

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

Monday, October 4, 2021
2009 Township Drive
Commerce Township, Michigan 48390

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

ROLL CALL: Present:

Brian Parel, Vice Chairperson
Brian Winkler, Secretary
Bill McKeever
George Weber
Chelsea Rebeck
Sam Karim
Joe Loskill

Also Present:

Dave Campbell, Township Planning Director
Jay James, Engineer/Building Official
Jason Mayer, Township Engineer, Giffels Webster
Larry Gray, Township Supervisor
Randy Thomas, Insite Commercial

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Rebeck, supported by Weber, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda of October 4, 2021, as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Winkler, supported by Karim, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of September 13, 2021, as written.

AYES: Winkler, Karim, McKeever, Weber, Parel, Rebeck

NAYS: None

ABSTAIN: Loskill

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES

Brian Winkler – Downtown Development Authority

- For the September 21st DDA Meeting, there are a couple highlights from what was otherwise a short and routine meeting.
- The public comments included a discussion of the speed limit on Martin Parkway, which is 45mph, and the lack of speed limit signs. Deb will be following up with the Oakland County Sheriff's Department and the RCOC on possibly getting some additional, and possibly portable signage on Martin Parkway in an effort to lower or control the excessive speeds.
- Regarding the Insite Commercial report, Five & Main, the large Aikens project; Aikens is currently making site plan revisions and they are in progress. Resubmission of the site plan to the Planning Commission potentially won't take place until the first quarter of 2022. Bruce will be reporting to the DDA and the Township Board in October.

- There is some activity taking place regarding the old Beaumont parcel at M-5 and Maple. There are three developers, single-family or multi-family, that have expressed interest, and I believe one has already made an offer.
- There's not much activity on other parcels within the DDA at this point.
- The graffiti at the tunnel, the paint work on the north side of the tunnel was completed by a local Boy Scout troop on the 25th of September. Township Maintenance personnel will be painting the south side of the tunnel due to some logistics. Deb sent a letter to the Spinal Column from the DDA asking them to cover the volunteer work on the 25th in a future edition.
- Regarding the Finance Committee, the DDA Budget Amendment, Advance and the 2022 Budget were all approved at the September 14th Board meeting.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Do we have any visibility into the changes that are forthcoming from the Aikens development?

Dave Campbell – I have only heard what Mr. Thomas has mentioned in the DDA meetings. I think the bigger change that has come up before is, if you can picture the plan we saw a few years ago, with the residential complex to the central north point of the development, and then the east side was going to be a movie theater, other entertainment and restaurant type uses. I anticipate you might see those get flip-flopped geographically, and the more entertainment based uses are going to land at the center of the development, with residential pushed toward the east. It has been mostly just discussion up to this point, and I have not seen any formal submittals for that.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Is the hotel still planned for the western portion?

Dave Campbell – I have not talked to Mr. Aikens in some time. I would anticipate the hotel might be a back burner proposal, given where the hotel industry is these days with the pandemic.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Thanks, Dave. Thanks, Brian. George?

George Weber – Township Board of Trustees

- Our last meeting was September 14th, and we've also had subsequent budget meetings.
- Of note on the 14th, was Wise Woods Park:
 - There were a few members of the community that were spreading an awful lot of misinformation regarding Wise Woods.
 - The Parks and Recreation Committee and the Township Board had approved, and the Parks Master Plan included, a small 19-space parking area at Wise Woods, where presently there is none. If anybody wants to go to Wise Woods, you literally have to park on Wise Road, which is high traffic and high speed.
 - Primarily two people were stating that hundreds of trees were removed, and even after attending a Parks meeting where they were shown that only seven trees were removed, they went back onto Facebook and said they proved that 70 trees were removed.
 - In fact, seven trees were taken down, and we're actually planting 11 new oak trees in the area.

- There was a great deal of discussion. We gave a presentation to show what the facts were. I think that information will also be presented in the Spinal Column in a coming edition.
- We also spent a great deal of time revoking a permit for Vital Massage because of some illegal activities that were taking place there. We had the OCSD and the attorney representing Vital Massage in attendance. The Board voted to revoke the permit. They can reapply if they so choose to after a period of time, and we will hear about what changes they would make to ensure that we don't have any more issues.
- We approved the appointment of Joe Loskill to the Planning Commission, with a term ending in 2024. We also approved Donald Peterson to a Library Board position ending in May of 2023.
- The Board voted to amend the ordinance to clarify what is lawful gaming and gambling, specifically to recognize and be consistent with State law.
- We also approved the ordinance known as 1.054, which clarifies restrictions of fireworks, and most importantly, the non-removal of any wildlife from any of our parks. If you want to fish, that's fine, but it's catch-and-release. You're not allowed to take any wildlife out of any of our parks. By clarifying the ordinance, we now have the ability to post signs and the OCSO can enforce that.
- Finally, we're in the middle of budget season. We are working through not only September, but probably a good chunk of October to review and finalize all of the individual department budgets.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Thanks, George. You told me the budgets were your favorite part of the job. It might be a good time to introduce Joe Loskill.

Loskill – I've been a Commerce resident for 19 years. I'm a partner at Fusco, Shaffer & Pappas Architects in Ferndale. I was looking to join the Planning Commission, or the Zoning Board of Appeals, or anything I could do to help improve the community I've enjoyed for the last 19 years.

Vice Chairperson Parel – That's wonderful, and it's a pleasure to meet you in person. Thanks for joining us.

Dave Campbell – Mr. Loskill, you're going to get used to hearing is, please speak into your microphone. With the ventilation system in here, it tends to dull the sound.

Bill McKeever – Zoning Board of Appeals

- I was unable to attend the meeting last Thursday.
- I'd like to defer to staff.

Dave Campbell – Jay was in attendance and I was not. There were three matters on the Zoning Board of Appeals agenda. Two of them were approved and one was denied.

- Approved was a detached garage on a through lot. A through lot is when you have a house with two parallel streets. They had a detached garage to the rear of the house, but it would be too close to the rear of the two roads.
- The Zoning Board of Appeals also approved an existing deck that was constructed without a permit. That deck was too close to the canal at the south

side of the house. The ZBA allowed the homeowner to keep that deck, so long as Jay can confirm that it was built properly and to code.

- The item denied was a home on Lake Pointe Lane, which is a peninsula that jets out into the west end of Commerce Lake. The house was proposed too close to the road right-of-way. It was a matter that had been on the ZBA agenda going back to May. They had tabled any action at that meeting to give the property owner an opportunity to revise plans. What he came back with was still requiring a variance and the request was denied.
- Did I miss anything, Jay?

Jay James – No, you got it.

Jay James – Building Department

- There are several developments getting under construction; Oak Hill, The Space Shop, the Townhomes.
- It will be getting busy shortly as everybody frantically moves to get foundations in the ground before winter.

Jason Mayer – Township Engineer

- For the Wise Woods parking lot; that has been paved. They just put the topcoat on it, and they're going to be planting trees shortly.
- They're wrapping up the Newton Road forced main.
- They planted some landscaping on the west side of the Dodge Park restroom building. They installed the donation pavers and signage at Scarlet's playground. It's looking good over there and we will close that project up this month.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Thank you.

E. PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Vice Chairperson Parel opened to Public Discussion.

Vice Chairperson Parel – There are no public hearings for the items on the agenda tonight. Therefore, this would be an opportunity for anybody here to speak, if you want to speak on an item that's on the agenda, or a topic that's not on the agenda. Would anyone like to speak?

No comments.

Vice Chairperson Parel closed Public Discussion.

F. TABLED ITEMS – BOTH ITEMS F1 & F2 WILL REMAIN ON THE TABLE

ITEM F1. PSU21-06 – SCOOTER'S COFFEE – SPECIAL LAND USE – TABLED FROM AUGUST 2, 2021

Brad Brickel of Nowak & Fraus of Pontiac MI, representing Scooter's Coffee is requesting approval for a Special Land Use for a drive-through business in a B-3 zoning district on the east side of Union Lake Road in an outlot at 2733 Union Lake Road.

Sidwell No.: 17-12-276-007

ITEM F2. PSP21-06 – SCOOTER’S COFFEE – SITE PLAN - TABLED FROM AUGUST 2, 2021

*Brad Brickel of Nowak & Fraus of Pontiac MI, representing Scooter’s Coffee is requesting site plan approval for a new drive-through business located on the east side of Union Lake Road in an outlot at 2733 Union Lake Road.
Sidwell No.: 17-12-276-007*

G. OLD BUSINESS

None.

H. SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

None.

I. NEW BUSINESS:

I1. PSP21-13 – BARRINGTON APARTMENTS PHASE TWO

MM Commerce Martin Apartments, LLC of Farmington Hills MI is requesting site plan approval for Phase Two of Barrington Apartments located on Unit 11 of the Commerce Towne Place Condominium, on the west side of Martin Parkway, just north of Pontiac Trail. Sidwell No.: 17-24-300-074

Dave Campbell, Planning Director, gave a review. The proposal for Phase Two of the Barrington Apartments includes three additional two-story apartment buildings of 12 units per building, 36 units total, upon Unit 11 of the Commerce Towne Place condominium. Barrington Phase One is nearing completion on Unit 10 of the CTP condominium. The subject property is within the Town Center Overlay on the Township’s Zoning Map, and multiple-family residential is a principal permitted use within the TC Overlay so long as it is developed to the Overlay’s design standards. The developer’s traffic engineer did do a trip generation comparison of the 36 residential units being proposed, relative to some of the commercial uses that could feasibly be developed on an 11-acre property. The traffic study is meant to demonstrate to the Planning Commission that these apartments would be a significant decrease in traffic generation compared to what could otherwise be developed on this property. Dave reviewed landscaping, renderings, and the sidewalk extension.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Dave, do we have the original commercial plan?

Dave Campbell – Yes, I can pull that up. Just give me a minute.

Jim Galbraith, Developer, 31550 Northwestern Highway, Farmington Hills, MI, was present to address the request.

Mr. Galbraith – I was involved in the original purchase and entitlement of the Barrington property. Dave has done an excellent job giving the background on Barrington itself. When we first negotiated the purchase of the property from the DDA in 2015, it was our intention, as evidenced in the purchase agreement, that we would develop the Martin Parkway frontage as retail, complementary and compatible with Five & Main. That was further evidenced when we closed, some two years later, when we divided the property into two separate condominium units. Back in 2015 when we got our site plan approved,

the placeholders that we showed on the Martin Parkway frontage were a hotel and two restaurants, as David has mentioned, that would be complementary to Five & Main. We've proceeded with the development of Barrington. It has been very well received. We're approximately 60% leased at this point. And, for a number of reasons, not the least of which was the pandemic, ecommerce, and the general lack of expansion by retail tenants, Five & Main has been stalled over the last couple of years. We feel that it would be in both our best interest, obviously, and the Township's best interest, if this parcel were completed at this time. We're proposing that we would be able to complete that in a unified fashion, rather than wait for opportunities that may not exist until Five & Main proceeds and is well into its development phase. In that fashion, we would be able to unify the frontage of Martin Parkway with the landscape character that we've created for the development, and finish it off. The buildings that are portrayed on the site plan sit back 150' from the Martin Parkway frontage, and we think they're much more compatible with the character of Martin Parkway, since we're not developing retail, which would have expansive parking lots in the front setback. I would be happy to answer any specific questions that the Planning Commission might have. We are still very anxious to see Five & Main move forward. It's a real asset to what we've done, and I think we're an asset to what they will do. With your blessing, moving forward to develop this side of the street, I think it really gives them an advantage because it puts more rooftops here and eliminates us competing with them in any way for other retail uses. I think we've demonstrated that it improves the traffic flow along Martin Parkway. We anticipated the large majority of the residents will come into the development from the Library, or the Barrington roundabout as we know it. The one curb cut that we will be retaining, that's a right-in and right-out. You would only get inbound traffic that would be coming southbound on Martin Parkway, and that's not the key generator. It will be an advantage for some residents to leave the site, from those three buildings, on a right-out basis to get to the roundabout at Pontiac Trail. We've come up with an expansive landscape plan for that frontage, the 150' setback. We pride ourselves on the landscaping that we've done in this community over the last 25 years. As you may know, we're the developer of Shearwater, Trillium, Commerce Crossings, and Maple Crossings. We have been deeply committed to this community and consider ourselves to be a development partner with the Township. I thank you for your time.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Thank you.

Dave Campbell brought up and reviewed original commercial plans. It was one example and showed something of a placeholder, showing a hotel and a bank.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Okay, I think that's helpful.

Commissioner Comments:

McKeever – I don't have any other concerns beyond the five points that were in the Planning Director's report. I'm wondering if you could speak to those items.

Mr. Galbraith – I'll attempt to remember what those five items are. I think what Bill is referencing is some concern over, and rightfully so, the relationship of this phase to Kingstowne. We're very sensitive to that from a landscaping standpoint and

preservation of existing vegetation. We've looked at some subtle options to what's shown on this plan to straighten the south building out a little bit, and shift the driveway over.

I think the other thing had to do with site lighting. Obviously we rely heavily on the streetlights of Martin Parkway. We would do some streetlights at that right-in/right-out entrance. We won't have any other pole mounted streetlights within the space. We'd have wall-packs on the ends of the buildings, but they're shielded so they're only lighting the parking lots. These are all things that we can detail for the Planning and Building Departments. The individual entrances to the building, there are 12 porches or vestibules, those all have coach lights and while they're LED, they're not offensive. I think the other comment from staff dealt with the building materials along the front facades of the buildings facing Martin Parkway. The entire development is done with a great deal of brick. I can't tell you the exact percentage, but for maintenance purposes we use lap sided vinyl, and we do the same vinyl on the fascia of the building. We would prefer to continue to use that, for consistency and for maintenance purposes. The required setback is 50' and we're showing 150' because of the shape of the commercial parcel, although we're willing to consider some options and we could work with staff on those, whether it's more brick or some alternate materials.

David, help me out here. I think there were a couple of other points that were raised that I don't remember offhand.

