhout Associates, 10465 Citation Drive, Brighton, MI, and Project Engineer, Mike Powell, PE, of Powell Engineering & Associates LLC, 4700 Cornerstone Drive, White Lake, MI 48383

Dr. Qatsha – Dave covered everything. We came before you previously and it has not changed a whole lot, except that we filled in the spaces. I do want to talk about the sign. I know we talked about bringing it into compliance. This is up to you, obviously. That sign cost a whole lot of money when I put it in. If I take it out, I have to get a whole new sign. Maybe you would consider that I can change it so it does not change, except the time and temperature. No flashing, no messaging, just time and temperature. I wanted to throw that out there to see if that would be an acceptable compromise, instead of ripping the whole thing out. A lot of my patients tell me they use it as a landmark to find the building next to it. That's the only item I wanted to bring up for discussion.

Mike Powell – Thank you very much for having us. Just a couple things. The parking in the rear is really for employee parking. The owner and I did not believe that making them 9.5' wide vs. 10' would be a major issue. I'm a patient of the doctor as well and I've never parked back there myself. There's plenty of parking around the building. For the front entry, there's no problem whatsoever putting in a handicap ramp and access for that spot. It can be signed as well as crosshatched. That would make three handicap accessible spaces there in the parcel. Everything else is very straightforward. All of the storm water issues were taken care of in the first round and we didn't have to add anything. We certainly can answer any questions you may have, but we believe this is a great addition to the Township. Congratulations to Dr. Pat for being as busy as he is.

Chairperson Parel – Yes, congratulations. It's good to see you again.

Dr. Qatsha – I have the architect here too if you have any questions for him.

**Commission Comments:**

McKeever – I don't have any issues with the site plan. I would be fine with making the sign stationary. Time and temperature is fine with me.

Weber – I agree with Bill. I agree with not putting a block wall at the end, and substituting spruce trees for that. That's more appropriate abutting the park. I just want to make sure that the ramp that's being proposed, which is obviously going to cut into the entry drive, isn't going to create access issues with cars.

Mike Powell – Around the front entry. If I was going to do that, because of the type that's there and door opening, I would take the ramp in off the truck side of that sidewalk, then come back in on the sidewalk, instead of going directly in.

Mike Powell approached the overhead and further explained in detail how the walkway would be constructed.

Weber – Okay. I have nothing else.

Chairperson Parel – Have we come to a conclusion on what is the most efficient or proper way to accommodate folks at this site?

Dave Campbell – They met the ADA requirements as far as providing two spaces here, including the van accessible space. Paula and I have a friend who is a patient of Dr.

Qatsha's who has a disability, and finds that with parking here, it's a long distance to get to the front door. She typically parks in one of the parallel spaces, but then to get across here and traverse the curb is a challenge. We can see the issue there and we thought the compromise would be to make an adjustment to the curb. I don't disagree with Mr. Powell's suggestion of having it be further south, but having it more accessible so that if you do park in a parallel space and you take advantage of the crosshatched area, that you have an unobstructed path to get to the front door of the building.

Chairperson Parel – In that scenario, we still have two on the north side of the building?

Dave Campbell – Yes, these two barrier-free spaces remain. You'd just be providing a better means of access for anyone who has a disability and opts to park in a parallel space.

Chairperson Parel – Okay, so it appears we do have a consensus.

Loskill – I think it looks great. I've got one question for your architect. Is this going to be a low-sloped roof, or a flat roof with an angled cornice?

Tom Jacobs – The plan right now is to have it slope backwards in terms of drainage. It will be sloped.

Loskill – My only concern is that this is Michigan. It's going to pile up with snow, rain and ice where you have the reverse slope roof draining into the existing roof. You'd better put a lot of ice and water shield in there to keep that from leaking because that's going to be a big issue at some point in the building's life.

Tom Jacobs – Yes, we will work with the existing roof. The tie-in will be detailed.

Winkler – No additional comments.

Karim – No comments.

Rebeck – I'm fine with everything and I agree that making the sign non-flashing will be fine.

