

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF COMMERCE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Monday, September 17, 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
Jay James, Engineer/Building Inspector
Jason Mayer, Township Engineer
Mark Stacey, DDA Director

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Jones, supported by Schinzing, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda of September 17, 2018, as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Jones, supported by Winkler, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of August 8, 2018, with one correction to Page 12, top of page, Mr. Lewis commentary, last sentence, revise the word “jets” to *juts*.

Discussion took place regarding Weber’s comment on Page 15. Weber confirmed he stated orientation, and he clarified that he was looking for something on their schematic or on their plan, showing a different view of the garages.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES

Chairperson Haber thanked Jay James for the update on the changes to local businesses. Jay gave all the credit to Judy, and he would pass along the appreciation.

Bill McKeever – Zoning Board of Appeals

- We have not had an agenda since our last meeting.

George Weber – Township Board of Trustees

- We met on September 11th.
- The primary purpose was to go through a discussion on budgets.
- We went through several SADs.
- Probably the greatest discussion we had with the public centered around the Outrun Hunger race, their utilization of the Township Hall and the community trails around the Hall, which was ultimately approved for that use. Going forward though, we have agreed to put a policy in place on how the Township Hall can be used by the public.

Brian Winkler – Downtown Development Authority

- At the August 21st DDA Meeting, we had a couple items of note.
- One is that the RCOC is going to replace the snow fences with landscaping at the Pontiac Trail roundabout. You'll recall that snow fence was added to slow traffic coming in from the north and the east.

Dave Campbell – I might have to update Brian's update. Everybody has probably seen the snow fences on the northbound and westbound approaches. The purpose is to force people to slow down as they enter the roundabout by impeding their vision. It was meant to be an experiment by the RCOC. The fences have been up for over a year. Based upon the data collected, they are effective at forcing people to slow down. Now that they know it works, they want to put in something more permanent. We've talked about landscaping, and challenges with irrigation and maintenance. We're still trying to figure that out.

We may look in a different direction at some sort of a wall, decorative fence, or something else, keeping in mind that whatever we do there may be an interim solution. This depends upon what happens with the Five & Main development, at the northeast corner of the roundabout, and whether the roundabout needs to be reconfigured to accommodate the development, or whether the developer wants to do a landscape plan of his own, utilizing those medians to incorporate everything together as a gateway into the development.

Discussion continued regarding irrigation, the potential for enlarging the roundabout, and the RCOC having a consultant perform a traffic impact study to verify the findings of the developer's recent traffic study. Widening of the roundabout is a concern as it creates opportunity for lane confusion and side swipes.

Brian Winkler –

- In addition, when reviewing July MTT judgements at the DDA Meeting, Mark mentioned a case in Escanaba where Menard's wants their taxes to go to zero on the property they built.
- This has become such an issue that a number of communities, including Commerce Township, are contributing to Escanaba's legal fund.
- Mark thought it was worth noting, particularly with the number of big boxes that we have along Haggerty Road, in the DDA area.
- I urge you to look at the August 21st DDA Minutes for more details.

Chairperson Haber – Mark, anything you want to add?

Mark Stacey, DDA Director – Brian covered it well. Obviously big box stores and their tax base for the DDA are a significant issue.

The only other thing I'd like to point out is the Pulte development, Merrill Park, is moving along exceptionally. If you have a chance, you should drive through there. I think the subdivision is going to be turned over to the homeowner's by the end of this year.

Jay James – Building Department

- There's a lot going on, but nothing exciting outside of the norm.

George Weber – Let me make one additional comment regarding last week’s Township Board meeting. It’s germane to the Pulte discussion at Oak Hills. The Rose Button land, due north at Wixom and Glengary; there was discussion on how that should be zoned. Correct me if I’m wrong, Dave, but there was a temporary or a contingent zoning.

Dave Campbell – A Conditional Rezoning.

George Weber – A Conditional Rezoning, and the Board would ultimately go back to the original R-1A zoning for lots of reasons.

Dave Campbell – That is the desire of the Board. The Township Attorney is looking at the Conditional Rezoning agreement from 2006, just to ensure that we’re in good legal standing if the Board does move forward with vacating that Conditional Rezoning agreement. I’ll keep you updated.

E. PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

None.

F. TABLED ITEMS

None.

G. OLD BUSINESS

None.

>>The Commission reviewed Items H1 and I1 together, then followed the review with separate motions for each item.

H. SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

ITEM H1: PSU18-004 – COMMERCE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY – SPECIAL LAND USE

Bowman Consulting Group, Ltd of Chicago IL, representing Resort Lifestyle Communities is requesting a Special Land Use for a new senior independent living development in the HRC Haggerty Road Corridor Overlay District proposed on approximately 17 vacant acres along the west side of Haggerty Road between Maple and Crumb. Sidwell No.: 17-25-476-006

I. NEW BUSINESS:

ITEM I1: PSP18-0005 – COMMERCE RETIREMENT COMMUNITY

Bowman Consulting Group, Ltd of Chicago IL is requesting site plan approval to construct a new senior independent living development located along the west side of Haggerty Road between Maple and Crumb. Sidwell No.: 17-25-476-006

Dave Campbell noted that there are two Planning Department review letters in the packet; one dated September 10th, and another dated September 13th. The updated version includes minor changes which are bolded and highlighted in yellow.

He gave a review of the location, current zoning, and the HRC Overlay. The HRC allows uses that are not allowed by the underlying zoning districts, so long as those additional uses are designed and built to the higher and better standards as required by the HRC. The proposed site plan is a 130-unit, 3-story, adult, independent living facility, Resort Lifestyle Communities (RLC). The facility will include a mix of studios, 1-bedroom, 2-bedroom and a few 3-bedroom units. There is a main core in the middle, with two wings on either side. The developer has done similar developments. The wings are adjustable and can be configured to the site, therefore a U-shaped building is proposed here. Independent living is technically considered multi-family from a zoning standpoint, and multi-family is a use allowed within the HRC Overlay as a Special Land Use.

Dave reviewed accessibility, including two driveways, along with details about the residents, the units, and extensive amenities.

He explained the 8 standard criteria to be evaluated for any Special Land Use. There's also specific development criteria for the HRC Overlay. The HRC defers to the Special Land Use standards of Article 26 for senior housing. The bulk of the review letter covers the specific criteria for senior housing as a Special Land Use in the HRC.

The development as proposed complies with many of the dimensional standards. Note that the Engineer and his team made a quick change to bring all of the units up to the minimum floor area standards. The Engineer also worked with the Landscape Architect to make adjustments.

The Planning Commission should discuss the design of the building, particularly the building height and length. There are standards in Zoning Ordinance for how long a multi-family building can be, to avoid for example apartment complexes that look like a series of army barracks. The standards create breaks and architectural variations. In addition, there are standards in the Zoning Ordinance relative to how tall the building can be, along with opportunities for the Planning Commission to make exceptions to those height standards, if they make a determination that this building as proposed satisfies a number of criteria.

A good bit of discussion is spent on the proposed sidewalks. The site fronts on three roads, Maple, Haggerty and Crumb Roads. The developer is proposing sidewalks on two of those three fronts, with no sidewalk along the north side of Maple Road. The north side of Maple Road had no sidewalk to connect to, so instead, there is potential to have the developer contribute funds toward continuation of the sidewalk that's already being developed along the south side of Maple Road.

Sidewalks and pathway connections were reviewed in detail on the overhead. Dave Campbell concluded by indicating that separate motions would need to be made for Special Land Use and site plan. Recommended language was provided in the review letter, along with findings and conditions, if the Planning Commission opts to make said motions.

The RLC project team was present to address the request, including Developer, Bob Lewis, Cameron General Contractors, 7101 S. 82nd Street, Lincoln, NE; Engineer, Payman Homayouni, PE, Bowman Consulting Group, Ltd., 311 S. Wacker Dr, Ste 1950, Chicago, IL; and Attorney, J. Travis Mihelick, Dinsmore & Shohl LLP, 900 Wilshire Dr., Ste 300, Troy, MI.

Mr. Mihelick introduced the team and provided an overview of the request for the Special Land Use and site plan approval. He also gave background information on RLC. He stated the team had visuals to present, including photos and a drive-by, along with a materials board.

Mr. Lewis thanked the Township staff and the consultants for their efforts in reviewing the project. He feels they all did a great job, and it has been nice to work with them. Since the conceptual review 6 weeks ago, RLC has opened 2 more communities, and now has 24 open and operational across the U.S., along with 11 in construction and 22 in development. RLC is out of Lincoln, Nebraska, and they are the builder, owner/operator of all the communities. RLC has been around since the late 90s. Mr. Lewis presented a Power Point and elaborated on the community model, the lifestyle, amenities offered, 24/7 staffing, 3 meals a day included in monthly rent, transportation, valet parking, weekly housekeeping, full-time maintenance, a 150-seat theater. There is not a pool in this community. There is a full-time activities director and various activities offered. There will be an onsite bank, pharmacy, gift shop, salon/barber, library, billiard room to name a few. All apartments have full kitchens, but again, 3 meals a day are offered in the dining room and most residents take advantage of that.

