

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF COMMERCE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Monday, August 6, 2018
2009 Township Drive
Commerce Township, Michigan 48390

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

ROLL CALL: Present:

Larry Haber, Chairperson
Russ Schinzing, Vice Chairperson
Brian Winkler, Secretary
Tom Jones
Bill McKeever
Brian Parel
George Weber

Also Present:

Dave Campbell, Township Planning Director
Paula Lankford, Assistant to the Planning Director
Jay James, Engineer/Building Inspector
Mark Stacey, DDA Director
Jason Mayer, Township Engineer, Giffels Webster

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Brief discussion took place regarding the agenda items, and it was confirmed that the items would be taken in the order presented.

MOTION by Schinzing, supported by Parel, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda of August 6, 2018, as written.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Jones, supported by Schinzing, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of June 4, 2018, with the comments and corrections as noted by Winkler:

1. Verify the statement at the bottom of Page 5, David Smith – *We have no problems with trying to sit down and make this asset conform to what the Township wants, but we're limited to **what we are**.*
Winkler – I think there was something more that should have been added there.
Haber – Anybody have any idea what's going on there?
Jones – Maybe he meant where we are with regards to the situation as it existed.
Haber – I think that's what it sounds like.
Schinzing – I think he said "where we are".
2. On Page 10, Mr. Wilson – *You know, at the end of the day, I guess we did probably re-route a **plumber**.*
Winkler – That should be a plumbing line or something like that.
3. On Page 11, 3rd sentence from the bottom, correct "your" to "our", Chairperson Haber – *Sir, I listened to you, now it's **our** turn.*
4. The adjournment time should be confirmed; it is shown as 8:08pm.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES

Bill McKeever – Zoning Board of Appeals

- I don't have anything to report.

George Weber – Township Board of Trustees

- We had two Township Board meetings in July.
- One item for this group that will be coming is a potential recommendation to make slight revisions to the sign ordinance. Something that will help us to better manage temporary signs, whether political in nature or not. The Township Attorneys have reviewed it and made an opinion. We think that the ordinance is strong as written, but with a few tweaks to it, we can accomplish more decluttering within the Township.
- The next topic, noxious weeds. We have a reasonably significant phragmites problem in the Township and there is a new ordinance as it relates to all noxious weeds that are beyond the setback. So, as it relates to phragmites, I believe Oakland County will be providing some assistance in eradicating those, but if they are also moving onto private property, we're going to require the owner to also take care of them.
- We revised the alarms ordinance; basically putting people on notice that if you have an alarm, you have to register it with the Township. This is specific to an alarm where Police or Fire are notified and dispatched if the alarm goes off. The purpose of that is when there are false alarms, or alarms go off, they don't know who to call.
- The rest of the time we've spent on the upcoming Police and Fire SAD's. We've now approved the November ballot language for the upcoming proposal for Police and Fire.

Brian Winkler – Downtown Development Authority

- There were a couple items of note at the DDA meeting on July 17th.
- There was a typical update from Insite Commercial about the progress and interest in the property. One of the items was that Bruce Aikens, in regard to the Five & Main project, will be attending the August DDA Meeting to give us an update on where he is in leasing of the property. He's very close to signing a couple of major tenants.
- Molly Phillips is exploring the possibility of refinancing some of the bonds from a variable interest rate to a fixed rate, given changes in the lending environment. We will probably reach a date where the variable interest rate will be greater than the fixed rates.
- Susan Averbuch let us know that the next Adopt-a-Road for Martin Parkway is on September 22nd.
- Mark, anything to add?

Mark Stacey – I think you've covered the important parts. Obviously, we have construction going on onsite every day. At Jim Galbraith's Barrington complex, they're doing land balancing and underground work. The childcare facility, just north of the Township Hall; I think you'll see the roof on it this week. Beyond Self-Storage was

supposed to start putting the outside wall panels up this week. I think they're a little bit behind, but you will see what that building actually looks like very soon. Thank you.

Jay James – Building Department

- We're pretty steady.
- There was actually a lull in the last month, which took me by surprise, but it's starting to pick up again.
- Merrill Park, across the street, they only have 7 lots left that are not permitted. They're building at a pretty rapid pace.
- The Orchards is built out.
- Hills of Bogie Lake is built out, and we're trying to close them out right now.
- We've got a lot of subs that have been going on the last couple years that are now getting ready to wrap up. We've also got some new ones starting.

E. PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Regina Fronczak-Roth, 4080 Lake Pointe Lane, Commerce Township, MI – I live on Commerce Lake and I was just wondering, in the Township, is there a noise variance or something with boats and jet-skis? They're annoying.

Chairperson Haber – I'm going to answer that question for you because I live on Commerce Lake. It is extremely annoying when some of those boats blast that music, and inside my house I can't hear my television, and there is nothing we can do. I'll take that back – I talked to David Scott about that, and he said call the Sheriff. Unfortunately on Commerce Lake, there are very few restrictions. They want to blast the music and have jet-skis going at 2 o'clock in morning. They want to party, et cetera, and I do understand that it's extremely annoying. I've looked into this before and there's not a lot we can do. In order to get regulation on the lake, you have to get 51% of the residents of the lake to agree to restrictions. It's not going to happen.

Regina Fronczak-Roth – Would that be lakefront owners?

Chairperson Haber – Yes. We hear them at 6 o'clock in the morning water skiing. You can call the Sheriff and they will respond. That's all we can do at this point, or get 51% of the people to feel like you and I do.

Regina Fronczak-Roth – That might be a possibility. I do go to the subdivision meeting.

Chairperson Haber – I'll sign the petition.

Regina Fronczak-Roth – That was one of my biggest concerns, and I didn't know if we had a stipulation of so many decibels.

Chairperson Haber – There is an ordinance, but by the time the Sheriff arrives, they're gone. It's worth a try, and there is a decibel limit, but it's difficult to enforce.

Jay James – We do have a noise ordinance and I think it is 60 decibels, but it's continuous. It's not just a quick dispersion of noise which then stops or goes down; it has to be continuous noise exceeding the 60 decibel limit. I think your neighbor running

their lawn mower exceeds that decibel limit, but it's not continuous. It stops after they're done cutting the lawn. Somebody running a generator for hours on end; that's something that we can address.

Dave Campbell – I think another part of the reality is, we as a Township don't have any way to get out there on the water and flag or chase people down. Jay has been trying to get a jet-ski in his budget every year and it never gets approved. Even if we had strict regulations in place, enforcement would be another whole matter, especially evenings and weekends. That's an additional challenge.

Chairperson Haber – Occasionally, the Sheriff is out there, and the whole nature of the lake changes when he is. No one is speeding, there's no loud noise, there's no craziness. But from what I was told, the Sheriff's budget did not include lake patrol on the weekends.

Discussions continued. Regina Fronczak-Roth is concerned with beautiful wetlands in Commerce Township, along with the many subdivisions being built, and she felt that the roads could not accommodate all of this development. She has lived here since 1971. She would like to see the Planning Commission give thought to preserving wetlands in the community of Commerce Township.

Dave Campbell noted that wetlands are typically regulated by the State of Michigan Department of Environmental Quality. The proper permits have to be acquired from the State for any impact upon the wetlands, whether filling or re-routing. The Township tries to go above and beyond, with a local requirement of a 25' buffer around the perimeter of any wetland.

F. TABLED ITEMS

ITEM F1: PSU18-003A & B – WILSON MARINE – SPECIAL LAND USE – REMAIN TABLED

*Wilson Marine of Brighton MI is requesting a Special Land Use for a vehicle repair establishment and accessory outdoor storage located at 4266 Haggerty Road.
Sidwell No.: 17-13-400-048*

Dave Campbell provided a brief update on the tabled item, noting that Wilson Marine is keeping their outdoor storage items out of the panhandle area in the interim, and they are reviewing their storage options going forward. Chairperson Haber asked how long the item can remain tabled before it is completely removed. Dave Campbell would verify, but he believed about 6 months would be allowed.

G. OLD BUSINESS

None.

H. SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

ITEM H1: PZ18-0001 – COMMERCE TOWNSHIP – TEXT AMENDMENT – PUBLIC HEARING

An amendment to the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance No. 3.000, to amend the following Sections: Article 6, Dimensional Standards, Section 6.03, Front Yards, to amend the language for types of structures to be included; and Article 39, Nonconforming Structures, Section 39.03, to amend the terms and authority upon which a nonconforming single-family residential structure may be expanded.

Dave Campbell gave an overview. The public hearing was published within 15 days, and all State law requirements were met for the process of amending the Zoning Ordinance. The amendments were packaged together as they're all somewhat interrelated. The Planning Commission saw this information on June 4th for preliminary discussion.