Chairperson Parel – The sidewalk on Commerce Road that's shown in the other rendering, is that existing?

Dave Campbell – Yes.

Chairperson Parel – My question is regarding the parking spots. So we're reducing the size of the spaces by 6"?

Dave Campbell – Not all of them, just the 10 new ones being added.

Chairperson Parel – Okay, I can cross that off my list. George made the comment on the row of spruces in lieu of the 6' masonry wall; I think that's a no-brainer. My questions have been answered about the handicap accessible spots. It doesn't sound

like I'm going to win the fight about the monument sign, but I appreciate you coming to us and making that compromise. I'm excited that you're doing great business in Commerce. We love having you. I drive by that building every day. It's beautiful, and I'm sure with your architect you will continue in a first-class manner putting this together.

Dave Campbell – I would mention in the recommended motion language provided on Page 5, there could be a couple changes. One is with condition #4; alter that to reflect the agreement that the electronic sign will remain but will maintain a static message of time and temperature only. And, potentially add a 5<sup>th</sup> condition to add an ADA accessible ramp in proximity to the south building entrance.

**MOTION** by Rebeck, supported by Loskill, to approve, **with conditions**, Item PSP21-15, Dream Dental Addition, the request by Dr. Patrick Qatsha for site plan approval for an addition onto the existing dental office located at 9600 Commerce Road.

Sidwell No.: 17-11-176-005

Move to approve PSP #21-15, a site plan for an expansion of Dream Dental at 9600 Commerce Road, based on a finding that the proposed building addition and parking lot expansion comply with the applicable standards of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance.

**Site plan approval is based on the following findings by the Planning Commission:**

1. The ten new parking spaces are permitted to be 9.5 ft by 18 ft (where 10 ft x 20 ft is typically required) so long as the curb adjacent to them is 4 inches in height to allow for a 2-foot overhang of a parked vehicle;
2. Six 8-foot spruce trees shall be installed along the north property line in lieu of the 6-foot masonry screen wall required by the buffer yard standards of Sec. 29.04.

**Site plan approval is subject to the following conditions:**

1. Approval of engineered construction plans by the Township Engineer, Township Building Official, and Township Fire Marshal;
2. An executed stormwater maintenance agreement;
3. Administrative review and approval of the exterior parking lot lighting, and particularly the height of the proposed new light poles;
4. The existing monument sign will remain and the display will be set to a static time and weather;
5. An ADA accessible ramp will be installed in proximity to the south building entrance.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**I2. THE UNION – CONCEPT REVIEW**

Robert Cobb of Key West, FL is requesting a conceptual review of a proposed bar/restaurant with outdoor dining located on the vacant NE & SE corners of Union Lake and Farrant.

Sidwell No.'s: 17-01-431-001, 17-01-431-002, 17-01-429-005 & 17-01-429-006

David Campbell, Planning Director, gave a review.

Weber – Dave, the property, -003, just to the west of the two lots that are being proposed; have we determined whether that is a Township owned property, or whether that is owned by the subdivision?

Dave Campbell – My recollection is that we thought it was a Township owned property, because it was coded as such with county assessing; however, upon further evaluation, it was determined that it is actually an out lot for the subdivision.

Chairperson Parel – Does that mean it cannot be developed?

Dave Campbell – It means it's collectively owned by the subdivision.

Chairperson Parel – Could someone put a house on it?

Dave Campbell – If the subdivision, in totality, agreed to sell it. It's not impossible, but I don't see that happening. If it did, I think the sub would have to be re-platted to designate this property as something other than an out lot.

Weber – So, in theory, that's lake access for those in Peninsula Park who do not live on lake.

Dave Campbell – Correct. The property is pretty overgrown and a tough spot to gain access to the lake, but you can see on the aerial that someone has something down there.

Robert Cobb was present along with Engineer, Jim Butler, of PEA Group, 2430 Rochester Court, Ste 100, Troy, MI.

Jim Butler provided handouts to the Commissioners.