Mr. Lewis addressed the impact upon the community. They will invest over \$30 million into the facility. There will be 22 equivalent full-time employees. There will be no impact on schools as the residents are seniors. It's a very low impact on traffic as 50% of the residents don't drive or have cars.

Mr. Homayouni provided an overview of the site layout on the overhead. The wings are basically 90 degrees to fit the site, parallel to Haggerty. He reviewed the two entrances to the site, one off Haggerty and one off Crumb Road. He explained that initially, the entrances were to line up with the driveways across the street; however, the Haggerty entrance was shifted to the north by about 96'. That will be verified to ensure it meets the requirements.

He addressed utilities, along with the second entrance off Crumb Road, which was also shifted over about 100' to the west, and this relocation was in an effort to preserve a 36" oak tree. A 5' sidewalk is proposed along the north side of the site, along Crumb Road, and an 5' sidewalk along Haggerty. He discussed additional efforts for tree preservation and landscaping details. He stated that there is existing sanitary sewer and water available, and the conceptual layout has been approved. They have also coordinated with the Fire Department and essentially were approved. A traffic study was done, and the impact is very small. One of the recommendations was to add a taper into the site off of Haggerty, and that will be added.

Mr. Mihelick reviewed the Planning Department's report. He indicated that the vast majority of the project standards have been met, and/or exceeded; density, setbacks, minimum floor issue, sloping, lighting, parking. Favorable recommendations were received from Engineering, Landscaping and the Fire Department. Points identified in the report by David Campbell are as follows. There are exceptions in the ordinance for decorative elements. One of the concerns of the Planning Commission was hiding the HVAC system and mechanical units, and that is where a lot of the height variations are,

to create aesthetically pleasing elements to hide those items and satisfy the requirements.

Regarding the sidewalk, one of the recommendations is to widen the sidewalk along Haggerty to 8'. It was proposed for 5'. There is no problem with the 8' width.

Mr. Mihelick deferred to Mr. Lewis regarding the payment in lieu of a sidewalk along Maple Road.

Mr. Lewis had spoken with David Campbell regarding payment in lieu, due to the fact that there is no existing sidewalk on the north side of Maple Road. The RLC team has no opposition to that suggestion for payment in lieu of the sidewalk. He added that they will work with staff to come up with an agreeable offset fee.

The RLC team continued their review, presenting photos of other existing RLC buildings, their materials board, and discussing the quality of the materials, including brick, stone, architectural concrete, columns, Hardiplank cement board, aluminum siding, and architectural shingles. They also shared their drive-by video on the overhead, with a virtual view from Haggerty road of the building perspectives and landscaping. Mr. Homayouni noted that there would be supplemental landscaping in the area of the dumpster enclosure, and at the entrances and corners of the development. Mr. Lewis noted the elevation changes along Haggerty Road; the site remains level while the road drops down heading south.

Dave Campbell – I know the Planning Commission members were curious about what the actual view of the facility would be from Haggerty Road, given that the road sits at a lower elevation than the finished floor elevation of this building.

Schinzing – Those berms are actual?

Dave Campbell – That's the actual grade of the road. A lot of Haggerty Road sits down in a valley as it goes by this site.

Chairperson Haber opened the public hearing.

No comments.

Chairperson Haber closed the public hearing.

Commission Comments:

Winkler – The petitioner has done most everything that we asked for at the conceptual review. I felt the building was very attractive, and seeing the building materials has reinforced that. The drive-by also gives an illustration of the attractive building. As to the site plan, I don't see anything that jumps out as being out of the ordinary or objectionable. As usual, Dave has done a good job of explaining this, and describing the steps that the petitioner has made to meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

Jones – I'm in agreement with Brian. One thing I would like to say is that the RCOC's request for lining up driveways is something that has been important to us. A few years

ago, Shearwater actually lost one building of units so that we could line up the driveway. They did that for safety reasons. I would request that both driveways line up with the other road. Other than that, I'm satisfied.

Chairperson Haber – Tom, I want you to take a good look at that. I think on Haggerty Road, it really needs to be lined up because it's an important spot; but I don't have much objection on Crumb Road not being lined up. That's my thought and we can talk about it more.

Jones – I would agree that's not nearly as important. There isn't a huge traffic problem there. That will be up to the RCOC as to whether they accept that.

Chairperson Haber – Haggerty is important.

Schinzing – I wanted to see the first view again, from Haggerty Road.

Dave Campbell brought up the perspective rendering from Haggerty Road, the most northerly view.

Schinzing – I like the berm because it covers more, but the problem with the berm is that it covers so much of the lower elevation material, and it looks like it's all aluminum siding from Haggerty.

