

**FINAL
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF COMMERCE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Monday, March 6, 2023
2009 Township Drive
Commerce Township, Michigan 48390

A. CALL TO ORDER: Vice Chairperson Winkler called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

ROLL CALL: Present: Brian Winkler, Vice Chairperson
Joe Loskill, Secretary
Bill McKeever
George Weber
Sam Karim
Brady Phillips
Absent: Brian Parel, Chairperson (excused)
Also Present: Dave Campbell, Township Planning Director
Paula Lankford, Township Planner
Jason Mayer, Township Engineer, Giffels Webster
Mark Gall, Township Fire Marshal
Debbie Watson, DDA Director

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Loskill, supported by Karim, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda of March 6, 2023, as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Loskill, supported by Phillips, to approve the Planning Commission Regular & Special Meeting Minutes of February 6, 2023, as written.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES

Bill McKeever – Zoning Board of Appeals

- Nothing to report.

George Weber – Township Board of Trustees

- I was out of town for the last meeting, but I did get a debrief.
- Maria Kaufman resigned from the Board of Review as she had some conflicts. We appointed Jamie Lieberman to a partial term, ending 12/31/24.
- Of note for this group, the Farrant properties were rezoned to R-1D from Business 1. Everybody saw the plans for that, and I assume we will see the site plan shortly.
- We voted to approve the use of some of our Tri-Party monies to repave the section of Loop Road off 14 Mile Road in front of the two hotels. Anybody who has driven to Costco or those businesses knows what a disaster that is. That will be repaved this Spring.
- Finally, Larry Gray, the Township Supervisor, along with Rick Sovel and myself had a Town Hall meeting with the Lower Straits Lake homeowners. We had our first round of presentations for weed control services for Lower Straits Lake.

Tuesday we expect to have presentations from the finalists and we will make a decision after that.

Brian Winkler – Downtown Development Authority

- The following is a summary of the February 21, 2023, DDA meeting.
- This meeting was the shortest DDA meeting on record, lasting all of 14 minutes, which has something to say about the organizational skills of the Executive Director.
- Insite Commercial Report:
 - Parcel B1 – Phase I – Aikens Five & Main: Aikens is close to signing a purchase agreement with an apartment developer for the residential component.
 - Parcel B1 – Phase II – Aikens Five and Main: The extension to purchase the property was extended through October of 2025. All rights of first refusal have been relinquished as a part of the extension.
 - Parcel C – LaFontaine Automotive Group: We will be holding a public hearing on the PUD for this property tonight.
 - Randy Thomas expects increased activity on the remaining parcels in the DDA area through October.
- Finance Committee: The DDA Board approved a motion to request a \$1.5 million advance from the Township Board to meet April debt payments.

E. PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

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

No comments.

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

F. TABLED ITEMS

None.

G. OLD BUSINESS

None.

H. SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

ITEM H1. PZ23-01 – COVE AT BENSTEIN CROSSING – CONDITIONAL REZONING – PUBLIC HEARING

MM Benstein LLC of Farmington Hills, MI is requesting a Conditional Rezoning of a 4.3-acre parcel of land from R-1B (One Family Residential) to R-2 (Attached Residential) located at 1420 Benstein Road. 18 attached condominium units in 9 duplex buildings are proposed. Sidwell No.: 17-28-476-002

David Campbell, Planning Director, gave a review of the Planning Department's report.

Mark Kassab, Senior Vice President, MM Benstein LLC, MJC Land Development LLC, M. Shapiro Real Estate Group, 31550 Northwestern Highway, Ste 200, Farmington Hills, MI, was present to address the request.

Mark Kassab – As Dave stated, we are the developer of Benstein Crossing to the south and to the east. Twenty-three years ago when I started with the company, that was my first acquisition of land. For those of you who recall, there were some very unsightly radio towers there. We developed the site. Dave, can you show the aerial of that location? (Dave brought up the aerial on the overhead display.)

We held off from building directly to the east in the center of that parcel with the assumption that we could acquire it. I met with the Turner's 20+ years ago. I believe they were the original owners who built the home. They were a lovely older couple. Both are recently deceased, and now the trust, the family, is selling the home to us with the land. We held that duplex off with the thought process of tying into the development to avoid an additional curb cut to the property. They certainly weren't ready to sell at that point in time, but we stayed in touch with the family.

Now the property is under contract. For those of you who know the area, there's a home and a silo on the property. The silo does have asbestos which will be removed properly with remediation. Essentially the property pitches to the east, so we can't get too creative on where the pond goes. It is going to go on the northeast portion of the property. This pond is sized for two 100-year storms back to back. That's also confirmed with the drain commission which we have to work with going forward.

We are proposing 18 units, which range from 1,450 to 1,950 square feet, with a loft option. It's very similar to the developments to the south and to the east that we developed. You can customize your own unit. We would have certain units as we go along so you're not getting that monotony of the same type of building over and over again. Assuming we get beyond the Planning Commission and the Township Board, and back to the Planning Commission, we will show the building materials.

We also agree to have the garages EV ready. We are going to be tying in the taper lanes. We will be restricting rentals within the HOA. As known by the associations to the north, to the east, and to the south, once the developer is out, these go to an HOA. The HOA then basically governs that. Within our master deed, we are going to restrict rentals. The Conditional Rezoning agreement will also avoid unsightly materials. We are committed not to use horizontal vinyl siding.

We did a trip generation report. If you develop this site as single-family, you'd generate about 176 trips. The engineers could speak more to how that is figured. With me also tonight, I have Eric Williams with Stonefield Engineering, our engineer for the site. As to the daily trips, that's based on 15 single-family homes which is less density than we're proposing. Again, 15 single-family homes would generate approximately 176 trips per day. With 18 duplexes, you would generate approximately 87 trips per day, so it's less per day from a traffic standpoint. And anyone who qualifies with cash, credit or a mortgage, can live in these units.

I know we're not on site plan review, but with landscaping, we've agreed to upgrade the landscaping requirements along Benstein Road. Certainly, for those of you who know us, if there are any concerns with the neighbors behind us or beside us, and if they want additional screening, we will work with them. I'm happy to answer any questions.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – Does anybody on the Planning Commission have any comments before we open to the public?