Mr. Cobb – I live in Key West, Florida. I originally lived in Michigan. I come back during the summers to see my kids, two of whom are sitting back there, and they're involved with me in this business. I've been in the business for 50 years, going back to 1970. I had a bar near the Wayne State University area, and it was more like a clubhouse for a lot of the students. Then I had some bars on the west coast in San Francisco and the Napa Valley area. Finally, I ended up coming to Florida and I really enjoyed it. The weather was terrific and the opportunities at that time were terrific.

A little over 30 years ago, we bought this bankrupt restaurant and redid it. As time goes on, we keep upgrading it. It's Harpoon Harry's, a family size restaurant. We cater to families and their kids. We're oriented toward people who live right in the immediate area. We like tourists; they're wonderful too, but our base is the people who live in the immediate area. We have very good price points and we always use the best quality products. I've always been a strong believer in that. We've always had good food. We are what I call a "middle-of-the-road" restaurant that caters to everybody. I would love boaters to come in, both by car and by boat, and I'd love for all people in the neighborhood to come in. I think they'll find that our prices are very reasonable.

Jim Butler – Mr. Campbell did a pretty good job giving an overview of the project. We have met with Dave to discuss the project and the mechanisms available to us for development of this piece. It does have some challenges. It is zoned B-1. It is also within the Union Lake Overlay District. One of the mechanisms that Mr. Campbell brought up was the potential of doing a PUD. We think that's probably a good opportunity here to take this project through since it is unique. It has the water, the

frontage on Union Lake Road and Farrant, and the parking that is kind of segregated by Farrant.

We did meet with the Road Commission to review the plan. We did get their feedback. What you see on this plan is what they recommended for improvements for traffic consideration. Obviously the concern of traffic exiting Farrant and going through the subdivision is something we would not need or want.

The other issue we have is with EGLE. The site does contain a regulated wetland. We had a preliminary pre-application meeting with them onsite. We have some steps we have to go through with them, but there is potential for us to get a permit to do this project.

With that, we're here to get your feedback on the project. We're here to take notes and answer questions.

**Commission Comments:**

Chairperson Parel – Thank you, gentlemen. We appreciate you coming out. Dave, anything else before I kick this off?

Dave Campbell – I don't think so. As we often do with a conceptual review, this is an opportunity to give feedback to the prospective petitioner and give them a good sense of whether this is a viable project that they should be pursuing.

Chairperson Parel – It's an informal conversation. Hopefully you'll get some good input tonight.

Winkler – This is quite a unique and interesting project. In looking over the design of the building and things like that, I really have nothing to suggest, other than Dave has made it very clear in his report on the project that there are a lot of challenges associated with this site. He touched on many of them in his report. As long as you're going in with your eyes open, I have nothing to add.

Karim – It is a very interesting project. You're suggesting a small residential unit above the restaurant for your own use?

Mr. Cobb – Yes.

Karim – Well, I just want to be sure this won't change in the future, if it's approved, for residential rental area. If it's approved, it would have to be part of the restaurant somehow, or part of the conditional use for the building.

Chairperson Parel – So, your thought is, we're potentially going to approve a residential unit, but ... Sam, I'm sorry. I'm not clear.

Karim – It's a combination of the restaurant and residential. The residential is above the restaurant. It's different than having the whole building residential.

Chairperson Parel – So your fear is that one day they could try to turn the entire building into residential?

Karim – Yes, and lease units upstairs.



Chairperson Parel – Okay, I agree with this. We want to restrict it in some fashion from becoming an Air B&B or some kind of transient housing.

Karim – Yes.

Rebeck – I think your biggest hurdles here are going to be procedural. I don't think you're going to get a lot of push back from us if you use the right building materials and you follow all of the steps. I think we would love to see more restaurants in the area. Hopefully you guys can do that. Good luck.

McKeever – I'm just remembering back to when the private facility to the south was rehabbed, and the issues that came up during that for a simple, private facility. I foresee an uphill climb with residents in the area. We want to avoid another situation like the one we've had with the existing bar that always seems to be at war with the residents in the neighborhood.

Dave Campbell – As far as that one goes, I think we have a much better operator there now. I don't think we have been hearing the complaints on that facility that we did five years ago. But I certainly understand what the concerns would be based on the history of that location.