Dave Campbell – A couple clarifications. I know the developer mentioned aluminum siding. My understanding is that this is actually the cement board siding, and the aluminum paneling is just an accent.

Schinzing – Still, it's all one thing all the way across.

Dave Campbell – I understand, and it's not so much a berm as it is just an existing difference in the elevation. If you're driving along Haggerty Road, you'll see there's a grade difference that gets steeper as you continue south. Haggerty Road sits about 10' lower than the developed portion of this site.

Schinzing – I understand that it's a natural edge. My thinking is that it does not present the best look it could because you're covering up so much of that elevation element.

Chairperson Haber – I agree. It may not be aluminum siding, but it gives that appearance. We need to look into taking the stone or brick elements up higher.

Parel – In this rendering, the smaller building, is that the garages?

Dave Campbell – Yes.

Parel – Then the dumpsters are behind those?

Dave Campbell – They're to the west. (Indicated on the overhead).

Parel – Okay. Dave, I had a question regarding the east and west elevations and how they exceed the allowable length. Are we saying it's the north and south distance on those?

Dave Campbell – Correct. You measure from this point to this point, and per the Zoning Ordinance, if you consider that to be one continuous plain, then it exceeds the allowable length. However, the question for you is, is that truly one continuous plain, or are there enough breaks, turns and variations in how the walls project that it's really not one continuous plain? The intent is to prevent the appearance of army barracks. It is your call to determine if their proposal is acceptable.

Parel – If we make that call, and we say it's okay, does that trigger a question of the 3rd story height?

Dave Campbell – The question of the length doesn't necessarily impact the question of height.

Parel – Those are two separate issues?

Dave Campbell – If you were to make a motion tonight, and as you'll see in my recommended language for the site plan, the first thing I would want you to do is make a number of findings. One of the findings has to do with the height of the building, and another with the lengths.

Chairperson Haber asked to see the east view again. Schinzing stated that the bottom photo shows a berm.

Parel – I support the sidewalk contribution.

Weber – Dave can you go to their website, rlcommunities.com? I looked at all the existing communities I could find to see what their buildings look like. The Hardiplank looked tired on some, but there's one that really stuck out that I thought looked great, the Parkside Village just outside of Denver. I'm wondering if this design will look similar to that.

Dave Campbell brought up the photo of Parkside Village on the overhead.

Weber – On this building, you used much more stone, and it looks like less Hardiplank and less brick. Are we going to see something like this in the front, and if so, could something like this, to some extent, be wrapped around the side? I have the exact same comment on the east and west sides, the comment that Russ had; especially from the lower road elevation, all you see is Hardiplank.

Jones – Good point.

Weber – Those verticals in the middle, if those were stone going all the way up, you would then break up the planks.

As to the Haggerty Road entrance, as close as that is to Maple Road, can you turn left there if you're heading north?

Dave Campbell – Can you make an exiting left turn from that driveway?

Weber – No, can you turn into the driveway? Is it full-access? Because for people heading south on Haggerty, that traffic light at Maple jams up past Crumb Road. Turning left into that traffic, if you're heading north on Haggerty, seems a problem waiting to happen, regardless of where the entrance is.

Dave Campbell – Where they're proposing the driveway, there is a dedicated center left-turn lane. It does back up pretty far from Maple.

Weber – The dedicated turn lane then comes down far enough? I'm not sure where it stops.

Dave Campbell – It goes at least as far as past Meijer.

Weber – Okay, never mind.

Dave Campbell – The traffic impact assessment done by our Traffic Engineer did not make any recommendations for any turn restrictions, inbound or outbound. The only recommendation was that this driveway have a deceleration taper for southbound traffic making the right turn.

Weber – Does the potential future cross-access to the west of this need to be included in the proposed motion?

Dave Campbell – The property to the west at one time was approved for a retail center. The parking lot, landscape islands and underground utilities were built, but the building was never built. We don't know yet what will become of this property, but it's likely to develop sometime in the foreseeable future. We want to leave the option open for internal cross-access here. Once the adjacent property use and layout is determined, the cross-access would be reviewed again to ensure it makes sense to connect the two sites. I'm hoping to get a note on the plan indicating that, if and when the day comes where we need cross-access, this developer is willing to provide it.

Weber – I know that a very high percentage of the residents are going to come from within the Commerce Township area. The concern would be whether there will be any taxing impact upon fire, rescue and/or police. We are sensitive in this area with existing senior communities, and the question centers around lifts. There's no issue with medical emergencies, but lifts take two people out of our fire department or our rescue service to come for a lift. Is that something that your staff can take more of the responsibility for, rather than our fire and rescue?