Dave Campbell – Since Mr. Kassab mentioned the traffic impact study, the traffic engineer also looked at whether there would be any upgrades warranted for southbound traffic, for inbound left turns; whether there would need to be a southbound

passing flare, or a center left turn lane. The amount of left turns to be generated by this development don't even come close to meeting the Road Commission's warrants for any southbound treatments. That was evaluated and not warranted based on Road Commission standards.

Phillips – I'm curious, what qualifies as a 100-year storm?

Jason Mayer – It depends on the duration, but in 24 hours it's generally around 4.3 inches of rain. The pond is designed to have two back to back 100-year, 24-hour storms.

Phillips – Okay, so it's well-designed or over-designed.

Jason Mayer – Yes, and they'll provide engineering calculations to show the percolation, and they'll have design calculations that meet the standard engineering design.

Dave Campbell – Jason, for the benefit of the neighbors in attendance, can you explain what happens if the pond were to overflow or crest?

Jason Mayer – As Dave mentioned, there is an end section at the southeast corner of the Benstein Commons development that goes into the pond at Benstein Commons. So, if any water were to leave the retention pond on this site, it would go into that storm sewer. It would go into the Benstein Commons detention pond and from what I can tell from the plans, that overflows into Benstein Road and flows north.

Weber – But before we would have to worry about that, it would be 9 inches of rain in a 48-hour period.

Jason Mayer – Yes.

Mark Kassab – That would be a problem. I would add that we have a community in Brighton, at 96 and Grand River, with a similar type of product. We have a few buildings up there right now. We estimate the selling price here to be \$400,000 to \$450,000 per unit. It's challenging because the site is so flat so we won't have any walkouts or daylight basements.

Vice Chairperson Winkler opened the Public Hearing.

Vice Chairperson Winkler discussed ground rules for the public hearing, including limiting comments to 2 minutes, and he asked that speakers refrain from repeating previous comments. In addition, he asked residents to speak clearly into the microphone and state their name and address. Dave Campbell added that this is not intended to be a pep rally, so everyone should be respectful and refrain from cheering or booing. He explained that the public hearing is not meant to be a dialogue between the speaker and the developer, or with the Commissioners. Questions would not necessarily be answered this evening.

Fred Levine, 1394 Gloucester Court, Commerce Township – I'm to the south. First off, in looking at the floor plan, it looks pretty identical to Benstein Crossing, am I correct?

Dave Campbell – This is an example. You talk, we listen. It's not meant to be a dialogue.

Fred Levine – Okay, if it is, I want to thank you because it will only raise our values next door. The other question is, you've talked about the acceleration and deceleration lanes. Being that they are so close to Benstein Crossing, if you add the trips in and out, does that then cause the need for a go-around on the southbound side? Because those two entry points are not going to be all that far from each other. The third thing, is that exterior wood that you're going to use now? Thank you.

Wayne Dasher, 1245 Andover Cir, Commerce Township – I live in Benstein Crossing as well. I've been President there for five years, and on the board for 10. I'm glad that they're bringing a new complex in there. It will help our values. I just have a question on the border trees that Mr. Kassab had mentioned, about working with the neighbors. Our border trees are probably 23 years old now. One of our biggest expenses is replacing the trees as they die. I wonder if there is going to be any more buffering on the north side of our property, the east side of your property, to give us additional trees between the neighbors houses and ours.

Jeff Jones, 1665 Pine Forest Drive, Commerce Township – I'm on the northern part of this property. I'm the President of the HOA. I think most of our questions could be addressed by Mark at some point, so perhaps we can do an ex parte with him after we're done with this meeting. I would like to know where the retention pond is being put in, and with this new development, where does that drain to? We would be concerned about overflow, which is probably not a problem based on two 100-year floodplain events. But if there was too much flow going into the pond, it's part of our property and then going next to the road and down into Wolverine Lake. We hadn't seen the plans yet preliminarily, so we had questions on the setbacks in terms of our property, and also the bordering. Lastly in terms of where the swales and drainage would be located on this new property and how it would affect the topography next to where our association abuts the property line. Those are primarily the questions I had, although I don't want to speak for the rest of my co-owners that are here tonight as well.

Connie Sarver, (no address provided) – I was the third person to move into Benstein Crossing. I have a lot of history with the developer; it is not good. I had a lot of history with the inspectors of this city, which was not good. I'd like to know if Mr. Jay James is here.

Weber – He is not here tonight.

Connie Sarver – All right. Mr. Jay James claimed that my property was clearly drained properly. It was not. It cost thousands of dollars to our community after MJC moved on, and we had to pay for it because the drainage was not proper. And when Mr. James ... I have letters, I have all kinds of information, Freedom of Information Acts, even to the point where MJC was leaving our community without the [inaudible] grade on our property. That would have left us to have to put the final coating on our property at our

cost. I have a lot of problems and a lot of questions before you agree to do business with this company.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – Ma'am, I didn't get your name or address.

Connie Sarver – It's private.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – Would anybody else like to speak regarding this project?

Diane Pieknik, 1627 Nottingham Court, Commerce Township – I don't know much about the building except that I want to thank you for the sidewalks, but they go absolutely nowhere. They're pointless. They're kind of stupid to even put in. I can't walk down the sidewalk to the park that's near us, past Wolverine Lake, and I can't walk to the walkway that the city put in for us to walk on. The sidewalks are stupid. All it does is cost our association money to go ahead and plow them when the snow comes. That's all I'd like to add. I don't know why the Planning Commission feels that new developers have to put in sidewalks. They're dumb.

Loskill – One thing, if we could keep comments to the project being talked about today and not previous problems that you may or may not have had with developers or the Township. We're here to talk about this issue here tonight.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – Thank you, Joe.

Linda Zawrotny, 1749 Pine Forest Drive, Commerce Township – I live in Benstein Commons. I live on the south side; the back would be towards that land. I think I heard some mention of possibly landscaping or screening for that. Is that in the plan? Also, approximately how long would the development take from beginning to end?

Loskill – I think they're currently looking at a 4-year plan.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – Would anyone else like to-

Connie Sarver – Is there going to be a berm?

Loskill – Please come up to the microphone.

Connie Sarver approached the podium again.

Weber – I'm sorry, ma'am? We are going to need your name and address.

Connie Sarver – Is there going to be a berm of privacy between Andover and the project?

Loskill – Can we get your name and address, please?

Connie Sarver – Why is that important? Can I have your name and address? Your home address!