A lot of these have to do with nonconforming residential structures, typically on lakefront lots where either the lot or the house, or both, are nonconforming. The effort here is to make changes to the Zoning Ordinance to take some of the burden off the Zoning Board of Appeals. Any time something comes before the ZBA continuously, it gives reason for staff to look at the standard to see if it needs amending.

Dave reviewed an example on the overhead of homes and garages along Union Lake Road. He explained the consistent setbacks and the garage locations, relative to the centerline of the road. He reviewed a request for a home addition in this area, and how the ordinance would have impacted a new dwelling on the site, versus an addition. Because it was an addition, she had to go to the ZBA. If the intent of the Zoning Ordinance is to allow these small, lakefront, nonconforming lots to continue to build in a setback pattern consistent with what exists there, then the logic is that it shouldn't matter if it is a new dwelling, or an addition to an existing dwelling – the same logic should apply. The proposed amendment will now apply to any new structure; whether it is an addition to an existing structure, or a garage, detached or attached. If it's consistent with the development pattern and average setback of the other homes on a block, then a new house, or an addition to an existing house, can be brought to the average setback line without going before the ZBA.

Chairperson Haber – Bill, if this came before the ZBA, would it pass? Would you allow it?

McKeever – I think so.

Dave Campbell – On this particular one, it was a few years ago, but yes, she was approved to put an addition on her house that came out to about as far as the house next door to her would be. I don't think she ever built it.

Paula Lankford – No.

Dave Campbell – That approval has now expired because it has been more than a year, but if the language we're proposing tonight had been in place at that time, she would not have had to go to the ZBA.

Chairperson Haber – Does it come before the Planning Commission?

Dave Campbell – It does not.

Chairperson Haber – It goes through the Building Department?

Dave Campbell – It just goes through the Building Department.

Chairperson Haber – Any questions before the public hearing?

Dave Campbell – There's a second part to what we're hoping to accomplish tonight with this amendment, and again, it's related.

It has to do with additions to nonconforming residential structures. The Zoning Ordinance as currently written says that, *Nonconforming structures can be improved and have additions added to them, so long as the addition does not intensify the nature of the nonconformity.*

If you have a building or a house that's 5' too close to the property line, you can't put an addition onto it that now makes it 2' too close to the property line. Mr. James and the Building Department has made interpretations over the years as to what it means to intensify the nature of a nonconformity. The intent of this proposed change is really to bring the Ordinance more into consistency with how the Building Department has interpreted the standards of Article 39. In my opinion, it's a huge burden to the Zoning Board of Appeals to bring every instance to them when someone wants to put an addition onto a nonconforming house. Jay can speak to how many requests we've had that involved nonconforming homes with relatively small improvements. At the advice of the Attorney, we now want to amend the Ordinance to make it more consistent with the way Jay has applied it.

Jay James – As Dave said, in the example he mentioned; if the house was 5' too close to the front property line, and they wanted to build an addition to the side, we wouldn't allow an addition that went out closer than the 5'; however, if they wanted to keep it the same distance back, even though that doesn't meet the allowable setback, to me the way I've always interpreted it is, the nonconformity is the distance, in this case, from the house to the front property line. It doesn't matter if it's just a single foot of the building that doesn't meet it, or the entire length of the building, the nonconformity is the distance to the front property line. It doesn't matter if it's 100' of the building, or 10'. In the past, I've allowed people to add the addition, as long as they didn't go any closer, even though what they were proposing didn't meet the setback, it did not increase the nonconformity. That's the way I've always interpreted it. The issue came up as to the wording in the Ordinance that talks about intensifying a nonconformity. Is intensifying it meaning, instead of 10' of the building being too close, we now have 20' of the building that's too close? Does that mean it's intensified? Or, does it mean intensified if it's going out closer to the front property line. The way I've interpreted, I've

allowed them to do the addition, but it can't go any closer, as long as the nonconformity itself isn't increasing. We're here tonight to continue with that interpretation that I've been doing since 2010. I believe my predecessors were doing it the same way.

Chairperson Haber – How often does this come up?

Jay James – Quite a bit, oddly enough. Throughout a year, maybe 10 to 15 times on different building permits. If it creates a nonconformity somewhere else, we don't allow it, but if it's the only thing we're addressing, we work with them.

Dave Campbell – There's two tiers to what this Ordinance amendment would be, and there is a lot of interplay between the two. It all comes down to issues we want to be able to address Administratively, rather than piling these matters on the Zoning Board of Appeals.