Mr. Lewis – Our staff today is not assist-and-lift. When we do call fire and rescue, we do indicate that it's a lift. The managers are trained, and those are not high priority emergencies if you will, and therefore it may take a little longer for a response. Today we don't, but we recognize that is an issue. I don't know how that will get addressed in the future, but it would be a process we could discuss in a sit-down with fire and rescue.

We average about 4 rescue calls a week. We feel that the senior community as a whole is a safer location than if these people were living in single-family homes. It is our opinion that with 150-165 residents, you actually have less calls here than if they were all living in single-family homes, because they're not performing maintenance tasks or cooking, et cetera.

Weber – Good answer. Thank you. I think what you've done is outstanding.

McKeever – Are you accommodating the taper lane, the decel lane?

Mr. Homayouni – The only recommendation was to provide a taper lane, with a minimum of 50'. We looked at this along Haggerty and it's about 75'.

Chairperson Haber – I'm happy you agree to the sidewalks on the south side of Maple instead. Thank you for that. We have to be consistent in the community with sidewalk requirements.

I'm not sure you have enough parking. People today have two cars. I speak from personal experience as my mother was in a facility that only had one space. We found that a lot of people parked their cars there and never took them out, and the second person had a second car that was taking up another space. I think maybe you should look at that a little more.

As to internal open spaces, are you going to provide a place for people to walk outside other than the sidewalks, interior space?

Mr. Lewis – We do have an exterior sidewalk that is contiguous for those who want to walk outside the building. We have an area outside the dining hall, a patio area. About 40% of the building is common area. I can tell you that today, on all of our communities, the average age is 80 years old, and they are typically people who have lost a spouse. About 50% of them do not drive. They ride the shuttle bus that we provide. We've found that the outside common areas don't get used.

Chairperson Haber – I have to yield to your expertise. Although I'm extremely close to 80, I can walk really well.

The dumpsters were addressed. The sidewalks are set.

As far as site plan goes, we're going to need to revisit the brick. I think what you had there was nice, but it's not going to be visible from the road. This is a main thoroughfare. I like what George suggested with bringing the columns up on the building.

Weber – Larry, dead-center at the top elevation, where you can see that; would it be agreeable if they used that stone to break up the siding?

Chairperson Haber – Yes and no. Yes, I think I'd like to see it go all the way up, but I'd also like to see another story of stone. We're not going to see the first floor of stone at all, so I'd like to see it up to the second floor.

Mr. Lewis – We can certainly look at extending the brick up the second floor, and then carrying that feature up, those columns. We can either continue brick, or go to the second level with the stone. We have some other buildings where we've done exactly that, so I feel comfortable in agreeing with those conditions.

Chairperson Haber – Do it with this one.
The cross-access is something that we have to have in the agreement.

Mr. Lewis – We've talked internally and we have no issue with cross-access with that property in the future. We've got a drive along that side.

Discussions continued between Chairperson Haber and Mr. Lewis regarding issues with the utility pole, issues with the RCOC and lining up drives, along with aesthetics. Mr. Lewis stated that they will work with the RCOC to arrive at an agreement.

Chairperson Haber – If you're going out onto Haggerty Road, turning right won't be a problem; however, if they want to go left northbound, that presents an issue. That needs to happen at Crumb Road instead.

Dave Campbell – Your suggestion is that if someone needs to head northbound on Haggerty Road, they should not be using the Haggerty Road driveway? They should instead go out to Crumb Road, make a right turn onto Crumb, then a left from Crumb to northbound Haggerty?

Chairperson Haber – Yes.

Dave Campbell – That sounds like something that could be done with wayfinding signage.

Chairperson Haber – Which brings me to the next point, signage. We will allow you to work that out administratively.

Dave Campbell – We're talking about doing some improvements to the side of the building, the view from Haggerty Road; adding brick and/or stone, et cetera. Is that only on the Haggerty Road side, or is that also on the west side of the building, abutting the vacant property?

Chairperson Haber – I think it needs to be consistent. Bob, is that clear?

Mr. Lewis – Yes, right. I think we wanted to address the parking and I'll let Travis do that.

Mr. Mihelick – One of the concerns you had was the parking. The ordinance requires one per unit, and then plus one for every full-time employee. In this case, it would be 150. We're proposing 165. Not only does it exceed the ordinance, but in other communities the parking net is more than sufficient for both the residents and the employees; it's 1.15 spaces per unit, which happens to be about 150. Whether it's your ordinance, or our experience in 24 other communities, those spaces are sufficient. I think it provides ample parking for the community.

Chairperson Haber – You have the expertise. I just have the experience at the facility I was involved in. Snow removal is another consideration.