You're correct; when this facility next door was converted into a private clubhouse, that was done as a Conditional Rezoning. So there was a Conditional Rezoning agreement between the owner and the Township with restrictions on what can and cannot happen on that property. A lot of those restrictions had to do with protecting the nearby property owners from noise, et cetera. We talked with Mr. Butler and Mr. Cobb about this. Some of those same types of restrictions would probably be warranted for this proposed facility.

Are there any thoughts as to hours of operation? Would that be something that the Planning Commission and the Township Board would want to see addressed as part of a PUD agreement?

McKeever – Weren't there restrictions on the private facility?

Dave Campbell – Yes, on the facility to the south, there were restrictions such as amplified sound and music, live music, fireworks, hours of use and the number of events per year. It makes sense that some of that same logic would apply to what Mr. Cobb is proposing.

McKeever – And it's not that I'm opposed to the concept. Like I said earlier, I've grown up in this area. There was always bar and restaurant activity on the lakes. Just be aware of what you'll be up against.

Dave Campbell – I've heard a lot of good stories about what used to go on in this area.

Chairperson Parel – I think the hours of operation are probably going to be critical. If there's going to be some kind of constraint to your operation, that's probably something we've got to dive further into.

Mr. Cobb – Usually the operation might go as late as 12:00am. Occasionally, and usually it would be on the weekends, and especially during the summer, because it stays light until about 10:00pm. It's conceivable, because then you get people that come in, and if it's a really warm night, they stay longer. If not, they drift on. You see people leaving after 12:00am, unless there's unusual conditions, like it's really nice or hot. I remember one summer in May, it was over 100 degrees five days in a row. From 5:00pm to about 11:00pm, we were busy, but we were never busy in May during those hours. It was unusual but it does happen, and thank goodness because it's hard to get business. Customers are real important. You've got to take care of people.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, we don't know what restrictions as far as hours were placed on the building to the south?

Dave Campbell – I should because there was a time where we had to read them quite frequently. The neighbors would remind us what they were. I'll make sure Mr. Cobb hears that story too. The neighbors are aware of what the restrictions would be. I want to say 1:00am rings a bell. Does that even sound too late?

Paula Lankford – Maybe.

Dave Campbell – It was no amplified sound after 1:00am or something like that. Even then, I think they were only allowed to do it no more than five times per year.

Mr. Cobb – That would be outside.

Dave Campbell – No amplified sound outside.

Weber – I'd love to see this on a different piece of property. I struggle with putting a bar restaurant in that location for a couple of reasons. One, especially putting five boat slips on what is really, I'm sure you know, a very narrow canal. Even if it's a 1:00am or a midnight restriction, you're going to have a lot of loud people on boats that are going to be buzzing back and forth right in front of all the docks of those other property owners. I think having the parking lot on the other side of the street, right in the middle of a residential area, is a concern. We all know, parking lots are noisy outside of bars, and they are noisy well after closing time. That's my experience.

So, putting it in the middle of residential, at the end of a very narrow canal and allowing boat traffic along there is really a show stopper. I think that if this does move forward, this is a very engaged residential area, Peninsular Park, and I think we will have significant feedback from them.

There is a great piece of property right at Wise Road and Union Lake. That's the old Sally's Barn. That is still vacant. I would love to see something like this on that property. However, on this property, I would struggle with putting it here because of the canal and the residential impact.

Mr. Cobb – The canal is actually much wider that you think it is.

Weber – Oh, I'm very familiar with the canal.

Mr. Cobb – When you have a chute that's 70' wide with a 20' boat, you don't have much trouble for people pulling in and out. We're only talking five slips.

Weber – I'm not worried about them navigating in and out. It's as they're coming and going, with a pontoon boat of 20 people. That would be great for business, but we know that the people that are coming there are going to be on pontoons and they're not coming with just two people. Those are my concerns.

Chairperson Parel – George, would a reduction in boat slips help?

Weber – To me, I think it's more of the location of this, and putting the parking lot across the street. Having that in a residential area is something I would struggle with.