Jay James – It's something we've seen enough that we've realized there's a need for an amendment.

Jones – One thing mentioned before, with regard to someone adding an addition, was the average. How do you set the average? Do you take every house within 300', half a mile?

Dave Campbell – It's every house on that particular block, on that particular side of the street. It's the average front yard depth of existing structures on the same side of the street on that single block.

Jones – Who sets the average?

Dave Campbell – It would be Jay and the applicant doing some measuring together and determining what the average is.

Jones – Okay, that's good for me.

Discussion continued regarding averaging of the setbacks, curves in the road, and other factors considered in determining the average.

Chairperson Haber opened the public hearing.

Regina Fronczak-Roth – I thought this was going to deal with sheds, because my neighbor had to move his shed three times. So I'm happy now, but I'll still say for the meeting. I really did think when the agenda said front setbacks, I thought "Oh Lord, is he going to have to move his shed again?" So I told him I'd come to the meeting.

Chairperson Haber – Okay, now you know it's something different.

Regina Fronczak-Roth – Yes, something different totally.

Chairperson Haber – He still may have to move his shed.

Dave Campbell – What's his address?

Jay James – He knows where the shed needs to go. We're on the same page. Did he move it already?

Regina Fronczak-Roth – Oh yeah, for the third time. Thank you.

Dave Campbell – I would say 99% of the time, this is going to apply to additions to existing lakefront homes.

Regina Fronczak-Roth – No sheds.

Chairperson Haber – This could be any home, it's not just lakefront.

Dave Campbell – Right, but the majority of our nonconforming homes are lakefront homes, just because they're small cottage lots from way back when, and they've since been converted to 3-bedroom, 3-car garage single-family homes. That's where you get the nonconforming issues.

Chairperson Haber closed the public hearing as there were no additional questions or comments.

Commission Comments:

Jones – I'm okay with it.

Chairperson Haber – Okay, we have to have a motion.

Dave Campbell – Our cover letter provided some recommended motion language.

MOTION by Schinzing, supported by Jones, to recommend approval, to the Commerce Township Board of Trustees, of Item PZ18-0001, Commerce Township Text Amendment, an amendment to the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance No. 3.000, to amend the following Sections: Article 6, Dimensional Standards, Section 6.03, Front Yards, to amend the language for types of structures to be included; and Article 39, Nonconforming Structures, Section 39.03, to amend the terms and authority upon which a nonconforming single-family residential structure may be expanded.

Move to recommend the Commerce Township Board adopt Zoning Amendment Ordinance No. 3.038, an Ordinance to amend Article 6, Sec. 6.03 and Article 39, Sec. 39.03 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

I. NEW BUSINESS:

ITEM 11. SW CORNER – HAGGERTY & CRUMB ROAD – CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Richard Tranter with Dinsmore & Shohl, LLP of Cincinnati OH is representing Cameron General Contractors and Resort Lifestyle Communities and is requesting a conceptual

review of a proposed independent senior living facility located on the south west corner of Haggerty and Crumb Roads. Sidwell No.: 17-25-476-006

Chairperson Haber – I will reiterate that on conceptual review, we receive their opinion, then give ours. None of it has any merit.

Dave Campbell – The property in question is approximately 17.5 acres on the west side of Haggerty Road, between Maple Road to the south, and Crumb Road to the north, near the Meijer store. The property is vacant. Approximately half of the property is encumbered by regulated wetlands on the south side. The property is zoned B-3 General Commercial, and it's master planned also for General Commercial. It's also within the Haggerty Road Overlay, which the Planning Commission is aware, allows additional land uses, so long as those uses are developed to a standard consistent with the Overlay. The Overlay requires better looking buildings, landscaping and site design. If a developer is willing to comply with the additional standards, they get the benefit of the additional land uses that would not otherwise be allowed in the B-3 zoning district. The applicant's team, including Mr. Bob Lewis and Mr. Travis Mihelick, is here this evening to give their comments on the concept plan for Resort Lifestyle Communities (RLC). RLC is an independent living facility with an age restriction of 55 and older. The facility would be situated on the north end of the site, the upland portion, because as we mentioned the wetlands are to the south. The building would be comprised of the central core, and two wings on either side. My understanding is that the core is where a lot of the common amenities are, the dining hall, fitness area, pool, salon, movie theater, and then the residences themselves are in these wings on either side.