Dave Campbell – There is a potential middle ground. If you wanted, they could show deferred parking of another 15 to 20 spaces. They would not build it as part of their construction, but they could design the site and the stormwater to accommodate additional parking spaces shown as deferred.

Chairperson Haber – Good thought.

Jay, what is the gradient between the back of the building and the retention area?

Jay James – It looks like from the back of the building, it's 6' lower.

Chairperson Haber – Are you going to have a fence there for safety?

Jay James – It's a gradual slope from the back of the building.

Mr. Lewis – That is a wooded area. We're not opposed to putting a fence, but we typically wouldn't do so.

Chairperson Haber – If you're comfortable with it, I am.

Dave Campbell – Mr. Lewis, that's from your experience running other facilities, and you don't have a memory care component?

Mr. Lewis – Correct, we typically do not fence our communities, considering the type of residents that we have.

Jay James – I know we discussed the perspective drawings today. You're showing those trees there along Haggerty Road, which block a lot of the building. Are those trees actually proposed to go in? I'm looking at your landscape plan, and they don't seem to correlate.

Dave Campbell – There are plantings there, but they don't appear to be trees. It looks like shrubs.

Mr. Lewis – The landscape plan we originally submitted was to meet the code. We are proposing additional landscaping along Haggerty, and so what we are showing is what we are proposing.

Chairperson Haber – The trees we see there are what you're thinking about doing?

Mr. Lewis – Yes.

Jay James – I just wanted to make sure because on the landscape tree requirements, it says; *...no shade or ornamental trees due to overhead utility lines.*

Mr. Lewis – Again, that was what we submitted, but we have gone back after that submittal and looked at that. There is an overhead power line, but the intent would be to put those in behind the power lines, on our property, at the street. I think they're at 50' spacing, so you're looking at 10 or so.

Chairperson Haber – Dave, will you put that in the landscaping?

Mr. Lewis – As to the driveway on Haggerty, we're not opposed to the right-in, right-out if that's what is stipulated there.

Chairperson Haber – There's so much traffic on Haggerty Road.

Mr. Lewis – I would say that our residents aren't on the road at 7-9 or 4-6. Their peak hours are 11-2:30, if they go out.

Dave Campbell – As far as the outbound left-turn restriction, if the Planning Commission is agreeable, could we discuss that with our Traffic Engineer?

Chairperson Haber – No problem, that can be done administratively.

Mr. Lewis – We have banked parking before, and we would agree to show that as future banked parking.

Chairperson Haber – Thank you.

Dave Campbell – I want to confirm your findings. On the Special Land Use, what I'm hearing on the building material is some improvement to both the east and west sides of the building in terms of incorporating more brick and more stone.

Chairperson Haber – Yes, and it should be consistent on both sides.

Jones – To be approved administratively by the Planning Director.

Dave Campbell – We will work with them to come with a payment in lieu of the sidewalk along Maple.

As far as improvements to the open space area, you're agreeable to letting those remain in the vegetated state.

Chairperson Haber – Okay. On the façade, they're looking to carry the brick and stone up to the second floor and with the verticals in the center.

Also, the additional 10 trees.

Schinzing – Yes, and the banked parking.

Dave Campbell – If we're looking at a motion for site plan approval, any further conversation on the request for a height exception?

Jones – What is the difference?

Dave Campbell – The maximum height in this zoning district was 3-stories and 35'. They're obviously at 3-stories, but the two wings of the building, east and west sides, those go up to 37.5', and the main core peak is at 46'. This was not brought up as a concern with the Fire Department.

One of the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance is that they have variation in their roofline and roof pitch to give the building uniqueness. You have the authority to approve that as a height exception.

Schinzing – Then they don't have to go to the ZBA?

Dave Campbell – Correct, if you approve it as a height exception.

Chairperson Haber – Bill, do you have any objection?

McKeever – No.

In addition, there were no objections from the other Planning Commissioners.

Dave Campbell – Are you agreeable that the east and west sides of the building have enough variation, such that it's not one, long continuous building, and therefore the length is acceptable?

The Commissioners agreed.

Dave Campbell – They're going to show deferred parking. In addition, it is in the Zoning Ordinance that a facility such as this has to take its main access off of a major thoroughfare. Crumb Road is not classified as a major thoroughfare. The Planning Commission has the authority to allow a facility to come off of a road classified as a local road, and I want to be sure you are all comfortable with that.

Chairperson Haber – I think we're all in agreement that Crumb Road should be considered the main entrance.

Dave Campbell – The 8' sidewalk was agreeable on Haggerty Road.

Mr. Lewis – Yes.

Dave Campbell – We discussed cross vehicular access and the note will be added to the plan. We will look at restricting outbound lefts. We will look at deferred parking, and we're going to double check the trees along Haggerty.