Dave Campbell – You started discussing the lap siding and whether an upgrade to fiber cement might be appropriate. You talked about the lighting. I know Mr. Galbraith is aware as I am, and Mr. James is, about the concerns that we've heard from the residents of Kingstowne Manor, particularly with respect to vegetation screening between the two developments, and then with the proposed road in this development and the potential for headlights of primarily southbound vehicles shining into people's back windows if the screening is not appropriate.

The other comments that are included as prospective conditions in the motion language are fairly standard, and have to do with engineering approval, RCOC approval and so forth.

Weber – First, Mr. Galbraith, I'm a fan of your developments. You put a quality product out and I think as related to the Township, you've earned a great deal of integrity and trust, meaning you say what you're going to do and that's much appreciated.

I'm not in favor of this for a couple of reasons. Even though we're talking a relatively small number, I'm not in favor of increasing more rental or lease units within the Township. Over the last few years we have approved, and they are in the process of being built, roughly 1,000 new rental units. That's in addition to what's already in existence in the Township, and that doesn't include the hundreds of units of senior and assisted living that have also been approved, and/or are in the process of being developed. I know that your lease arrangements are at the high end, but to me, with the overall transient nature, I think we've reached a tipping point for rentals and leasing. I also think that the original concept of the mixed use with commercial is the proper use for that corner, understanding the issues with the Aikens development. I don't think anybody is happy with where that sits and we are pushing to move that along; however, as relying on that, I think you have an opportunity to lead rather than be complementary to them. I think with the rooftops you already have in place, 300 rental units that have already been approved within this development, and then everything else along Martin

Parkway, I think you'd have a better choice of who you would want your tenants to be. I think it's prime for that kind of mixed use.

Finally, I would say I am very sensitive to traffic. I went through the traffic studies, and as my colleagues know, that's a hot button for all of us. In my opinion, I think the prudent thing would be to live with that traffic. There aren't going to be any left turns going into that development because of the way Martin Parkway is built, so it would be right-in and right-out. I think the ability to have the entrance and exit off Pontiac Trail also helps alleviate that.

I'm not a fan of any more rental units. I think the mixed-use commercial would be great in that location, and great for the residents that are moving in to your existing Barrington property, and I'm willing to live with the increased traffic at that location as a result. Those are my comments and thoughts.

Loskill – I would normally be more in favor of following the master plan intent for this area, which is to develop this as commercial, though I don't think I'd be completely opposed to the plan submitted because you have triple the setbacks and you're proposing extensive landscaping. I think maybe a smaller elevation might minimize the view. If you look at the renderings now, what you see is just a large façade of the building. Maybe a one-story proposition might be more favorable, but I do like what I see. I think you've done a good job of trying to really improve the view and the aesthetics of that corner. Would you be doing any development off of Pontiac Trail at this point, or would that just be common area and grass for perpetuity?

Mr. Galbraith – We would not be doing any development at this time at the Pontiac Trail intersection. It's a very small piece and a very difficult piece to find the right tenant or owner for that. The intended use for that small parcel was for a financial institution, whether it would be a bank or a credit union. At this time, there's a dearth of existing banks that are available because of the consolidation that is taking place in the banking community. So most of the financial institutions that are looking for sites are in a far better place to buy an existing building and repurpose it than to go to a green site where they've got to build from scratch. That's kind of a long winded answer to your question.

Loskill – What is your intent for that piece?

Mr. Galbraith – If we ever get a financial institution that would be accepting of that piece, we would try to see what it would fit and work out an arrangement with them. At this point, that curb cut exists. That's also a right-in and right-out. We would not be using it at this time for the apartments for any reason.

Loskill – Are you going to just leave it as is, or are you looking to develop it in the future?

Mr. Galbraith – We could possibly develop in the future for a financial institution.

Rebeck – I normally agree with George, but I actually think that less traffic in this area, especially with it being one of the worst intersections in Michigan, is probably a good thing. I'm okay with the apartments. I don't like the siding, especially not being on Martin and the way that is supposed to be developed. I think if we can do something with the siding, that will make this a lot more palatable for some of us.

Karim – I live in the Richardson area, so this is my main route when I want to go anywhere to the south. I was very concerned originally with having commercial and the three exits there on that small strip, especially in the mornings when there's 10-15 cars lining up to go into the roundabout. So, I'm in favor of less traffic. That's why I would be in favor of this project. I wish that we could leave that corner undeveloped, but that's up to you.

Winkler – I agree with Chelsea's comments regarding the traffic and the siding. Dave has created a very good report on what this project entails and the history of it. I don't have any objections to the project, with the stipulations enforced that Dave has in his report.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Thanks, Brian. And thank you, Mr. Galbraith. I appreciate it.

Mr. Galbraith – Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Vice Chairperson Parel – A couple things. I've been going back and forth with this all day. One question to Dave first. The reason I wanted to see that previously proposed commercial plan was just to ask, I don't know if it's based on developable footprint, but we're putting three residential buildings in an area that originally was approved for a hotel and two smaller commercial buildings.

Dave Campbell – I don't know that you want to say it was approved. It was shown on the Barrington Phase One plan as an indicator of what the potential future for Unit 11 could be.

Vice Chairperson Parel – But I assume it was planned according to our ...

Dave Campbell – At that time, I think it was a vision shared by both the developer and the Township.

Vice Chairperson Parel – I can appreciate less traffic. I think we've done our homework and this will be the lesser of the evils. I think we're having enough trouble filling retail across the street, and I don't think more competition for that retail is a good thing. I hear George's concerns and it's very hard not to agree with him. I agree with Chelsea. I think if we are going to develop apartments in this Township, it should be with someone we trust and who puts forth a good product.

One of the alternatives that I don't want to see is the hotel here. Correct me if I'm wrong, but the developer would be well within his right to put a hotel here if he weren't doing this.

Dave Campbell – That's correct. He would still have to come to the Planning Commission for site plan approval.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Yes, not a fan. I heard a couple comments about landscaping, the buffer and some of the upgraded building materials and the siding. I see the rendering of this drawn from Martin Parkway and I see a lot of trees, but I don't see very mature trees. I understand that they'll grow, but we're seeing a lot of the two-story building.

Mr. Galbraith – Mr. Chairman, we've taken a good, hard look at that. In talking to my project manager, we're really talking about much more dense plantings than are shown on that particular rendering. Quite honestly, I'm a little embarrassed by the way that rendering was produced. We're going to be installing 10', 12' and 14' material from the start, and in a fashion that will soften and screen that building a great deal. With that setback, the critical mass of the building isn't going to be so apparent along the road. I'm confident that we can deliver the elevation and the screening along that frontage. We're going to continue the fences, pilons and so forth, and we will wrap it down and around the corner so that it's cohesive with everything that we've done, and with the west side of Martin Parkway in general.

Vice Chairperson Parel – I'm also sure that your residents probably don't want to be looking out at traffic.

Mr. Galbraith – No, and I don't think they want to be looking at the back of a retail building, and as we drive down Martin Parkway, we would be looking at a sea of cars parked on asphalt. It's a delicate balance and I think we offer that here.

Vice Chairperson Parel – I'm definitely having a tough time balancing it so I can appreciate that too. Dave, from a landscaping perspective, can we handle those concerns administratively?