I believe 130 dwelling units are proposed, and they approximate that will come out to about 175 residents. A majority of their residents are single occupancy units. There is a mix of lofts, 1-bedroom and 2-bedroom units. There would be optional garages on the south side of the site.

They're proposing two points of access; one on the west side of Haggerty Road, and another on the south side of Crumb Road. The building is effectively facing Crumb Road, and my letter touches upon this. The Haggerty roadside will be the side of the building. One of the things mentioned is to ensure that this side of the building along Haggerty is designed in a building material and quality such that the view from Haggerty Road is not of a non-descript side of a building. There are things that can be done to give it a good visual presence from Haggerty, especially given that this land use would only be allowed because it is within the Haggerty Road Overlay.

The applicant's team provided conceptual elevations. There are materials that I know the Planning Commission typically likes to see; a lot of brick and stone on the first floor, transitioning to what I believe is composite Hardiplank siding on the second and third floors. Obviously a lot of windows and balconies, and variations in the roofline.

We will discuss ensuring this is a quality building. One thing we want to avoid any time we have multi-family developments, or senior living such as this, is long, linear buildings or something that resembles an army barrack.

One thing I mentioned in the report is the sidewalks, so we'd want to talk about that. Particularly, sidewalks along the frontage roads as this development has frontage along three roads; Crumb, Haggerty and Maple. The Planning Commission has the authority to require frontage sidewalks along frontage roads for any developments, and

technically could require sidewalks along all three frontages. We may discuss whether it is viable to have sidewalks along all three, and particularly along Crumb Road which dead ends into the east side of M5.

The idea in general is for the developer to introduce themselves to the Planning Commission and vice versa, and to exchange preliminary thoughts to see if this project should move forward.

Because this is a Special Land Use in the Haggerty Road Overlay, we would be required to have a public hearing for the development. In speaking with the developer's team, we've talked about potentially having that public hearing at the September meeting of the Planning Commission.

Mr. Bob Lewis, Director of Development for Cameron General Contractors, 7101 S. 82nd Street, Lincoln, Nebraska, and Mr. Travis Mihelick with Dinsmore & Shohl LLP, were present on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Lewis – Good evening Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission. We're here tonight to present our conceptual project from 30,000 feet, to provide you with information about who we are, and also get your feedback on this project and how we might be able to incorporate your thoughts and ideas.

To give you background, Cameron General Contractors and Resort Lifestyle Communities (RLC) are sister companies. Cameron is the builder and developer, and RLC is the owner-operator. We currently own and operate 22 communities in the US today. We don't have any in Michigan at this time. We've got 13 under construction, and several more in the development stage.

We build strictly independent senior living. We own and operate every one of our communities. It is 130 units, 128 rentable. We have a live-in manager in one suite, and then we have a guest suite for visitors and/or other residents who live in other communities, but who may travel to Michigan.

Our typical layout is four studios, four 3-bedroom, and then approximately 62 of the 1-bedroom and 62 of the 2-bedroom units. The makeup of the building again would be 130 units.

We build a luxury senior living facility, with 40% of the building as common area. It is 180,000 square feet total, with an approximate 65,000 square foot footprint. We are a highly amenitized-community. We offer the fitness center. We have a 150-seat state-of-the-art theater. We have three meals a day, housekeeping, maintenance, a full-time shuttle bus driver, concierge service, valet parking. All of those are inclusive of the monthly rent. We do month-to-month rent. We have determined in 20 years of business that's the way we want to operate, and we make it easy for our seniors to get in and out as their lifestyle changes.

In the 22 we operate today; 70% of the residents that moved in to those communities lived within an 8-mile radius of the facility. We have determined there is a need here. There is a shortage of this type of independent housing in the area.

To clarify, when we stated the occupancy, about 150 is what we would consider fully occupied. That's our average today. We might be at 165 in one of our communities. It takes about 24 months to lease to full occupancy once we open the doors.

Chairperson Haber – This is just conceptual, so if we say something, it just may not happen.

Mr. Lewis – That's fine.

McKeever – I don't have any questions. I agree with what Dave had pointed out. Sidewalks should be on all three frontages.

Weber – What are your price points?

Mr. Lewis – We're market rate apartments. Today's prices for a 1 or 2-bedroom are going to be somewhere around \$3700 to \$4200 a month. That's all inclusive, 3 meals a day, and all of the amenities.

Weber – What is the turnover, month-to-month at other locations? What do you see as the annual turnover?