Loskill – Yes, my name is Joe Loskill, I live at 5970 Strawberry Circle.

Connie Sarver – I told you in the beginning. Apparently you didn't catch it, but my name is Mrs. Sarver.

Loskill – Fine. And your address?

Connie Sarver – You don't need it. It's private. If you want it, later, I'll give it to you. But this company is not responsible for building, and mainly the problem are your inspectors. They don't get out of their trucks and go in and inspect. They had Derek come out and the inspector signs the paper. Never gets out of the truck. And when you have a city that's run like that, and you depend on MJC, which built these apartments that have caught on fire behind your building here ... I mean, this isn't a quality builder. I want to know if there's going to be a berm between our property and theirs.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – The site will be landscaped according to the Commerce Township-

Connie Sarver – Landscaped? Will any of the water from their building come into our property? He's sitting right here.

Weber – Ma'am, we've addressed the water flow. I'm assuming you heard the discussion that we just had-

Connie Sarver – And we've had to repair all of the water flow that they have built in our subdivision. We've had to repair it at thousands and thousands of dollars.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – Ma'am, you said that before.

Connie Sarver – Okay, you're not listening. We expected that.

Adam Pieknik, 1627 Nottingham Court, Commerce Township – I heard in the proposal that they're going to knock down the landmark that I advise people where to turn into my property. I was wondering, since you have a Commons, and a Cove, and a Crossing – any possibility of signage indicating which is which? Just a thought.

Loskill – That would be up to the developers.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – Is there anybody else who would like to speak on this matter?

No comments.

Vice Chairperson Winkler closed the Public Hearing as there were no additional comments or questions.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – I would like to invite the petitioner to come up and address any comments that were mentioned if you'd like.

Mark Kassab –

- I'll take the last one. I think there is a sign up for Benstein Crossings. This one will have a sign as well, but I can't speak to the development to the north.
- As for timing of the development, within the Conditional Rezoning agreement, it is 4 years. However, this is a relatively small development so it should be much sooner than that. But, with market conditions and everything that we've seen with material shortages and so-forth, we think 4 years is the time frame.
- A little bit about the developer; MJC is the 8th largest condo builder in the country. Have they done things that probably could have been done better? We all have. But they will always work with the HOAs and homeowners to make it right.
- There was a question regarding the bypass lane to the south. We had a traffic engineer that I spoke with, and I believe Mr. Campbell spoke with. We said that we want to be a good developer and do a bypass heading southbound. She said we could propose a 4-lane road, but that doesn't mean the Road Commission is going to accept it. They have something called warrants, and they take into consideration our development and all the traffic within the area, and this does not meet the warrant requirements for the Road Commission.
- A full landscape plan will be submitted to the Planning Commission for review upon approval by the Township Board. Tree maintenance; I can sympathize with the Board. Typically, when a developer leaves, the HOAs take over and they don't maintain the trees with spraying, pruning, deep root injections, et cetera. We would look to screen as much as possible between the south, the east and to the north, certainly within Township requirements, but again we have as much at stake as the folks surrounding us.
- Sidewalks; I live in a community on the east side, and sitting on commissions in the past, we all had the same theory that these sidewalks go nowhere. The reality is that every spot you put in will get filled eventually, and eventually hopefully the Township sidewalk plan will fill in these gaps. You have to start somewhere. I'm a firm believer that sidewalks are critical for seniors, students and children. It is connected to the south, and it will connect to the north and hopefully beyond that.
- We spoke about the drainage.
- I appreciate both HOA presidents being here representing your communities as well.

Connie Sarver – Any berm?

Weber – Could you go over a little bit of the screening?

Mark Kassab – Dave, can you bring up the site plan and zoom into the setback requirements? That's from the property line, the dark dashed lines to the south, and that's to the side of the buildings, it's a 30-foot setback. Now certainly, the buildings are on the south of that property line as well, and to the east of that. We would look to landscape it. Unfortunately, from a berm standpoint, we can't accomplish much with the grade requirements set. From a grading and planting standpoint, if you look at what we did at Benstein Crossings, we could screen pretty heavily around these developments to eliminate visibility from deck to deck. To position these properly, it's my experience to meet with the HOAs once the units are built and agree on where we are going to plant them, with the Township involved in that. Certainly, there will be a landscape plan that's

approved, and meeting the requirements of the Township, and we're well-known in many communities for exceeding the landscape plan.

Connie Sarver – Is any of that going to drain into our property?

Vice Chairperson Winkler – Ma'am, the public hearing is over.

Connie Sarver – I'm asking him. He's the builder. He's the representative.

Loskill – It has been mentioned that they're planning a detention pond to handle two 100-year storms-

Connie Sarver – That's for the other side of it. I'm talking about the property that adjoins our property.

Mark Kassab – If I may, Mr. Chairman. If you'd like me to respond, I think I can help. It's our requirement to drain our property within our property when the site is engineered, final engineering with our engineers and the Township engineers. A berm would cause water to go from the grade of the berm toward the other side of the property. To avoid that, all of this water would go into our pond, and not into the adjacent properties unless there were two 100-year storms, which equates to 8.5 inches or so.

Dave Campbell – It's a Township requirement that they contain their storm water on their site. That's why you've got a retention pond that has been preliminarily engineered to contain two consecutive 100-year storms.

Connie Sarver – And they're going to water with city water?

Dave Campbell – Ma'am, it doesn't make for a productive meeting when we have folks shouting from the audience. We had a public hearing. You had two opportunities to talk-

Connie Sarver – But he has brought up other questions.

Dave Campbell – Understood.

Connie Sarver – Is it going to be city water?

Vice Chairperson Winkler – Thank you very much.

Mark Kassab – Thank you.

Commission Comments:

McKeever – I have no comments.

Weber – As Mr. Kassab knows, I originally had some concerns with the development. I do go and walk the property. I did go and look at the silo, which is not safe. I went inside and as much as it pains me ... I do agree, especially with the storms that we've been having, it's not long for this world unfortunately, and the fact that it contains asbestos. The foundation is probably the best thing on it. Everything above the foundation is the

problem. I do support what you're doing. I am familiar with the work that your firm does and I do think they are quality builders.

Loskill – I think this is the best use for this property. It completes what was anticipated on the original design of the surrounding properties. I have no issues with it.

Karim – I just have one comment about sidewalks. Sidewalks are necessary. In this area, maybe it's not going to connect anywhere, but when the rest of the area is developed, and the rest of the properties, some sort of connections will be made somewhere. You have to have them right now.