Dave Campbell – I think so. If this were to receive site plan approval, conditional on a revised landscape plan that confirms what Mr. Galbraith is saying, that the plantings, and particularly those along Martin Parkway, are going to be more mature in terms of size upon installation, that would be something that we could confirm administratively.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Is that already in the proposed language, or do we need to add anything?

Dave Campbell – I think you'd want to include that in the language. What the Planning Department does provide in the proposed language is a revised landscape plan, but it's specific to this area. I'll zoom in. This is where the private road would wrap around and out toward Martin Parkway. In between, there is some existing vegetation, but on the other side of this line is the back of some of the units at Kingstowne Manor. When we talked about a revised landscape plan, my hope was that any approval would be conditional upon some enhancement through this area to provide a better buffer, to screen headlights and other lighting, from this proposed development to the residents of Kingstowne Manor.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Okay, if it were to be approved, we'll put in some language for that. Lastly, I think you've got a good shot at getting this approved. You'll have my support, and it sounds like you'll have Chelsea's support. I know it's not a fun thing to do with maintenance. I used to be in property management so I can appreciate it, but I'd really like to see some upgraded materials on these buildings if we're putting them along the road.

Mr. Galbraith – We're committed to doing that, Mr. Chair.

Dave Campbell – If we were to get toward a motion, are there any thoughts on what those upgrades might entail? I heard Mr. Galbraith potentially offer additional brick or stone, or is it upgrading the lap siding material from vinyl to cement board, understanding the concerns from the developer of maintenance?

Vice Chairperson Parel – I would like to see no vinyl.

Rebeck – I would be fine with either, just no vinyl.

Dave Campbell – If that's the direction we go, is it just on the portions of the buildings facing Martin Parkway, or the entirety of the three proposed buildings?

Vice Chairperson Parel – For me, it would be visible from Martin Parkway.

Rebeck – Visible, but it also has to coordinate with the other side of the building. I don't want to see vinyl on anything that's visible from the other side either. It wouldn't match the building.

Mr. Galbraith – In the interest of the comments I've heard here tonight, we're going to increase the percentage of brick, but we will do the cement siding on both sides of the buildings. My construction manager may not be happy but ...

Vice Chairperson Parel – Are you good with that Chelsea?

Rebeck – Absolutely.

Dave Campbell – If what Mr. Galbraith just offered is the desire of the Planning Commission, and this moves toward approval, then it would be worth stating as much in the motion.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Okay, so there would be two items we would want to add to any motion. One is in relation to the landscape buffer on the south end, and also along the east end on Martin Parkway. David, I don't know if you have any proposed language for that, but we'll have to hit that and the upgraded materials; no vinyl, and increased brick and cement siding facing Martin Parkway.

Dave Campbell – If you look at the prospective motion language on Page 8 of my report, under 2.a., it speaks to an upgraded lap siding material, from vinyl to fiber cement on the three buildings. Based on what I've heard from Mr. Galbraith, that particular sentence could also include an increased percentage of brick and/or stone.

Vice Chairperson Parel – So do we only have to add the landscaping comment?

Weber – Increased brick or stone, and landscaping.

MOTION by Rebeck, supported by Karim, to approve, with conditions, Item PSP21-13, Barrington Apartments Phase Two, the request by MM Commerce Martin Apartments, LLC of Farmington Hills MI for site plan approval for Phase Two of

Barrington Apartments located on Unit 11 of the Commerce Towne Place Condominium, on the west side of Martin Parkway, just north of Pontiac Trail.
Sidwell No.: 17-24-300-074

Move to approve PSP#21-13, the site plan by MM Commerce Apartments LLC (Jim Galbraith) for Barrington Phase Two, comprised of three new 12-unit residential apartment buildings to be developed on approximately 11.5 acres on the west side of Martin Parkway north of Pontiac Trail.

The Planning Commission's approval is based upon a finding that the proposed site plan complies with the applicable standards of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance, the Commerce Towne Place PUD Agreement, and the Commerce Towne Place site condominium master deed, and is consistent with the principles of the Commerce Towne Center Special Area Plan within the Township's Master Plan.

The Planning Commission's site plan approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Review and approval of engineered construction plans by the Township Engineer, Fire Marshal, Building Department, and the applicable departments of Oakland County and the State of Michigan; and,
2. Administrative review and approval by the Planning Department of revised plans that address the following:
 - a. The direction of the Planning Commission regarding an upgrade of lap siding material from vinyl to fiber cement on the three buildings, as well as an increase of the percentage of brick or stone; and,
 - b. Provision of a lighting and partial photometric plan, with particular attention to any lighting impacts on the Kingstowne Manor development; and,
 - c. Provision of an enhanced landscape buffer between the proposed private road and Kingstowne Manor, as well as an enhanced landscape buffer facing Martin Parkway; and,
3. All work within the public road right-of-way, including removal and restoration of the existing driveway approach along the west side of Martin Parkway to be reviewed and approved by the RCOC; and,
4. Entrance sign(s) and/or directional signs to be reviewed and approved under a separate Sign Permit by the Building Department subject to the requirements of Article 30 of the Zoning Ordinance; and,
5. Continued cooperation and good faith with the Commerce Township Downtown Development Authority and the Commerce Towne Place condominium association.

AYES: Rebeck, Karim, McKeever, Loskill, Parel, Winkler

NAYS: Weber

ABSENT: None

MOTION CARRIED

12. HERKULES ADDITION – CONCEPT REVIEW

Herkules Equipment Corporation of Commerce MI is requesting a concept review for proposed additions onto their existing building located at 2760 Ridgeway Court.
Sidwell No.: 17-24-202-002

David Campbell, Planning Director, gave a review of the concept plan for an expansion of Herkules Equipment's existing office/warehouse/manufacturing building located at 2760 Ridgeway Court. Herkules' business is growing requiring more light manufacturing and office space.

Mr. Todd Bacon, 2760 Ridgeway Court, Commerce Township, MI, was present along with Robert Miller, M Architects, 114 Rayson St, #2c, Northville, MI, to speak to the proposal.

Mr. Bacon – We have a growing business at Herkules Equipment. We employ 43 employees right now. We have been in business for over 35 years, and in the this building for about 30 years. We're very familiar with this area. Many of our employees have been employed with us for over 35 years. We have a really good group of people, very dedicated, and a lot of good families working for us.

We manufacture very high-tech types of equipment used in automation. Automation is booming right now in the United States, and our customers want Made-in-USA equipment.

We have engineering staff. We do all of our designing, testing and manufacturing in our building. We purchase a lot of product from suppliers, bring it into our building, assemble and paint these products. We provide equipment to aerospace, military and automotive. Pretty much anybody that makes anything, we sell them the equipment. With this expansion, we're hoping to add anywhere from 10-15 new employees to our staff.

Thank you for letting us present here and taking a look at this. We're interested in your thoughts.

Dave Campbell – Mr. Bacon, while you have the floor, could you and your architect point to some of the building elevations on the screen, and speak to what's envisioned in terms of the additions, the building materials, and how you feel this would be a significant enhancement to the existing building.

Mr. Bacon – I'll let Robert do that.