Mr. Lewis – I don't know that I have that number. What I can tell you is the average stay is about 6 years. We are 55+, and our average age range is actually 83, with an average stay of 6 years. The type of people that move in here have lost a spouse, the ability to drive, et cetera. and they're looking for a community as they can no longer deal with home ownership.

Parel – I like the concept. It's very nice. Was the reason for the orientation facing Crumb, as opposed to the front facing Haggerty, was that strictly due to the wetlands?

Mr. Lewis – It was probably based on the width of the building, in order to fit and to stay out of the trees. Where the slope and contour start, there's a good tree line there. The intent is not to disturb those trees and to stay up in the grassy field area. After seeing comments from staff, we could sure look at rotating the building because we do understand the look you're trying to do along Haggerty. We may take a look at that to see if we can't rotate and still stay out of the tree line.

Parel – If it were to remain like this, one of my concerns would be the garages facing Haggerty Road. I know this is conceptual. Other than sidewalks, and you mentioned today that it would actually be closer to 150.

Mr. Lewis – Yes, 150 to 165 is our average number of residents.

Parel – So it would actually be less than what was listed here?

Mr. Lewis – Yes.

Parel – Thank you.

Schinzing – Where would deliveries happen? It seems like there's a lot of food prep and all that.

Mr. Lewis – We'll have two semi or larger straight trucks that deliver to the kitchen for food, and then we probably have four van sized smaller trucks that deliver vegetables per week. You're looking at about six trips per week. The way the site is currently laid out, off Haggerty Road, they would come into that area and make the turnaround. The kitchen is in the back of the building on the right side. The area that juts out is a 1.5 story dining hall, and the kitchen is to the right of that.

Schinzing – I think if you rotated the building, the people on Haggerty Road wouldn't have to see the trucks and the deliveries. So, I also like the idea of rotating the building and having that all at the back.

Mr. Lewis – We could sure look at that.

Schinzing – With Haggerty Road, would it be right-in and right-out, or would there be a left permitted there? Obviously, the RCOC has not had a chance to look at this.

Dave Campbell – I can't recall if we sent this to the RCOC yet.

Paula Lankford – No.

Dave Campbell – Usually we want to get through this step first. We did note that they are proposing to align their Haggerty Road driveway with the driveway on the east side for the shopping center. I know the RCOC is always looking for that driveway alignment. When we start talking about turn restrictions, we would want to take a closer look at the traffic volumes generated by a place like this.

Mr. Lewis has mentioned that it's probably not a huge traffic generator, relative to if there were just a standard apartment building, because a lot of the residents are past the point where they're driving. But, we may want to do a trip generation to determine how many trips are generated.

Schinzing – I'm with Bill and the others; I think sidewalks are a necessity on all three sides.

Jones – I like this project and I assume that your fee includes meals.

Mr. Lewis – Yes, it includes three meals a day.

Jones inquired about staff parking.

Mr. Lewis – We will create equivalency of about 25 to 30 full-time jobs. The most staff we have on at any one time is 15, and 2 of them already live there.

Jones – They'll use some of the spaces further out for staff parking?

Mr. Lewis – Correct.

Jones – The closer spaces would be for residents and visitors?

Mr. Lewis – Correct, and we also have valet parking.

Jones – I assume these people use your transportation also.

Mr. Lewis – Yes, we have a full-time shuttle bus driver. The bus is 16 passenger with a wheelchair lift on it. That is provided to the residents at no extra charge. We have scheduled outings and then it's available by reservation for other uses.

Winkler – First, I agree with Mr. Jones. I like the project as well. I do have a couple questions about the south entrance elevation, which would be the north elevation. Dave, if you could zoom in on the center portion. The very top of the roof on both sides of the entry, it looks like there's a couple skylights there. Next to that, there's a little blob that looks like it's screened by a railing. What is that? Is that the HVAC unit?

Mr. Lewis – Yes, we have two air-handling units.

Winkler – Okay. I like the clean lines of the building, and its appearance is very attractive. I'd make one suggestion, and that is to see if you can't conceal that unit in the roof trusses. Just build in a little flat roof area there, because that just seems out of place, given the concept of the rest of the building. That would just make it as clean as it could be. That would be my only suggestion. Otherwise, it's a beautiful building.

Chairperson Haber – I had the opportunity to meet with your team when we were there, and we really hashed this out pretty good. I'm glad to see there's no EIFS there, because I told you that wouldn't work here.

Jay, I have a question for you. If we put sidewalks in there, along Crumb Road, are we going to destroy the trees?