Unidentified Speaker – You haven't driven down Benstein then.

Phillips – No comments. I'm fine with the proposal.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – My comment regarding this is that it's a good fit for what's around this property, and compared to its current zoning which is single-family residential. I also have a feeling that this particular petitioner is going to be a good neighbor and they're going to make sure that the project is built the way it needs to be built, and drains the way it needs to drain. I have faith in both the Planning Department as well as the Building Department that whatever regulations and ordinances apply to the site will be enforced.

MOTION by Loskill, supported by McKeever, **to recommend approval, with conditions,** to the Commerce Township Board of Trustees, of Item PZ23-01, Cove at Benstein Crossing, Conditional Rezoning, the request by MM Benstein LLC of Farmington Hills, MI for a Conditional Rezoning of a 4.3-acre parcel of land from R-1B (One Family Residential) to R-2 (Attached Residential) located at 1420 Benstein Road. 18 attached condominium units in 9 duplex buildings are proposed.

Sidwell No.: 17-28-476-002

Move to recommend the Township Board approve PCZ#23-01, a Conditional Rezoning petition by MM Benstein LLC for The Cove at Benstein Crossing, an attached residential development of 9 duplex buildings for a total of 18 condominium units upon the property at 1420 Benstein Road.

The property would be conditionally rezoned from R-1B (One Family Residential) to R-2 (Attached Residential). The Planning Commission's recommendation is based on a finding that the conditional rezoning petition meets the applicable criteria within Articles 3 and 36 of the Township's Zoning Ordinance, meets the intent of the Commerce Township Master Plan, and will achieve consistency with the duplex condominium developments surrounding it.

The Planning Commission offers their recommendation with the expectation that the project will return to the Planning Commission for consideration of approval of a site plan that demonstrates compliance with all applicable standards of the Zoning Ordinance, and with the approved conditional rezoning plan.

This recommendation of approval is conditional upon the following:

1. The applicant enter into a Conditional Rezoning Agreement with conditions volunteered by the applicant and acceptable to the Planning Commission and Township Board, and the executed Conditional Rezoning Agreement be recorded with the Oakland County Register of Deeds prior to any formal consideration by the

Planning Commission of the site plan.

2. The applicant shall apply for approval by the Planning Commission of a site plan consistent with the terms of the Conditional Rezoning Agreement subsequent to approval and recording of the Agreement.
3. The public road improvements called for in the Conditional Rezoning Agreement and shown on the Conditional Rezoning Plan be reviewed and approved by the Road Commission for Oakland County. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Vice Chairperson Winkler – I'd like to thank the public for your comments regarding this project, and thank you for taking the time.

Dave Campbell – And just so everybody understands the prospective schedule; if the petitioner is agreeable, this could move ahead to the Township Board at their meeting a week from tomorrow night, on March 14th, for approval of the Conditional Rezoning Plan. If that were to happen, then the petitioner would come back to the Planning Commission with a fully developed site plan.

We heard a lot of questions about the landscaping, so a lot of those questions would be answered on that fully developed site plan, and that could happen as soon as the Planning Commission's meeting on April 3rd. Just keep those dates in mind if you want to track this project. It would not be another formal public hearing, but with any meeting, there is an open Call to the Public at the beginning of the meeting, both at the Township Board level and then at the Planning Commission. If anyone wanted to comment further, that would be the opportunity.

ITEM H2. PPU22-01 – LAG DEVELOPMENT – PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT – PUBLIC HEARING

LAG Development of Hartland, MI is requesting approval for a proposed PUD (Planned Unit Development) for a dual-branded automobile dealership (Hyundai and Genesis) to be located on the northwest corner of Pontiac Trail and Haggerty Road on Unit 3 of the Commerce Towne Place site condominium. Sidwell No.: 17-24-401-056

David Campbell, Planning Director, gave a review of the Planning Department's report.

The applicants, Elizabeth Marchese and Gary Laundroche of LAG (Lafontaine Automotive Group) Development, LAG Commerce Township, LLC, 9990 East Highland Road, Hartland, MI, were present to address the request.

Gary Laundroche – Dave pretty much covered the features. We are excited to be able to come in here and contribute to the gateway into this community with a really unique automotive experience. Really, the buildings are the features here. These are prototypical buildings, but they're representative of what the materials are and what the look is.

Genesis, which is the more prominent visual from the corner, was designed to have a very contemporary look. It's all glass and it's like a floating roof with the columns hidden on the inside. They do have the ACM material which is pretty standard and specified these days.

Hyundai's image design calls for a lot of EIFS. We're aware that EIFS is not a favorable material, so what we have proposed is a two-toned burnished block system. If you don't know what burnished block is, think about grinding the surface of that down and

exposing the aggregate. It's integrally died brick. It has a high-end finished look to it. It's like taking a concrete floor and polishing it to the point where it looks like terrazzo. Because it is integrally colored, and it's not a surface coating, it doesn't fade or chip, and it doesn't need repainting. It's not a long-term maintenance item, so it holds up that look and it's really pretty desirable. We've had success in getting Hyundai corporate to approve this material in communities where they don't like EIFS. You guys aren't the only ones that don't favor EIFS.

From a visual standpoint, what glimpses of the front of the building that you're going to see won't really contain any of the block material. That's more in the back and not exposed so much to public view. This was designed with these buildings being the foremost attention. We wanted to request four display pods to show the brand of vehicle that we do have here.

To Mr. Weber's earlier concern, we've done a pretty good job of moving the overhead doors back. We've maintained single lane service receptions for only a single door. They are not represented really well as full glass doors, but that's what they are. They don't quite look like that on this rendering, but the front doors are full glass doors. The one on Hyundai is off to the north and hard to even see. Those are showing glass slats, but those are full glass.

Through the angle of the overhead door on the Genesis building, you really don't have a direct line of sight for that. It's less than desirable for a service customer who would typically pull straight into the service lane, so we have to address that with directional signage.

We've done some pretty extensive landscaping, and of course, what we've shown as the "Welcome to Commerce" knee wall is just representative. We're open to whatever you'd like to see, whether you want backlighting on there, or whatever else. We've tried to be sensitive to our surroundings and to this community, knowing the typical concerns people have with car dealers.