Mr. Miller – Along the front elevations, we're looking to reclad the entire front façade. Right now, we're looking at maybe using EIFS, or stucco, or metal panel. We're not really sure what it is, but the idea is that it will have some kind of varied pattern to it and some different colors. We're looking at introducing new brick materials at the front, and maybe staining some of the existing brick that's there now. Staining has longevity versus paint. We're also looking at doing new windows along the front.

The biggest piece is going to be the 15' addition up front, which will be housing new offices, but also a new showroom as well. They need a space to display what they do. That is already taking up quite a bit of space inside their existing facility. This will be a brick façade with new storefront windows. We're looking at putting in a new canopy piece. You can see the side elevation of the canopy here. The idea is related to what they produce, which are hydraulic lifts, so the shape of that would have something similar to one of their lifts. That material could perhaps be fabricated from steel or EIFS. This is the conceptual stage.

Along the back of the building would be a block addition, and then we're looking at painting and upgrading the side of the building which is all block. Anything that is existing block gets painted. Anything on the front of the building basically goes away and gets redone, and then of course the addition off the back of the building, and the 15' wide addition along the front which would be brick and glass.

Commission Comments:

Vice Chairperson Parel – Thank you. Before we go to the Planning Commission for comments, just a quick explanation of what we're doing here. This is all conceptual at this point. Nothing that we say is binding. It's just feedback both ways and we're here to try to make this work. It's just a conversation, right Dave?

Dave Campbell – It is. It's an opportunity, if there are any significant red flags, or whether they need insight on building materials, to have an informal discussion so that the property owner and his development team know that they're on the right track.

Vice Chairperson Parel – And my guess is that Dave already gave you that when you spoke to him. With that, we'll go to the Commissioners.

Winkler – Whenever I see projects like this, I get excited because there's a business that wants to expand in Commerce rather than going somewhere else. I commend you on the history of your company. I don't have any objections with the project site as proposed, but I think that EIFS on the front elevation doesn't meet the current Zoning Ordinance as far as the allowable extent of EIFS. However, particularly because the existing building, as David states, probably wouldn't meet the current Zoning Ordinance, I would be more adamant to have that front elevation have the EIFS removed and come up with some other kind of material, a composite panel, or vertical siding, or something else to replace that EIFS. As Planning Commissioners, we've talked many times about EIFS and trying to limit it on the elevation. Otherwise, I love the project.

Karim – I do agree with Brian about the elevation. I have some comments on the back elevation. Right now, there is a development at the back. It's brick, but I would suggest some sort of change to that elevation to break it up. I don't know what it is. I'm leaving that to the architects. I'm an architect and I know we can get something. Work with that long wall to make the elevation more attractive.

Rebeck – I love the concept of the project. I think you know that we like quality building materials after hearing the comments during this meeting. Other than that, I think it's great.

Loskill – I took a drive around your site and I noticed there is a lot of outdoor storage. You have a couple shipping containers back there, and there's a fenced in area that's full of pieces and parts. Are you going to absorb that into the addition, or is that going to be pushed back further onto the site?

Mr. Bacon – Some of that product is pallets that in the past, the Fire Marshall and our insurance has required that to be outside. So we prefer to keep some of the outside storage, especially pallets, in the fenced in area.

Loskill – That and a few things don't show up on your plan. You've got no location for trash dumpsters. You've got no indication of your outdoor storage. You've also got gas storage out back, fuel cylinders and ...

Mr. Bacon – That's not our fenced in area. That's the neighbor's property.

Loskill – On the back right-hand corner of your property, you've got a fenced in area that has propane tanks.

Mr. Bacon – Oh, yes, forklift truck propane.

Loskill – Is that going to be outside the building?

Mr. Bacon – We were planning on having that outside, per our insurance.

Loskill – Okay, so I'd like to see how you're going to address all of those issues on the site plan.

Mr. Bacon – Okay.

Loskill – My only other concern is the truck well. Is that going to be recessed?

Mr. Bacon – Yes.

Loskill – Okay, I'm concerned with getting into that truck well. If anybody parks behind the building that fronts Martin Parkway, you'll have a difficult time getting your semi in. You may want to examine how you're actually getting into that truck dock and if that's the best place for it.

Now how are you going to get rid of the truck dock for the other building? Are they voluntarily going to delete that? Are you going to fill it in for them?

Mr. Bacon – We're still in negotiations with them. Our plan was to pay to move it, or pay for a new one and allow them to use ours.

Loskill – I would just like to see some of those issues addressed. As far as the aesthetics of the building go, my only concern is with the EIFS coming to the ground on the canopy. I would like to see that as a different material. If EIFS is up high and out of reach, I'm not so concerned about that, but the arch in the front, I'd like to see a more durable material coming to the ground.

Weber – First, I'll say, I really tried to figure out how to get one of your lifts in my garage a few years ago. It wouldn't work unless my wife was willing to park outside. I also drove by and I think Joe had everything I did, which centers more on screening. I hope you can figure out how to solve the easement issues, but other than that I think it's a great thing to do and a great project.

McKeever – Is the current building fire-suppressed?

Mr. Bacon – No.

McKeever – How big is it?

Mr. Bacon – Around 32,000 square feet.

McKeever – Is there any issue with that?

Jay James – I don't know what the requirements were at the time when the building was built, but I believe the Fire Marshal will have to weigh in to see if the addition pushes that over into a requirement. I know there's a threshold as to square footage.

McKeever – The current is 12,000 contiguous feet.

Jay James – I don't know if it's different for industrial buildings versus commercial and residential, but yes, that is something Mr. Bacon will want to look into.

Dave Campbell – I think we talked about that in some of our discussions, that the Fire Marshal is going to have to weigh in on whether this addition is the trigger for suppressing either the addition, or the whole structure.

Mr. Miller – Yes, we're aware.

McKeever – That, and the EIFS. The EIFS is not going to fly, just from past experience. I'm sure that has been mentioned in your meetings. Everything else has been covered.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Thank you, gentlemen, for coming in. This is really cool, learning about your company and that you're doing all of this in Commerce. It's wonderful. The fact that you've been here forever, I think right off the bat, you have our support. We want to see this. When I heard about it, it sounded great, and now I see your beautiful plans. You have my full support, and it sounds like you have the support of the Commission, with a few minor tweaks. With that, a couple questions. Parking; you said you're going to add 10-15 people, which is wonderful, but you're also increasing the footprint of the building and reducing the size of the existing parking lot. Any issues there? Are there any variances that you're going to have to go in for? I might be asking the wrong guy.