Chairperson Parel – I understand that. Dave, I think I read in here; if a PUD was the path that we take to get this done, that would require Township Board approval as well, right?

Dave Campbell – Correct. Any PUD comes the Planning Commission for formal recommendation and goes to the Township Board for approval, and then comes back to the Planning Commission for review of the actual site plan.

Chairperson Parel – I think that's noteworthy because there's a lot of approvals that have to go into this.

Loskill – My only concerns are the setbacks, the wetlands and those issues where you have to deal with EGLE and everybody. I'd like to see a place in this Township that was open after 9:00pm because I sure would like some place to go after these meetings. I think you have a number of hurdles to get through and I'm not going to stand in your way right now.

Chairperson Parel – I have a bunch of comments as usual. Sam made a great comment on the restrictions for rentals. The one thing I would not want to see is a restaurant that has a residential concept up top that's an Air B&B kind of thing where you have people coming in every week, or on a short-term basis.

To George's point, one of the items that is high on my list of concerns is regarding the parking across the street. George pointed out the noise. I also worry about folks walking across the street. Maybe it's too early to get into this question, but I'm wondering about the parking ratio for a restaurant of that size. I don't know if this is even ample parking and if we're going to get into the situation where people will think they can park on the drive there.

Dave Campbell – We have not done a parking analysis yet. Maybe Mr. Butler has looked at that. Part of the reason it would be challenging is that I don't know if we have nailed down the occupancy for the building and the outdoor seating.

Chairperson Parel – I know it's early. I'm just thinking through these things and I think that could be a challenge.

Dave Campbell – You're correct, if parking does prove to be insufficient, now you're inviting people to park along Farrant and that would be another challenge.

Mr. Cobb – On a night that might be busier, would it be possible to arrange with some of our other neighbors to park additional cars on their property through our valet service

and then bring the cars back to them, if we had to accommodate more people? The practical reality is that you're only going to get so many people for this space. The problem would be that if we get to the point where we have people sitting up on the second floor. We're really talking about a 12-week period. After that, it just goes down. I've talked to some of the other people in the area if they would be interested in allowing me to park cars there on a Friday, Saturday and Sunday if we needed them. There seemed to be some people who would be inclined, but I don't know what your answer would be.

Chairperson Parel – I think that's a good solution. That's just my opinion and I'm only one of seven. When I look at nearby properties, the center across the street with Willson's where we go frequently, that parking lot gets pretty full on a Friday or Saturday night. I'm not certain the gentleman who owns the property to the south would be up for that, but it's a possible solution. I don't know how that gets us past the challenge with a potentially loud parking lot on a Friday or Saturday night in the summer when you have residences right around the corner. That's the purpose of this conversation, so it's definitely good to talk about those things.

I'd be curious to see how close the nearest home is. It would also be interesting to see what the buffer zone looks like, which may require us to actually get out there and take a look at it before we make any formal decisions on this.

Dave Campbell – I can take a measurement. The closest home to which element? Parking on the north side or ...

Chairperson Parel – We're pretty close to the parking lot. I really hadn't given much thought to what George said about the parking lot noise level until this meeting. That's pretty close so it's a challenge.

This Harpoon Harry's is the concept that you would open here?

Mr. Cobb – Yes.

Chairperson Parel – I think you're going to have some challenges with the residents and the buffer. You're obviously coming in for a special use here and you need approval. I think the question that we all have to keep in mind is, what's the alternative? You have a right, if you own this property, to develop something with little to no input from us without going into a PUD or Special Land Use, because it is zoned B-1, which allows for a carryout restaurant, or ... Dave, maybe you could talk about what could be done. I'm assuming it's not a two-story building.

Dave Campbell – There are uses permitted by right based on the existing zoning. In the B-1 zoning district, low-intensity uses are permitted, such as a bakery, a flower store, an insurance office or things like that. What is expressly not permitted are bars and restaurants. This would be a deviation from the existing zoning and that's part of why it has been brought up early as a potential PUD. A PUD is an opportunity to deviate from the Zoning Ordinance with the desired outcome being a better project than could have been otherwise achieved.