Our lighting has been designed to be full cut-off LED fixtures. There is a delicate balance between light pole height and the number of poles you have. If the poles are too low, then you end up looking like you're selling light poles because there are so many on the site to try to get even light distribution. We've picked a moderately low height so there's not a ton of light poles in there. What we're doing, which is really cool with these LED fixtures, is that we have the ability to utilize the control systems they make for these. Our objective here is to turn these lights off in the evening in the back lot. They would be on a motion sensor with a timer as a deterrent. We find that police departments really like this feature because when they drive by and the parking lot is dark, everything is good. If they see a light on in the back, there's somebody back there who shouldn't be. We also have the ability to still maintain security and safety, and yet still dim the lights that remain on in the public areas along the front.

It's going to be a challenge for us to be so limited with access, to say the least. We're really hoping to be able to utilize the Walnut Lake intersection and the Walmart driveway. Ideally for us would be to be able to have some kind of an entrance or directional sign on that. There will be some confusion for people when they're not able to turn left into the site. We're conscious of that and looking for a resolution to that as well.

We are also going to have EV charging stations located on the north and south of these buildings that will be public facing. There is a whole network of applications that people have on their phones where they can find the location for EV chargers. It's a common feature.

Genesis as a company has set a goal to be fully electric by 2025. So, the small Genesis service garage only has 3 bays in it and all are electric vehicle bays. The couple internal combustion service calls that we take for Genesis will be done in the building to the north.

Hyundai has 13 service bays. Hyundai Motors has a lot of electric vehicles that they are bringing on the market as well, and they're doing very well. We will have to have a minimum of one dedicated for electric vehicles, and that means two bays because one is a flat stall. The batteries in these are fully underneath the car, so they have to be brought in with a forklift and have maneuverability. Plus, there's an alignment rack in there. There are really about 10 bays in there. We're not going to do any long-term service repairs there, or major work, because it would tie it up, but we do want to be able to do a lot of diagnostic and service work for the electric vehicles that come in. I think as you all know, we also plan on doing a proposed renovation and remodel to the Dick Morris location to the south of us. That's really where we're going to do most of our service work, and that's where we're also going to premier our pre-owned vehicles. With the limited display we will have here, it's really sort of a destination. A lot of the customers that are buying are coming in, even from out of state. These are customers that are shopping online, they're pre-sales, and we actually do a lot of deliveries too. I have Elizabeth with me tonight and we can answer any questions you might have.

Dave Campbell – Can you speak a little bit more to Dick Morris and how that gets sequenced with this? If this project were approved for this corner, what happens with the Dick Morris property from a timeline standpoint?

Gary Laundroche – As soon as we figure out what we're doing here and we get approval, we'll probably bring that one in to you next. We'd like to do it almost simultaneously with this, because it is going to coexist with these facilities being that these are predominantly new cars and EV. Car dealers always have a pretty strong used car presence. It's a big part of this business. You all know with the chip shortage and what had gone on here in the last 18 months, used cars were everything and that's where all the money was being made. It's still a strong part of the business. So, we're going to need the Dick Morris location to help bolster both of these facilities, and also to be able to control that used car inventory. There certainly isn't display room for vehicles here for used cars. Of course we are proposing to bring the Dick Morris site up to current standards as well. It needs the sidewalk across there and it needs landscaping. Our plan will be to pretty much tear off the entire front of that building. The only thing we would utilize out of that is the service garage, which we just put a new roof on. It isn't going to necessarily be branded either Genesis or Hyundai. We want it to be current and we're pretty flexible with the materials that we use on that one by not tying it to a brand.

Vice Chairperson Winkler opened the Public Hearing.

Fred Levine, 1394 Gloucester Court, Commerce Township – Being that the lot is not all that big, where are you going to put your vehicle stock?

Gary Laundroche – There is some in the back.

Fred Levine – Is that enough for you?

Gary Laundroche – Yes. There's not a lot of Genesis models yet, but we are utilizing what we can in the back of the site.

Fred Levine – If I remember, you're talking about coming in from the Walmart entrance too. I don't think you can make a left turn into that entrance off Pontiac Trail. You've got to turn in much further to the west. If people don't know that, they're going to get goofed up.

Gary Laundroche – Well, we will be giving as much direction as we can.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – Thank you for your comment.

Ray Golota, 1595 Vanstone Drive, Commerce Township – I'm no Road Commission guy whatsoever, but I know when I go south on Haggerty and make a right turn on Pontiac Trail, to get into the Walmart parking lot, to me that's just a long runway. I'm surprised that would be the only entranceway off Pontiac Trail going west to get into Lafontaine. I'm speaking as a consumer; if I'm going to go there, and I'm coming west on Pontiac Trail, I'll be scratching my head. Why would I have to go in, as this gentleman just said, that long runway at Pontiac Trail and Walnut Lake Road? Then you've got to go through all of the Walmart parking lot.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – Thank you for your comments. Would anybody else like to speak?

No comments.

Vice Chairperson Winkler closed the Public Hearing as there were no additional comments or questions.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – Does the petitioner have any additional input regarding the comments from the public?

Gary Laundroche – We recognize that is going to be a bit of a challenge, but we're pretty used to having to give a lot of direction to customers as well, in advertisements, TV spots, direct mailers, or whatever the case. We're just going to have to work really hard to make sure we can direct people into the site as best we can.

Dave Campbell – I don't know if this gives any insight into Mr. Golota's question. If you were westbound on Pontiac Trail, I think that was your scenario, you could also make a right turn on Haggerty. You can still make an inbound left turn at this northerly driveway. It's somewhat counterintuitive because you have to go past the site and come back, but there is direct access via Haggerty, even if you wanted to make a left turn in.

Fred Levine – It's like the Dunkin Donuts at Maple. You've got to know how to get in there.

Dave Campbell – It's a great site in terms of visibility, but it has some accessibility challenges. It's a very busy intersection. The other thing I wish I had mentioned, and I'll take this opportunity; as part of their PUD agreement, Lafontaine is offering to pay their

proportionate share to what we hope is a future traffic signal at this intersection of Pontiac Trail and Walnut Lake Road. When the Five & Main project develops, this developer will be responsible for the bulk of that cost, and we're hoping Walmart will participate in that as well. We did have our traffic engineer look into what would Lafontaine's future traffic volumes be that would utilize that intersection. Based on the percentage they came up with, that's the percentage that the PUD agreement would commit Lafontaine to contribute toward that future signal.