Mr. Miller – If you see the parking calculation table, we're trying to be as transparent as possible. There's clearly a deficiency of 53 spaces, based upon the entire project. There's the addition off the back of the building for the industrial, the addition off the front of the building for the office, and then within the building, there is an existing mezzanine space which is proposed to be renovated where it talks about the second floor office use. There's two office renovations, and one industrial addition renovation to this project, so we do have a parking deficiency to this. Even with that deficiency, we do have the ability to add in potentially another 13 spaces along the front. We could also restripe the parking along the main street frontage to gain a couple of extra spaces there, and along the side of the building. We could reduce that deficiency to 40 spaces. We all know that parking has been a big subject amongst municipalities over the past few years, especially when dealing with COVID. Right now, the need for this company to grow exists not only in growth, but also in the fact that we're in a COVID world. We can't cram in as many people as we could before. Right now, their existing space is being spread out. So that's part of this as well, with a need for more space that is COVID-friendly. There has been some good dialogue about that, and some of that relates back to, what happens when COVID goes away. Now we would have all of the space available, but not the parking for that. It boils down to how they're going to operate and how many cars employees are truly going to have at any given time on any given shift. Those are the conversations we've been having with them so that we can

come back to you with that information to show, yes, we have deficiency, but also within this affidavit, we can say we don't need as many parking spaces as what the ordinance is asking for.

Weber – If you're looking to grow to 60 people, and you've got a plan that can get you to 115-120 spaces in an industrial use, I'm assuming with shifts, then I get what you're saying. I don't want to speak for the Zoning Board of Appeals, but I think there's probably ways to solve that with an explanation of shifts, understanding that this is not a retail environment.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Yes, and you're getting a lot of nods. I think we're in agreement.

Loskill – Yes, I don't need to see extra concrete.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Maybe part of the solution, instead of moving into the greenspace, would be banking some spaces.

Dave Campbell – Yes, one of the conversations we've had with Mr. Bacon and Mr. Miller is that there certainly is no shortage on the site of impervious surface. Some of the areas where they're proposing parking is already existing paved surface, but it's not currently striped. My expectation here is that the parking situation will be solvable, given the amount of paved surface already available, and if there is an opportunity to share parking with some of the adjacent business owners as well. You as a Planning Commission do have the authority to deviate from strict application of the Township's parking requirements. I can see this being one of those opportunities as this plan moves ahead.

Mr. Miller – I think too that it would be great if we could increase that deficiency to allow for storage, and to be able to give that screening for storage. As you know, there's no room for that on the site plan, because we're trying to get them what they need to function as a business, but then provide some level of parking. We've got to find that happy medium.

Loskill – Yes, but we want you to deal with reality. We don't want you to give us a plan that's nothing but pie, and you'll end up taking a bunch of spaces back. I'd like to see what you need, show it all on the plan, so that we can have a functional plan for you and not just something that meets the Zoning Ordinance and will get tossed aside once the building gets built.

Mr. Miller – Understood.

Vice Chairperson Parel – My last comment was regarding outdoor storage, but Joe handled that. So, if I said no EIFS, would that get our message across?

Mr. Miller – These are conceptual drawings and they're a late night thing. EIFS was the easiest thing we could say.

Vice Chairperson Parel – We completely understand. Other than that, I think the design is beautiful. We obviously have an issue with EIFS. Is there anything we didn't answer for you, or any other questions? Obviously, Dave is available. I think this is an amazing project for us. It's not really far off the main drag, and I think it's important that we have beautiful properties. I think the building is tired right now. It needs some help, and the architect put together a great design.

Dave Campbell – What we typically like about projects like this is that if it comes to fruition, then we can show it to the next guy and say that's where the bar is now. That's our expectation for what some of these buildings along the Martin corridor can be.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Show them a building with no EIFS. Thank you gentlemen.

Mr. Bacon and Mr. Miller thanked the Commission.

13. BAY POINTE ON THE LAKE – CONCEPT REVIEW

Windham Development Corporation of Bloomfield Hills MI is requesting a concept review for a proposed single family residential development located on the existing Bay Pointe Golf Club property at 3655 Union Lake Road. Sidwell No.: 17-13-276-005

David Campbell, Planning Director, gave a review. Bay Pointe on the Lake, on the northwest corner of Richardson and Union Lake Rd, is being proposed as a conceptual plan by Windham Development, Herb Lawson. The proposal is to acquire and redevelop the Bay Pointe golf course property with 206 new single family homes. The municipal boundary between Commerce Township and West Bloomfield Township straddles the Bay Pointe property, such that 199 of the proposed homes would be in Commerce and 7 would be in West Bloomfield. The 199 proposed homes within Commerce would be comprised of 93 traditional single family homes, and 106 age-targeted detached ranch condominiums that are marketed toward buyers 55 and over. Due to the number of new homes proposed, the mix in lot sizes, and the complexities of developing what is a challenging site, the developer is likely to propose the project as a Planned Unit Development (PUD). A point of conversation is the impacts of the new development to the existing traffic challenges through the Union Lake/Richardson/Martin/Haggerty corridor. The developer is proposing to make upgrades to the existing traffic signal system to allow for better coordination, to dedicate the right-of-way necessary to allow for potential future road improvements, and to limit site access to the existing signalized intersection of Haggerty and Richardson, thereby limiting impact to Union Lake Road.

Because this is likely to be a PUD, this meeting could serve as the preliminary meeting with the Planning Commission, which is required as part of the PUD process. In that regard, it may be more than a typical conceptual meeting. Concerns discussed tonight could be addressed in their formal submittal, which will require a public hearing.

Winkler – David, with the petitioner having offered easements along Union Lake and Richardson for future expansion, would that easement also include the possibility of that roundabout?

Dave Campbell – At least on a preliminary basis, and I think Mr. Seiber can speak to this better than I can, but the right-of-way that would be dedicated appears to be more

than sufficient for a roundabout to land at Union Lake and Richardson Road, as soon as someone figures out how to pay for it.

Herb Lawson, President, Windham Development, 36400 Woodward Ave, Ste 112, Bloomfield Hills, MI, was present along with Clif Seiber, Project Engineer, Seiber Keast Engineering, 39205 Country Club Drive, Ste C8, Farmington Hills, MI.

Mr. Seiber – With me is Herbert Lawson with Windham Development. He is the applicant, and he was also the applicant in 2005 when this was before you. We actually took it as far as a public hearing back then. I don't know if anybody on the Planning Commission was around that long ago.

The layout of this development that's being proposed is actually very similar to the one proposed in 2005. You can see there's quite a series of canals and ponds included in that design. The reason for that is, you may know, the northerly portion of Bay Pointe Golf Course is rather low. It's about 3' to the ground water at that point. The intention of these canals and ponds is to dig them out. That generates enough dirt that we're going to raise these homes at least one foot above the floodplain. By doing that, it serves two purposes. One, it provides the dirt to raise these homes and roadways. It also provides our stormwater detention. So very little if any, for the lower intensity rainstorms, we'll have actually no water going into Middle Straits Lake. It will all be contained onsite. If we have a very large, intense rainstorm, there will be some, but it will be a very small amount. It really provides a great benefit of retaining that water onsite and acting as somewhat of a groundwater recharge.

Only about 3% of this site is in West Bloomfield. As Dave had indicated, those seven lots to the right are located in West Bloomfield, the rest, 199 are located in Commerce Township. At the very northerly edge you can see there's nine lots. Those are the only nine lots in Commerce Township that front on Middle Straits Lake and who will have access to the lake. In comparison, the plan in 2005 actually had 30 lots in Commerce Township fronting on Middle Straits. One of the big reasons for that reduction is, you can see the age-targeted homes, the ones more to the left, closer to Union Lake Road. All the ones that front on that portion of Middle Straits Lake will not have access to the lake; certainly no boat access. From that standpoint, it improves over the original 2005 plan. The lot sizes for the single-family homes are 60x125. The age-targeted homes have an equivalent envelope of about 55' in width.