Jay James – No. I'll be honest, I haven't been down Crumb Road in a while, but sidewalks, we can weave those in and out. They don't have to be straight lines down the roads. We can meander. You might lose some small trees, but we can do everything possible to prevent any large trees from coming out.

Chairperson Haber – Sidewalks are important to us here because we're trying to be consistent throughout the community. We want people to walk more. We're putting in the whole Rails to Trails program, which we talked about before, and this can connect. When do you anticipate this happening? What's your schedule?

Mr. Lewis – If everything moved forward, including building permits, we would probably be looking at late spring, mid-summer start of 2019. It takes about 14 months to build this building, weather permitting, and then leasing at that point. So, you're looking at 2020.

Chairperson Haber – Do you have a backup generator?

Mr. Lewis – We do. It's fully screened with the same building material as the building.

Weber – Is this DDA land, Mark? Do we own the land?

Mark Stacey – It is in the DDA district. We do not own the land.

Chairperson Haber – I have one issue, and I want people to think about this. If we swap that building and relocate it, we're going to have the parking on Haggerty Road.

Dave Campbell – I was going to mention the same thing. I would assume rotating the building is a big undertaking for the developer. Yes, if your entrance is fronting Haggerty Road, you'll also have a parking lot fronting on Haggerty Road. I was interested in the Planning Commission's opinion of a balance between those two things.

Chairperson Haber – I think I'd prefer to have it the way it is, and have a really nice looking building facing Haggerty Road; something to be proud of. I'd like you to look into swapping that, because that's the consensus we're getting here. I don't have anything more, except can I put my name in? It sounds good. Did we help you here?

Mr. Lewis – Absolutely, and Dave with his staff report that he prepared gave us some direction. Just for the record, we're not opposed to the sidewalk issue. We have a sidewalk that's continuous around the building for our residents, which can connect out. That would be a positive.

Chairperson Haber – I like the concept, and Brian's point was well taken. We don't like to see mechanicals.

Dave Campbell – I was wondering if Mr. Lewis could speak a little to emergency response, and the type of trips that a place like this would generate amongst fire and ambulatory services. I know with facilities like this, or more so with assisted living type facilities, one of the concerns is the potential for putting a burden on emergency responders. I know you provided some data on other facilities.

Mr. Lewis – I'd be glad too, and I've got a little more information after a site visit down in Raleigh, North Carolina. We average about four emergency calls per week to our communities. That's all calls. We have a medical alert system that goes to our staff, and then our staff is first onsite to do an evaluation and determine if 911 needs to be called. After talking with the management couple in Raleigh, they're allowed to call and ask for lift-assist, versus a fire department or an ambulance rushing to the site. Instead of sirens and an emergency situation, it's not quite as timely but they do a lift-assist. I don't know if that's something we can look into here.

Dave Campbell – Thank you. The other question I had as we've talked about whether or not to rotate the building, or if there's more that could be done along Haggerty Road; Mr. Stacey and I were talking this morning. If the building were to keep its current orientation, one of the questions is, would there be any interest in taking elements such as these dormers that are currently proposed along the main entrance, and incorporating those along the east side of the building, the side facing Haggerty Road,

to potentially dress that side up a little bit? Is there a possibility of putting something that more resembles an entrance along that side of the building? It wouldn't necessarily have to be a functional entrance, but it would give that aesthetic from the road. If the developer were to come up with some ideas like that, might that be of interest to you if we kept the current orientation and keep the building facing Crumb Road?

Chairperson Haber – I think that's a good point there.

Weber – I think it would help too with an orientation showing the garages, just to see how that would look.

Discussion took place regarding the proposed location of the garages.

Chairperson Haber – Is there any way those garages could be reoriented? I don't care so much about the one on the west side, but the east side.

Mr. Lewis – We can look at that.

Bennet Lublin, 613 Pinetree, Walled Lake, MI – I'm reading in there, the total square footage of the building is 117,500?

Dave Campbell – I thought we had 180,000.

Mr. Lewis – Yes, roughly 180,000.

Bennet Lublin – So 120,000 on the two sides, and 60,000 in the middle?

Mr. Lewis – That's the total square footage, correct.

Bennet Lublin – Thank you.

J: OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION:

None.