In that same neighborhood, along the Walmart property, one of the other benefits in the Lafontaine PUD agreement is that they are offering a pathway connection from their frontage sidewalks along Pontiac Trail and Haggerty, extending along this shared property line between the subject site and Walmart. The intent would be to extend it to that point right there, and then it would be up to the Township, in cooperation with the DDA, to make a connection across this dogear of Walmart's property, hugging along their retaining wall, and hooking up with the pathway network there. Currently, the pathway network dead ends at the back of the Walmart property, and from there, the pathway meanders through the Commerce Towne Place development. There are some really nice walking paths back there.

This connection would likely be done, and this is where I might look to the Township Engineer again. There is an existing sewer pump station here along Haggerty Road that would be abandoned as part of the development of this site, but more so the Five & Main site. The idea is that this pump station would be abandoned and then there would be a gravity sewer that will extend across some portion of Lafontaine's property, across that dogear, all the way across the Five & Main property, and it would empty out into a manhole somewhere along the east side of Martin Parkway and find its way to the new pump station in the Barrington project. The reason that is all relevant to the pathway discussion is if Lafontaine can get the pathway to here, and then we're putting sewer pipe across here, hopefully as part of the restoration for that sewer main, the Township will create a level foundation for a pathway, so that we can connect the pathway from point A to point B. The reason I bring that up is because Lafontaine is committed to that pathway, but I think they're proposing to provide the funding for it and the easements. They don't necessarily want to construct it as part of the construction of their site, because it would be a pathway to nowhere. It would dead end right there, until such time as the Township and the DDA can get the sewer pipe in the ground to get the pathway across this portion. I want the Planning Commission to understand that.

Commission Comments:

Vice Chairperson Winkler – Sam, any comments?

Karim – No comments.

Phillips – No, I'm good.

Loskill – We had some technical issues with the PDFs that were sent out. What material is the façade across the front of the Hyundai dealership?

Gary Laundroche – That's ACM.

Loskill – Are you going to have that screen printed?

Gary Laundroche – It's aluminum composite material so it's stamped aluminum.

Loskill – Is that printed or painted on?

Gary Laundroche – Those are shaped panels that are all connected that way. It's like a giant jigsaw puzzle. Those are individual panel pieces.

Loskill – Okay, interesting. Our elevations didn't show and we didn't get printed copies.

Dave Campbell – This wasn't included?

Weber – There were just a couple of the site plans that for whatever reason, Joe and I had an issue where it locked up our iPads.

Dave Campbell – So the renderings are certainly lovely and they really do help paint a picture. These are the more technical, straight-on elevations that include the mix of building materials up in here. I expected that a lot of the discussion this evening would be about building design, architecture and building materials.

Loskill – My only other question is, on your drawings, you're showing a number of rooftop units that would be visible above the façade. Are you planning on screening those with something?

Gary Laundroche – Yes. Again, keep in mind that this is just representative, it's just their prototype drawings. These aren't construction documents.

Loskill – Understood, but you've got a flat roof and the AC unit is 4-5' tall.

Gary Laundroche – What you're seeing there are screening mechanisms. Those aren't rooftop units. The rooftop units are much smaller than that.

Loskill – I'm going by what was written there on the legend; it just says, "rooftop units". It doesn't say "screening", #12.

Gary Laundroche – Yes, they didn't label that correctly. Those aren't the rooftop units. We could certainly mandate screening of any rooftops if they would be visible from the road. Dave, can you go back to the Genesis elevations? What you're seeing on Genesis is an atrium in the middle of the customer lounge area of the building. That's actually like a clear story of a glass extension that goes up. That has live trees and things inside there. It's a pretty cool feature. That story of glass is raised up above the roofline in the back. It didn't seem to show up well on this elevation either.

Discussion continued between Loskill and Gary Laundroche regarding the glass atrium roof area.

Weber – We will see more once we get to site plan.

Gary Laundroche – You will. We can get actual building elevations and floor plans.

Dave Campbell – Keep in mind, these preliminary renderings and elevations are intended to be exhibits to an agreement, a contract that we will all sign. These are meant to be representative to what we can expect, if and when this project comes back to the Planning Commission for site plan approval.

Gary Laundroche – They certainly are representative.

Dave Campbell – So you don't get to sell us a Genesis and then deliver a Hyundai.

Gary Laundroche – I'm not in the car sales side of the business.

Loskill – I want to see details on the ACM façade. That does not look like fun to construct.

Gary Laundroche – It's very expensive and very specialized.

Weber – I just have a couple questions, and most were already answered. One clarification on the pathway. It's hard for me to tell exactly where that is, but I just want to make sure that you're planning for it so that when we go to build it, we're not going to be tearing up your landscaping or disturbing the site.

Gary Laundroche – There's at least 15-18' on that side there. I think we were talking about an 8' pathway, so there's still room for us to do landscaping. Our plan is to keep the landscaping within the limit so it won't be disturbed.

Weber – Okay, I was thinking about the equipment. Garage doors; what are your thoughts about making them opaque glass? So that even with the visibility that will be there, people won't be looking in and seeing service advisors. Opaque glass might screen some of that.

Gary Laundroche – We've always tried not to do opaque glass for service reception, so that you can see customers pulling up. I think these new style doors, with as many slots as they have, which almost look like louvers, they're not as visual as the full glass panels. I think it will be a lot harder to see in those, especially from a little bit of a distance. And bear in mind that it's just a single car lane.

Weber – Is it a single car lane for both Genesis and Hyundai?

Gary Laundroche – It is single car for both, but the writers aren't sitting in there either. The customer will go into the main building portion to sit with a service writer.

Weber – So the rendering of the Hyundai store showed a couple drive-through doors.

Dave Campbell brought up the renderings on the overhead and noted that the floor plan also shows two.

Weber – The words in the documents spoke to one door, but the renderings showed two.

Gary Laundroche – Well, I think with the 17,000 square foot building, that is going to be the predominant service reception for both of these and we probably need those two lanes. Again, that service reception on the site plan, it's really skewed because it almost faces north and it's not perpendicular to the road.

Weber – I get it, it's just the words in the document I was reading said it was supposed to be a single lane, but when I looked at the drawing, it had two.

Dave Campbell – Which document? I guess I don't remember that either.