As Dave had indicated, we were proposing an access drive out to Union Lake Road. Typically when you have a development, you have two access points for secondary emergency access. When we first submitted the plan, there was discussion, especially initiated by the Township Supervisor, and in agreement with the traffic engineer, that the access point created issues on Union Lake Road, which of course as you know already has issues with very high traffic volumes. It was determined after talking with the traffic engineer that if we eliminated that road access, provided an emergency access driveway, which has been discussed with your Fire Marshal, that that would provide that secondary access. It would have an electronic gate with it. It would be on a Yelp system. I have not heard of that, but a siren or something triggers the gate to open. That would be the provision for our secondary access.

From the standpoint of the Master Plan, it allows for 2.1 acres of commercial right at that corner of Richardson and Union Lake Road, and then cluster residential, which provides a density of 3.5 units per acre. Based on our 80 acres of usable upland, and at

3.5 units per acre, that provides 280 units on the site. We're at 199 units, which is about 29% under the permitted Master Plan density.

From the standpoint of traffic, it was an improvement. Your traffic engineer indicated that by providing a SCAT system and new signalization at Richardson and Martin, we could improve the level of service, even with the additional homes from Bay Pointe. In addition, it was indicated that the change in traffic would be very slight at Union Lake Road and Richardson, because most of the traffic leaving the site would be leaving at Richardson and Haggerty, and the majority would be going southbound on Haggerty Road from that traffic signal.

We have had EGLE out to walk the site with us. They have given us some input as to some of the wetland pockets and the edge of the lake, and we made some adjustments to reflect those comments. They've indicated they don't see any real issues here with them eventually issuing a permit for this project.

Finally landscaping, we're proposing a berm along that entire length of Union Lake Road, just to provide some screening for the age-targeted homes and aesthetically, it would look nice along Union Lake Road. Also, we are proposing to dedicate all the right-of-way along Union Lake Road and Richardson Road, as well as whatever right-of-way is required for the future roundabout. There's quite a bit of greenspace there at the corner, so if the RCOC makes some adjustment to increase their right-of-way requirements, or shift the roundabout, we will be able to accommodate.

Mr. Lawson – I would like to thank everybody for allowing us to meet with you this evening informally. I really appreciate it.

Dave Campbell – I'll repeat that if this plan were to move forward, the next step would be a public hearing with this Planning Commission. At that point, the Planning Commission would have the option of making a formal recommendation to the Township Board, who then would have the authority of whether they would want to approve this PUD, which would include approval of a PUD agreement, the contract with the Township and the developer of what will happen with the property. An exhibit to the PUD agreement would be a PUD plan that would be pretty comparable to the version we've been looking at this evening. If the Township Board does make that approval of the PUD, then the development team would come back in front of the Planning Commission with a PUD site plan, a fully developed version of this plan, with preliminary engineering, more detail in terms of landscaping and lighting, and so forth. Those are the steps that a PUD goes through. At a minimum, two more formal meetings with the Planning Commission, and at least one formal meeting with the Township Board. Given the scale and high level of attention this project is going to get, and appreciating that there will need to be some coordination with West Bloomfield Township as far as their approvals, I wouldn't be surprised if there were an extra meeting or two in the process.

Commission Comments:

Vice Chairperson Parel – Again, this is a conversation. It's non-binding.

McKeever – I would be very curious to see how the traffic studies wash out, and how we're going to deal with the stacking issue along the main roads of Richardson and Union Lake Road. I know there will be time limits with Martin Parkway, but traffic still backs up to make a right onto Union Lake Road. I'm very curious to see that. What's the square footage of the house that you intend to market toward empty nesters?

Mr. Lawson – That's a good question. We're working with a number of different potential builders. We've worked on the marketing and site plan. We do have some concept plans if you'd like to take a look at them. We've been working with Pulte on this development. There has been extensive market research as to what is the right product and the right square footage. I can leave some information with you or bring them up now.

McKeever – I'd be interested in seeing them.

Mr. Lawson – There's more elevations, but these were some of the plans they feel would be best to be marketed for Bay Pointe.

Dave Campbell – Mr. Lawson, am I correct that the detached units would be age-targeted but not necessarily age-restricted?

Mr. Lawson – That's correct. The nice thing about that is the total traffic is actually a slight reduction compared to the parallel plan we submitted, because of the age-targeted units.

Weber – Mr. Lawson knows, I'm disappointed that Bay Pointe would be going away. I golf there. I also recognize that the owners have a right to sell their property and move on into retirement. It can be sold the way it's zoned, and it's zoned residential. I think the plan you've put together is probably as good as it can be.

Yes we have traffic concerns. One comment that you've made, and something I think has not come out from the Township traffic engineer, is that you're willing to invest in the smart signal, which is about a quarter-million dollar investment. The numbers I had written down for that, by doing that signal, it will take the traffic delay at Martin Road and Richardson from a 236-second delay to a 39-second delay. It's a pretty substantial improvement in flow, which again is just a band-aid until we can figure out how to fix the entire Martin Parkway/Union Lake Road corridor.

I do believe that the age-targeted, and where you have them will help the traffic issue. I like the greenspace that you have for the development. I know historically, you put together a good product. I don't have any other questions at this time.

Mr. Lawson – One thing I might add, the \$250,000 will be paid immediately, prior to getting started. That's something that can be done right away. Obviously the development will take probably 6-9 months to do, but we don't want to wait for that. We want to get the traffic dealt with immediately.

Weber – The money part you can control. The more difficult part is to get the RCOC to put in the traffic signal. I have no idea how long it takes to get them to act.

Dave Campbell – I might look to my boss on this one as well. We just had a zoom meeting with the RCOC about upgrading traffic signals throughout Commerce Township, and particularly in this area. The hope is that it's something that could be done during the 2022 construction season.

Loskill – On Union Lake Road, did anybody look at a right-turn only exit from the western portion of the property?

Dave Campbell – I don't think that came up in the Township's discussions. The original plan showed a driveway out to Union Lake Road and it was meant to be a full movement driveway. There was never an analysis of doing right-in/right-out only.

Loskill – Okay. On the age-targeted product, are you going to be doing that as a one-story or a two-story?

Mr. Lawson – It will be one-story or one-and-a-half. There could be an upstairs area, but the master bedroom would be on the first floor.

Dave Campbell – Mr. Lawson, when we look at the berm renderings, is it fair to say that these homes were dropped into this rendering? Are those representative?

Mr. Lawson – No, those were just schematics. In various meetings, there was mention of making sure that we had a good buffer. I think the typical distance is at least 70-90', plus we have the berm with plantings. I think there was a video, but the type of homes are not like that at all.

Loskill – My only concern is that we get enough buffer so that the homes along Union Lake Road are not affected by daily traffic. The traffic is constant during most of the day and I want to make sure those people are going to have a good quality of life and not be subject to constant road noise. The more we can do to buffer them, the more in favor I'll be of the plan.