Chairperson Parel – I think it's an uphill battle. I mirror George's thoughts. I'm not opposed to it. It sounds like we're a little mixed on this, but I do wish it was a different parcel. We have a ton of different challenges with this site.

Dave Campbell – Of all of those challenges that we're discussing, it sounds like a lot of them have come down to noise and traffic, and respecting the adjacent residential. Mr. Cobb knows how to run a restaurant better than any of us do, but my question to the Planning Commission is, would a commitment to restrictions on hours of operation help minimize some of those concerns? Then my question to Mr. Cobb would be, would limiting your potential hours of operation be acceptable?

Mr. Cobb – I would have to think about it.

Chairperson Parel – And you would have to know what those limitations are, if it's 1:00am you might be fine with it. I don't know who determines that.

Dave Campbell – If it were a PUD, then it's a negotiation. You would be entering into a contract with Mr. Cobb. I don't know what that magic number is. If you were to ask me 20 years ago, I would have told you 3:00am. If you ask me now, I'd say 9:30pm.

Chairperson Parel – You're up that late?

Dave Campbell – Sometimes.

McKeever – Only on Planning Commission nights.

Chairperson Parel – I hope we answered some things for you. The intention is that hopefully we can help you move to the next step. Do you have any other questions?

Jim Butler – No, I don't think we have any additional questions. These are not shocking responses. We met with Mr. Campbell and he did tell us about these issues. Obviously we need to come to some resolution and mitigate. Maybe it is a change within the district. It is zoned business and we realize that. The overlay is there. We will have to go back and think about some things and see what we can do to answer a lot of these questions.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, what is the zoning on Matter of Taste?

Dave Campbell – B-2.

Chairperson Parel – Which allows for restaurants, obviously.

Dave Campbell – Correct.

Chairperson Parel – Was it always B-2?

Dave Campbell – I would have to go back and look at the history. I think this area in general has always been zoned as one form of commercial or another. As we talked about in our report, historically this has been a district of bars, restaurants and retail.

Chairperson Parel – George, I know what’s going through your mind. It’s a different animal than Matter of Taste. Residences are not right next door.

Dave Campbell – Mr. Butler, from an engineering standpoint, the concerns that keep coming up are noise. Any thoughts on buffering, whether it’s a wall or another physical impediment, to try to keep the noise contained in the parking lot?

Jim Butler – Yes, we deal with these quite frequently. There are techniques and things that you can do; walls, fences, additional reinforcement of landscaping with variety and different heights, for not only the noise, but for light intrusion.

Chairperson Parel – Taking a quick look at the zoning map, the transition from B-2 to the residential, it looks to me like B-1 was put there for a reason.

Dave Campbell – Zooming out to look at Union Lake and its proximity to Union Lake Road creates a unique situation, particularly here where the lake comes right up to the road. There are some big, nice houses that come up to the lake on one side and Union Lake Road on the other side. But then not too far away is some pretty significant commercial. Union Lake Road has been built up for a long time and it’s a mix of land uses that have been developed there over a long period of time. So, establishing a cohesive network of zoning districts can be challenging when you’ve got those natural features abutting a major commercial thoroughfare.

Jim Butler – The feedback was all good. We’ll go back, think about a few things and do some potential reconfiguration.

Chairperson Parel – We appreciate the interest and I’d love to have you in Commerce. It would be great to make it work.

Mr. Cobb – We would love to be here.

Jim Butler – Thank you so much.

Dave Campbell – One more question. Have you had the opportunity to speak to the owner of the property to the south? When we talk about overflow parking and valet, is that property an opportunity to address some of these concerns?

Mr. Cobb – We have talked with many of the neighbors, them being one. We’ll see what happens.

**13. NW CORNER MAPLE & M-5 (Former Beaumont Property) – CONCEPT REVIEW**  
*This item was withdrawn and was removed from the agenda.*

Dave Campbell – The item was withdrawn at their request. Beaumont, the seller of the property, has multiple potential buyers. One of the buyers wanted to come before you this evening. The way it was explained to me was that Beaumont said, we don’t want you to go public with the proposal until you have the property under contract.