Weber – I wrote it down, but it's somewhere in the 150 pages. So, you're saying the intent is that Genesis is a single, and Hyundai is a double?

Gary Laundroche – It is.

Weber – All right. I don't have a problem with it, I was just clarifying. Around the retaining wall, the signage and the pillars holding up the pergola, your renderings show stone. I want to make sure that's your intent.

Gary Laundroche – Absolutely.

Weber – So it's not brick, it's actually stone.

Gary Laundroche – It's stone. We don't have any kind of brand imaging that we have to comply with for those. We thought it should be something that ties in with the welcome wall. Again, we're up for suggestions.

Weber – Stone is what we mention to most developers. When you talk about the flagpole, which I found on Exhibit D, it says your flag is going to be 30' x 60'.

Gary Laundroche – Right. That's big.

Weber – I don't know how I feel about that, but we were talking about dimensions.

Dave Campbell – Are those proportions right? It's supposed to be 3x5 I thought.

Weber – Your standard is a 3x5 or a 4x6 for a house flag. So it's a 60' long flag.

Gary Laundroche – It is. We have one on the Cadillac GMC store in Highland.

Dave Campbell – And as much as we all love the American flag, would this be the only American flag?

Gary Laundroche – It would.

Dave Campbell – At some dealerships, you'll see one attached to every light pole in the whole place.

Weber – We don't have any restrictions on how tall the flagpole can be, do we? I'm assuming that is a really tall flagpole for a 60' flag.

Gary Laundroche – It's 120'.

Dave Campbell – We do have standards with respect to the fall zone. The idea is that if the flag ever fell over, it wouldn't land on anything. As I mentioned before, this is a PUD and there are opportunities for give and take. Quite honestly, if this flagpole were to fall over, it would be their problem to deal with and it would not land on somebody's house.

Weber – It might land across Haggerty Road.

Gary Laundroche – Typically it has to be far enough away from the road so that if it did come down, it would not hit the road.

Loskill – They're not being representative of the height of this flagpole in these renderings. That flagpole looks to be about 30-40', and you're telling me it's going to be 3 to 4 times that size?

Gary Laundroche – Yes, that is certainly not representative.

Loskill – That is going to be awfully massive.

Discussion continued regarding the size of the flag and the height of the flagpole. Loskill had no problems with what was shown on the renderings. He would like to see an accurate representation so the Commissioners know what they're approving.

Dave Campbell – That could be a condition of site plan approval, if and when we get to that point. They would need to bring in true renderings.

Weber – When you build your facilities, does Lafontaine make an attempt to use local trades, such as Commerce Township plumbers, carpenters, electricians, et cetera? Or do you have a builder or general contractor that you use?

Gary Laundroche – We self-perform a lot of our work, and we do work with GC's as well. We always go to local municipalities to see if they have trade lists that we can use. Oftentimes we get unions contacting us. What we're really finding though is that we very well may be publishing these projects on the builder's exchange, so we're going to get quotes from all of the different trades in southeast Michigan, and we have to with construction costs being up 40% right now. We would love to have the local guys have the best qualified numbers for this. That would be ideal for us.

Weber – I would just say, if it is close to a tie ...

Gary Laundroche – We have no problem, and I'm sure some of the local trades probably already have a relationship with us.

Weber – That's all I have.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – How about you, Bill?

McKeever – It has all been covered.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – Regarding the Genesis building, it's beautiful. Regarding the Hyundai building, I wonder if there's any ... As part of the Planning Commission's approval of the PUD, one of the conditions is for you as a petitioner to work out any tweaks to the elevations that would improve the appearance of the building that we'd like to see, prior to preparing your site plan submission. There are basically three things on the Hyundai elevations that I'd like to mention that you could consider.

First, along the south and north elevations of the building, you have that expanse of the burnished block. If there was a way to possibly use the structural base of the building to delineate a change in burnished block to a polished block, or something very compatible color-wise with the burnished block, to simply break up those masses.

Secondly, another suggestion might be to extend that composite aluminum panel along the south elevation; maybe extend that burnished panel back to where that ... There is something missing on that elevation. There is a very faint line which is a change, and maybe bring that aluminum composite panel back to that next jog in the wall. Where it's over the glass, it's cantilevered, but that same plane continues back to the first break in the building. The same holds true on the north elevation where it's visible from Haggerty. Maybe that aluminum composite panel that you have returning above the service doors could be extended back along that lower bay.

The third item would be at the one door on the east elevation; you have the two doors going into the service bay, and then the door to the left is a door into the new car presentation bay. You basically drive cars in there when people are taking delivery.

Gary Laundroche – Yes, that's a delivery bay.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – If it would be possible, budget and timewise, you could extend that glass to encompass where that new car delivery bay is. It would make that northeast corner of the building just a little bit more presentable. All of this comes with the caveat that time is important right now, and if these kinds of changes would delay the process of you getting approval to go ahead with this project. I don't know what you have to do with Hyundai, or what changes have to go back to them for approval, and how long that process would take.

Gary Laundroche – All of these manufacturers have pretty rigid design programs, however, what you're not talking about drastic changes and I think they could complement the building. I think we could talk to them and get direction whether they would consider that or not. We could find that out pretty fast.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – Dave, thinking ahead, I believe if we recommend approval tonight, this is probably going to the Township Board at their meeting next week.

Dave Campbell – If you choose to take action tonight, that action would be to make a formal recommendation. And yes, if you make a formal recommendation tonight, then the tentative schedule is to get it to the Township Board next week, Tuesday.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – And then we would see site plan probably in April?

Dave Campbell – I might look to the petitioner to see how close they think they are to getting this back in front of us and if April 3rd is achievable.

Gary Laundroche – The April 3rd meeting? So you'd have to have it pretty quick, in a couple weeks.

Dave Campbell – Yes.

Weber – The Thursday before.

Dave Campbell – Well, the agenda packet would go out the Thursday before, but leading up to that, we need to write letters, Jason's team needs to look at it, and the landscape architect needs to look at it. It would be a fairly quick turnaround.

Gary Laundroche – I think our engineers could be pretty close on the site plan. We would not have to have full engineering done at that stage. I'm a little more worried about the architectural drawings. Could the PUD approval include the condition to be able to continue review of the building elevations?