Mr. Seiber – There's room for a 6-8' high berm with the trees on top of that. I think that will go a long way to knocking down that noise.
About your right-turn out on Union Lake Road; one of the real concerns we had with this development, from the traffic standpoint, was cut-through traffic with people trying to avoid the intersection. We had designed a road system to discourage cut-throughs, but Township staff and the engineer came up with the idea to eliminate that entrance, which addressed the whole cut-through issue. I thought that was a positive impact to the whole development.

Rebeck – Does anyone else realize that the traffic light fell down at Martin and Richardson last week? It was smashed. They didn't happen to put a smart light in, did they?

Dave Campbell – Unfortunately, it's not as easy as just hanging a smart signal. There's a lot of underground utilities and equipment, and they have to change the whole configuration of the signal.

Rebeck – In general, I think this looks like it's going to be a nice development. If you can address the traffic concerns beyond the general aesthetics, I think that will go a long way with us.

Karim – I like this development. I like the entrance where it is right now. I wish that we could solve the problem of Union Lake Road. Most of the traffic is not from the traffic light; it's from the congestion of that road. I think everything has been covered.

Winkler – Bill, were you on the Planning Commission when this site came before you in 2005?

McKeever – Yes.

Winkler – Do you recall the outcome of that public hearing?

McKeever – It was a typical development that involved lake frontage, so it was high volume and people were not in favor, if I remember correctly.

Dave Campbell – I can dig up those minutes and compile them for the Planning Commission so you can understand what your predecessors discussed all those years ago.

Winkler – The petitioner might want to know what took place at that time. Otherwise, the development as proposed looks good. I'll say one thing. We're seeing this development, and recently we've seen Reserve at Crystal Lake. These are significant developments that are adding more houses, more residents, more development. It makes me think, as the old fellow that I am, people are attracted to Commerce Township for a lot of reasons. Some of that attraction is greenspace, rural character, and having amenities nearby. When you look at projects like these, it makes me think, as George said before, about the tipping point when it came to rentals. I just wonder if Commerce Township will reach that tipping point where things are no longer appealing. I think we'll be looking at this with the Master Plan updates.

Dave Campbell – We're overdue to start the review of our 2015 Master Plan.

Weber – Everything you've discussed is very important to the Board, and has been discussed for most of 2021. I know some of this group is familiar with the property strategy subcommittee and the work that has been done. Correct me if I'm wrong, but presently roughly 32% of Commerce is protected greenspace, parks and lakes. The protected greenspace is either Township-owned or Proud Lake-owned and cannot or will not be developed.

Yet, with some of the other parcels, part of what we struggled with was projects just like this, and understanding what might be developed in the future. The Reserve at Crystal Lake was a little bit different because there was some control over that. This is an owner of the land that wants to sell the land, land that is zoned residential. It would be akin to somebody coming to us to say that you can't sell your 5 acres of land that's zoned to have two homes put on it.

The bottom line is, the Township Board recognizes that. We had that exact same discussion. To the north and west sides of the Township, there is a lot of greenspace, and a lot of parcels that are zoned R-1A, or only larger lots, including a parcel we just rezoned from R-1B to R-1A, located off of Wixom Road. For the people in the audience, these are big decisions that weigh heavily on all of us, but at the same time there's that balance with the property owner who says they want to sell the land for what it's intended to be used for. It's how we find that right balance, and if it's going to happen, how do we try to make it painless to traffic, and to the surrounding residential communities and commercial businesses? It is something that is going to get wrestled,

and I'm sure as this goes through the PUD process, we're going to have lots of challenging discussions on just this.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Thanks, George. I don't think I have much more to add. That was a pretty good description of my feelings as well. The only other comment I have for you gentlemen is that I think you did yourselves a little bit of a disservice showing the two-story buildings behind the berm as Dave mentioned. We'll come back and look at it. I know you're willing to beef up the berm to make it work. That's something that will be critical to me.

Mr. Lawson – Absolutely. We'll correct the rendering.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Did we answer everything for you?

Mr. Lawson – I think so. Thank you very much.

Mr. Seiber – Thank you.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Thank you.

Dave Campbell – As far as scheduling, if this goes through and gets the approvals that you're hoping to get, what sort of timeline might you be looking at in terms of this project actually commencing, and then completing?

Mr. Lawson – I know we're going to go through the 2022 golf season, so a year from now would be the earliest that we would start, assuming we were fortunate enough to get all of the approvals. We would probably start in the first quarter of 2023 to develop, and that would probably take until the 3rd or 4th quarter of 2023 to get the infrastructure installed, then start building homes. The first residence would likely be in 2024, and that's all dependent on how long it would take us to get through the approval process, permitting and all the things that are necessary.

J: OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION:

- Weber and Dave Campbell discussed timing for the Master Plan kickoff in 2021.
- Weber discussed ordinance revisions regarding vinyl vs. cement board, and also changing minimum and maximum percentages for building materials, such as EIFS.
- Dave Campbell talked about how EIFS can be good in small percentages for creating decorative elements.
- Parel discussed issues with EIFS; it gets stained, it's hard to clean and it's hard to repair.
- McKeever noted that staining is due to weather and all building materials will do that.
- Parel asked Dave to look into what other communities do with regard to EIFS.
- Vinyl vs. cement board was discussed at length. Weber suggested that for entry level 1,200 square foot homes, with a price point of \$250,000, vinyl might make sense. Rebeck suggested that maybe it needs to be based upon square footages. Weber also noted that this would need to be something that is easy for Jay James to administer.

K: PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- **NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: MONDAY, NOVEMBER 1, 2021 @ 7PM.**
- Dave discussed the following items with the Planning Commission for the November meeting:
 - One item is a Conditional Rezoning, located on the south side of Oakley Park, east of Martin Road, across from the Detroit Gun Club. The developer is looking to do a 3-story independent living facility, about 120 units.
 - Scooter's Coffee is a tabled item. We expect them back in November. They wanted their own traffic consultant to do a study. Our consultant has to review it to ensure that the findings are valid. That added a little time to the process, plus the fact that Union Lake Road was closed throughout most of the summer.

Weber – And they're also coming with their documented and immediate need.

Dave Campbell – They are aware of that.

Discussion continued regarding details of the recent closure of Union Lake Road.

Dave Campbell –

- Valvoline wants to do a quick lube place, located at the empty lot between Bar Verona and the Costco gas station. They would have to rezone the property, and it would be a Special Land Use, comparable to Jiffy Lube creating a new out lot at Meijer.
- The November agenda also includes housekeeping items; election of officers, review of bylaws and looking at the meeting calendar for 2022. The Chairperson position needs to be filled, since Chairperson Haber stepped down, along with the Vice Chair and Secretary positions. I will remind you that Mr. Weber, Township Trustee, and Mr. McKeever, Zoning Board of Appeals, are not eligible to be officers on the Planning Commission. Therefore, out of the five remaining Commissioners, three of you need to be the officers on the Planning Commission.

Dave Campbell and Vice Chairperson Parel discussed the status of the M-5 pedestrian bridge updates and lighting.

L: ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Rebeck, supported by Loskill, to adjourn the meeting at 9:22pm.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Brian Winkler, Secretary