Discussion continued regarding the Beaumont property, other potential proposals for the site, contamination issues, and the fire station which was part of the originally planned hospital. When Beaumont went away, the concept of the fire station went away with it, and since then, the Township is replacing the fire station on Welch Road. Beaumont did wind up agreeing to provide a contribution to the fire station when their property sells. Additionally, Dave Campbell added that this site will be an ideal location for a trailhead for the Michigan Airline Trail.

**J: OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION:**

None.

**K: PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

- **NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: TENTATIVELY MONDAY, JANUARY 10, 2021**
- Sally's Bar was mentioned this evening in the context of Mr. Cobb's proposal. I have a phone call tomorrow with a potential buyer of that property who wants to do a car wash there. We will discuss the zoning.

Mr. Weber – What happened to the concept presented by one of the owners of Kickstands?

Dave Campbell – I remember it well. I have to assume that went away. It was a joint venture between the owners of the private clubhouse and the owner of Kickstands. They were going to build a very cool bar/restaurant at Union Lake and Wise, keeping the existing building with the retro barn look, but then adding a big outdoor seating area. You saw that concept plan at least a year ago. It sounds like they're not pursuing that and now the property is being actively marketed for sale.

You can see on the aerial the challenges we discussed. This is the overflow for Union Lake that comes through the culvert. That was supposed to be replaced in 2021 and the RCOC postponed that to 2022. So, by the way, we're all going to be dealing with the road closure again in 2022. You can see the path where the overflow comes under the parking lot and dumps out into the wetland and creek through here. As you can tell from the condition of the parking lot, this is some pretty mucky, unstable soil. It's a tough site to build on.

We did have a meeting with Mr. Aikens and his potential residential partner for the Five & Main development. The primary purpose of the meeting was to discuss infrastructure, specifically sanitary sewer. When he develops this property, part of what he is obligated to do is abandon this pump station and construct a gravity sewer. It's an expensive endeavor. Mr. Aikens and his engineer, Mr. Butler, discussed interim steps at the meeting with the Township Engineer. They want to get the project started, generate some cash flow, and then do the gravity sewer after they generate that initial cash flow. The engineers are looking at that to determine whether there is enough capacity in the existing gravity sewer along Pontiac Trail to allow Mr. Aikens to get started with the residential component, without building the sewer quite yet.

Discussion took place regarding the sewer obligations for the site. It is both an infrastructure conversation, but also a land use conversation.

Dave Campbell – We had our master plan workshop earlier this evening. You were going to get us some things on these guiding principles. Anything you send to me, please also send to Paula. I get a lot of emails and sometimes I miss things. The last thing I will mention is the Country Hills property on the north side of Wixom Road, west of Glengary. This is a Township owned property that the Planning Commission has discussed. There was a Conditional Rezoning agreement for this property recently, along with the adjacent hammerhead property. Those properties had been rezoned to R-1B back in 2006 but the project never came to fruition. There was a 15-year sunset on the Conditional Rezoning, which expired in 2021. Both the Planning Commission and the Township Board agreed to let those properties revert back to R-1A zoning. Now that the Township is actively listing this property on the market, there is a Letter of Intent from a prospective buyer/developer to acquire this property and develop it under the R-1A zoning. The Township Board is going to be discussing that LOI at their meeting tomorrow evening. If that moves ahead, the Planning Commission can expect to see a site plan for development of that property. That is all I have on my list of things for you tonight, other than to wish everyone safe and Happy Holidays!

Chairperson Parel – Thank you, Dave. The agenda says our next regular meeting is tentatively January 10<sup>th</sup>?

Dave Campbell – Correct, one of the things we hope the Township Board does tomorrow night is approve the meeting calendar for all of our boards and commissions, including the Planning Commission. Assuming they do that, it will no longer be tentative.

**L: ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION** by Rebeck, supported by Karim, to adjourn the meeting at 8:29pm.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

---

Brian Winkler, Secretary