Dave Campbell – I think that's what Mr. Winkler is recommending. In our review letter from the Planning Department, we provide recommended motion language and we try to touch upon that, the intent would be that they would take action tonight on the condition that you would come back with a site plan that includes elevations that reflect some of these suggestions that you're hearing this evening.

Gary Laundroche – Yes, and really more defined plans. That's what we need. I just don't know if we're going to get the guys to turn them around in a couple weeks.

Dave Campbell – I'm looking toward Deb Watson, DDA Director. Is it fair to ask, from a timeline perspective, if in an effort to get this right, it would be a May Planning Commission?

Debbie Watson – I think we're fine with that. We've already gone past the date we were hoping to close, so I don't think another month would make a difference at this point.

Gary Laundroche – I think that's much more realistic for us.

Debbie Watson – Yes, and I appreciate the way that you have both worked so well with all of the suggestions that have been made. I think you've had a lot of layers of bureaucracy to work through, and you've done it with grace. You've done well, and if you want to pursue those changes, I would rather see it wait another month and be done right, as you've said.

Dave Campbell – Without layers of bureaucracy, I'd be unemployed. So we would be talking about the May 1st meeting.

Vice Chairperson Winkler – Dave, it's not my intention to throw a wrench into the machinery.

Gary Laundroche – Well, this is the opportunity to do that and I know this is an exhibit to the PUD. I'd really like this to be what you'd like to see. We'd like to do all that we can with the manufacturer.

Gary Laundroche approached the overhead screen and reiterated the suggested changes on the renderings. Vice Chairperson Winkler noted that the glass, to the far left of the elevation, would continue where the overhead door is and about halfway down, up to where the new car delivery bay is. Gary indicated that there are two offices there as well, and he thought glass could be done on that whole side. Weber added that the two small windows are the two offices. He explained that the offices could remain somewhat screened, and basically the entire new vehicle delivery bay would be all glass. Vice Chairperson Winkler agreed, and added that these are simply suggestions.

Dave Campbell – Mr. Laundroche, we have two members of our Planning Commission who are in the architectural field, so if this is something where we want to sit down and make sure we're all on the same page with this before you go back to Hyundai to propose the changes, we would be happy to schedule something like that.

Gary Laundroche – I'm clear.

Dave Campbell – Okay, and for what it's worth, some of these comments come from our Planning Commission Chairperson, Mr. Parel, who wasn't able to be here this evening. He met with Mr. Winkler and myself in anticipation of this meeting and we discussed some of these changes, so they are indicative of what he was hoping for as well.

Gary Laundroche – What I'd like to do, if you'd consider it, is I'd like to work on getting some of these elevation changes done and back to you guys for comment before we submit the site plan for the May 1st meeting.

Dave Campbell – Even better.

MOTION by Weber, supported by Loskill, **to recommend approval, with conditions,** to the Commerce Township Board of Trustees, of Item PPU22-01, LAG Development, Planned Unit Development, the request by LAG Development of Hartland, MI, for a proposed PUD (Planned Unit Development) for a dual-branded automobile dealership (Hyundai and Genesis) to be located on the northwest corner of Pontiac Trail and Haggerty Road on Unit 3 of the Commerce Towne Place site condominium.

Sidwell No.: 17-24-401-056

Move to recommend approval of PPU#22-01, a PUD application from LAG Development for Lafontaine Hyundai-Genesis, a dual-branded new & pre-owned vehicle dealership consisting of two sales & service buildings and an outdoor vehicle inventory display lot located on the northwest corner of Pontiac Trail and Haggerty Roads upon Unit 3 of the Commerce Towne Place condominium.

The Planning Commission's recommendation of approval is based upon a finding that the PUD application satisfies the requirements outlined in Article 38 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance; that the proposed development is consistent with the goals of the Commerce Township Master Plan and the Commerce Towne Place PUD; that the project is compliant with the master deed for the Commerce Towne Place

condominium; that the project offers recognizable and substantial public benefits proportionate to the deviations from the Zoning Ordinance being requested by the developer; that the PUD agreement achieves the goals of the Township, the Commerce DDA, and LAG Development to create a high quality facility at a highly prominent location; and that the Planning Commission is confident that the goals of the PUD - if approved by the Commerce Township Board - can be finalized in a future PUD site plan.

This recommendation of PUD approval is conditional upon the following:

1. Approval by the Commerce Township Board of Trustees of the PUD agreement and all of its exhibits, most importantly the PUD plan;
2. A detailed PUD site plan to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission subsequent to Township Board approval of the PUD;
3. The PUD site plan submittal to incorporate the comments of the Planning Commission provided during the PUD review, including but limited to comments regarding:
 - a. Revisions to the proposed building materials
 - b. Revisions to the proposed landscaping
 - c. Revisions to the design of the building itself
4. Submittal of a detailed final signage plan that incorporates the comments of the Planning Commission but is also agreeable to Hyundai-Genesis (avoiding the scenario of LAG submitting a signage plan to the Township that Hyundai subsequently rejects);
5. Approval by the Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) for all public road improvements within their Haggerty Road right-of-way, most notably the extension of the southbound right turn lane on Haggerty as recommended by the Township's Traffic Engineer. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Dave Campbell – I assume your schedule is open for next week, Tuesday, for the Township Board. It's a big day.

Gary Laundroche and Elizabeth Marchese confirmed.

I. NEW BUSINESS:

None.

J: OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION:

None.

K: PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Dave Campbell discussed the following with the Commissioners.

- **NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: MONDAY, APRIL 3, 2023**
- We anticipate the following on the April 3rd agenda.
- Potentially, we will see the site plan for the Conditional Rezoning for Benstein Road that you just heard this evening.
- We thought maybe LAG would make it back it April, but it sounds like now we're shooting for May 1st, and that makes sense.
- There is a new medical building proposed along Martin Road, not far from the intersection of Martin and Richardson.

- We need to do the Sixth Amendment to the Commerce Towne Place condominium. This is for the Barrington development where they are building the three final apartment buildings as we speak. They're making some fairly innocuous adjustments to their unit boundaries, but because it is a condominium amendment, it still has to go before the Planning Commission and the Township Board.
- The last items is that we are going to take a look at the tree removal ordinance. This is something that the Planning Commission has asked for. I know it's a big item for Mr. Parel in particular, so I wanted to wait until the April meeting so that he could be part of that conversation.

L: ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Loskill, supported by Phillips, to adjourn the meeting at 9:00pm.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Joe Loskill, Secretary