K: PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Dave Campbell –

- We haven't met since June, so I have a couple things to bring you up-to-date on.
- Potentially at the September meeting, and in addition to seeing this team again, is that Pulte Homes is looking at vacant property at the southeast corner of Glengary and Wixom Roads. The property owner had site plan approval to do approximately 70 homes on this property, which is 30+ acres. The owner had his site plan in 2006 before the economy crashed. Pulte is negotiating to acquire the property and do closer to 90 homes; a little bit smaller lots, with a little bit more density. In order to get there, they would have to have the property rezoned, or they'll propose a PUD. One of the first steps is a pre-application conference with the Supervisor, staff and Jay James. We have that scheduled for this week. If Pulte wants to proceed, their next step is to bring a concept plan to the Planning

Commission. Their approach with the Township is that with the higher density and smaller lots is to say that this is the closest you'll be able to get to starter homes in Commerce Township. They're hoping to get a market in the \$300,000 range. They're wanting to go to 50-foot frontage lots; 8,000 square foot lots.

Discussion continued regarding density, lot sizes, tree preservation, clustering, ITC wires in the area of the site, the PUD process and upcoming meetings with Pulte.

- The M5 Bridge; hopefully everybody has had a chance to see the progress. We're looking at closer to October now, instead of September, before that is open. It's a slight delay from what they originally anticipated. They delay is for an over-abundance of caution; they want to reinforce some things. They're certainly making steady progress on the project.
- We're working with the RCOC on the landscape plan to replace the snow fence at the M5 and Pontiac Trail roundabout. The fences forced people to slow down, so now they want to do a more permanent replacement, which will be some sort of evergreens and shrubs. They have a plan in place, and they're putting that through their engineer to get a cost estimate. They're hoping we can share in the cost of that project.
- As Mr. Winkler mentioned, Mr. Aikens will be at the DDA meeting in a couple weeks to give an update on his project.
- We may be seeing a proposal for a small single-family neighborhood at the southwest corner of Carroll Lake and Wise. The Planning Commission has seen different concepts for this site over the years. The owner has a buyer who wants to see if he can get about nine new homes on that corner. It's a tight corner and probably eight or nine is the most they would get.
- We've had some conceptual meetings over the last few weeks, including someone moving into the former Hiller's at Commerce and Union Lake, and a potential development on vacant land at the corner of Martin and Boulder Court. I have more details if you're interested.
- It sounds like the residential developer who is looking at the Beaumont property is going to hold their offer. That might be back out for bids. That's a big piece of property at a high-profile location, so we're going to watch that one closely.
- Don't forget to vote tomorrow, if you haven't already voted absentee.

Weber – Dave, the architect and engineer for the bridge, they're not coming back to the Township with added costs, are they?

Dave Campbell – Not that we know of yet. We have the wave panels that go across the bridge. Those obviously have a weight and wind load to them. The bridge contractor, up until recently, assumed that the 8' fence that goes across the bridge was just standard. Then there was the realization that it can't be standard, because it has to take on the added weight and wind load of these wave panels. So what's going to have to happen, instead of having aluminum fence posts, is that they will need to be upgraded to steel to take on the added wind load. They're now designing those fenceposts, figuring out the

grades of steel and whatever else they do. We'll see where it goes. So far, no one has said that will result in a bill to the Township.

Winkler – I have a question for Jay. A few months ago, we saw a residential development on the southwest corner of Loon Lake and Benstein. Has that gained any traction?

Dave Campbell – That's Windwheel. They got condominium site plan approval from both the Planning Commission and the Township Board. Since then, they have not submitted engineering plans that I'm aware of.

Jones – You talked about the Beaumont property. I had discussions six months ago with Dave Scott regarding the Township Board's feeling in terms of that many more apartment rentals. It would be helpful to us on the Planning Commission if the Board would take a position as to what they would prefer to see with those properties. We could use guidance.

Dave Campbell – I agree, certainly on projects of that size and that are high-profile, we should get the Township Board's input long before anybody submits anything in a formal manner. We're probably long overdue to have a joint meeting with the Township Board and we should make a point of doing it every year.

Schinzing – Can we make sure there's no sewage discussion on the agenda?

Chairperson Haber – Dave, if you're going to do that, let's look at September. Let's move this along.

Jay, I talked to Dave last week and wanted to mention it to you. Can you notify us when there's a change of usage in a building? We'd like to know that. An example is Hiller's.

Jay James – We can do that.

- **NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: SEPTEMBER 17, 2018 @ 7PM**

L: ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Schinzing, supported by Weber, to adjourn the meeting at 8:14pm.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Brian Winkler, Secretary