MOTION by Schinzing, supported by Jones, that the Planning Commission **approves, with conditions**, Item PSU18-004, Commerce Retirement Community, Special Land Use; the request by Bowman Consulting Group, Ltd of Chicago IL, representing Resort Lifestyle Communities, for a Special Land Use for a new senior independent living development in the HRC Haggerty Road Corridor Overlay District proposed on approximately 17 vacant acres along the west side of Haggerty Road between Maple and Crumb. Sidwell No.: 17-25-476-006

Move to approve PSU #18-004, a special land use for Resort Lifestyle Communities of Commerce, to allow a multi-family senior independent living facility within the Haggerty Road Corridor overlay zoning district on undeveloped property along the west side of Haggerty Road between Maple and Crumb Roads. Special land use approval is based on a finding that the applicant has demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission that the proposed use complies with the special land use criteria of Section 34.08 of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as the use standards of Sec. 26.110, including the use standards as they apply to quality building design and materials.

Special land use approval is based on the following conditions:

1. Approval of a corresponding site plan by the Planning Commission;
2. A financial commitment by the Developer bound by terms agreeable to the Township Attorney, Planning Director, and Twp. Engineer to contribute toward the construction of a pathway along the south side of Maple Road between M-5 and Haggerty Road in an amount proportionate to the estimated cost of constructing a sidewalk along the subject property's frontage on the north side of Maple Road;
3. The proposed driveway on the west side of Haggerty Road include a right-turn deceleration taper as recommended by the findings of the Traffic Engineer, unless an alternative is required by the RCOC;
4. The facility to be addressed and marketed as located in Commerce Township.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

MOTION by Schinzing, supported by Jones, that the Planning Commission **approves, with conditions**, Item PSP18-0005, Commerce Retirement community; the request by Bowman Consulting Group, Ltd of Chicago IL for site plan approval to construct a new senior independent living development located along the west side of Haggerty Road between Maple and Crumb. Sidwell No.: 17-25-476-006

Move to approve Site Plan #PSP18-0005, Resort Lifestyle Communities of Commerce, a 130-unit senior independent living facility to be located upon 17.5 undeveloped acres along the west side of Haggerty Road between Crumb and Maple Roads.

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

1. The building's proposed height qualifies for a height exception under Sec. 6.05 of the Zoning Ordinance from the Planning Commission due to the required variations in roofline and roof pitch;

2. The proposed building's east and west elevations include sufficient variation to not be considered "a continuous plane of uninterrupted wall without breaks and corners", thereby meeting the maximum building length requirements of the Zoning Ordinance;
3. The 50 enclosed garage spaces can be considered parking spaces for the purpose of satisfying the minimum parking requirements of the Zoning Ordinance;
4. The primary driveway on Crumb Road is acceptable despite its classification as a local road;

Site plan approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Review and approval of engineered construction plans by the Township Engineer, Fire Marshal, and Building Department;
2. Review and approval of the proposed driveways by the Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC);
3. Administrative review and approval by the Planning Department of a revised site plan with the following revisions:
 - a. The proposed building materials and architecture to address the comments of the Planning Commission as discussed herein;
 - b. The proposed frontage sidewalk along Haggerty Road to be 8 feet in width, as a continuation of the sidewalk network already established;
 - c. Dumpster enclosure designed in accordance with Sec. 26.517 of the Zoning Ordinance (incl. the material of the enclosure and the gate);
 - d. Note along the west property line committing to future vehicular cross access with a future development on the undeveloped commercial parcel to the west, if required by the Planning Commission when that property develops;
 - e. Any revisions required by the Landscape Architect's review;
4. 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;
5. Restriction of outbound left-turns will be looked into with the Traffic Engineer;
6. Deferred parking will be included;
7. Confirmation of the landscape plan along Haggerty Road.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM I2: PPU18-0001 – OAK HILLS – PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT (PUD)

Pulte Homes of Michigan LLC of Bloomfield Hills MI is requesting a Preliminary Review of a Planned Unit Development consisting of 91 single family homes located on approximately 35 acres on the south east corner of Wixom and Glengary Roads. Sidwell No.: 17-20-300-001

Dave Campbell gave a review of the PUD development process, including this preliminary review. The site is approximately 35 acres and is vacant. He provided some history on the property, which was previously approved by the Township for a site condominium with 78 single-family homes, to be known as Commerce Pointe. That development was approved in 2006. The master deed was recorded; however, the bottom fell out on the economy and construction never commenced.

Pulte Homes hopes to acquire the property from the current owner, who was also the approved developer for Commerce Pointe. Pulte would construct a new single-family neighborhood with this configuration called Oak Hills. This would be 91 single-family homes, with access via the proposed new boulevard entrance on the east side of Wixom Road, with cross connections to the adjacent neighborhoods.

The 91 homes is relevant because they are of a lot size and lot width that is too small for the zoning on this property, R-1B, which allows a minimum lot size of 12,000 square feet, and a minimum lot width of 70 feet.

Pulte is hoping to construct homes that are more consistent with R-1D in terms of lot size, which is 7,200 square feet, and more consistent with R-1C in terms of lot width, which is a minimum of 60 feet. Since the development as proposed doesn't work as far as the underlying zoning, we've had some preliminary meetings with Joe Skore of Pulte about their options procedurally for developing this site. We talked the possibility of a Conditional Rezoning, and the possibility of a Planned Unit Development (PUD). Pulte has opted for the PUD, which means there would be a development agreement and a corresponding development plan that would be approved by both the Planning Commission and the Township Board, to allow them to develop something that doesn't fit with the R-1B zoning.

The tradeoff between the Township and the developer with any PUD is that in exchange for getting some flexibility with the underlying zoning, they present a development to the Township that goes above and beyond what they could otherwise do with the underlying zoning, in terms of design and public benefit to both the future residents of the new neighborhood, and to Commerce Township as a whole. A public benefit that could not otherwise be achieved if this were developed under the R-1B zoning.

Pulte representatives, Joe Skore and Mike Noles are here to speak to their request and to what they consider to be their recognizable public benefits.

The review letter included a perspective timeline of the meetings and approvals involved with a PUD. Tonight is Step B, which is the preliminary review by the Planning Commission. Dave reminded both the developer and the Planning Commission that comments received tonight are non-binding in nature, and this is not unlike a conceptual review.

Mike Noles, Vice President, Diffin-Umlor & Associates, 49287 West Road, Wixom, MI, was present along with Joe Skore, Vice President of Land Acquisition, Pulte Homes, 100 Bloomfield Hills Parkway, Ste 150, Bloomfield Hills, MI.

Mr. Noles delivered a presentation on the overhead, detailing the proposed Oak Hills single-family community. He explained that the proposal is a more innovative approach than the 2006 approved plan. He believes this results in a higher quality neighborhood. A zoning amendment is respectfully requested from R-1B to a PUD.

He demonstrated why Pulte believes this is a higher quality development than the alternative plan. The previously approved lots measured at 80x150. Pulte's proposed concept plan slightly increases the number of units by 14 homes, however, by clustering smaller 60x120 foot lots, they're able to create common open space necessary to offer the following 7 benefits:

1. Tree preservation along Glengary Road, which was not part of the 2006 approved development. The current proposal preserves a mature buffer to maintain the viewsheds, which is important from main arteries.
2. The old plan had no pedestrian connectivity. Oak Hills includes offsite path connections to the south and to the east, which benefit the entire community.
3. The approved plan had limited tree save areas. The new proposal increases open space, allowing preservation of several select stands of mature trees.
4. The 2006 plan had no internal path amenity. On Pulte's plan, not only are the required frontage walks included along Wixom and Glengary Roads, but also on both sides of the internal roads. In addition, a nature path network would be created, which would wind through the woodlands and up to Glengary Road.
5. The old plan did not buffer the adjacent overhead utility lines. The current proposal is sensitive to the trees that border the east property line.
6. The 2006 plan did not include the wetland buffer, and in fact, a portion of the existing wetland was located on a development lot. On the Pulte plan, the existing wetland has the required buffer around it, as well as a big stand of trees beyond the buffer.
7. The 2006 plan had three detention basins along the southerly border. Three basins aren't necessarily objectionable, but they would have cut down the trees to develop those basins. The Pulte plan is sensitive to the trees that border the south property line, and the impacts have been minimized. There are two basins, and a tree buffer is being kept between the basin and the property line as a screen for the existing residences to the south, as well as a buffer between the last development lot on the south and those existing roads. As for the detention on the east side of the site, Pulte is looking at the tree survey and the topography, and it is believed that the basin can be moved further to the north. There is a steep slope at that location, which makes it difficult to build a basin, and also there is a great tree stand there that would further screen the power lines and keep a bigger buffer.

Mr. Noles explained that the PUD guidelines do afford an opportunity to create a better plan through flexible lot sizes. He hopes the Commissioners will agree that these 7 factors result in a significant community benefit over the alternative plan.

Regarding density, the proposed development strictly follows Article 38, Commerce Township PUD Zoning Ordinance maximum density of 3 units to the acre. This is a nice transition between the high-density manufactured housing, and the larger lot communities. The density is 91 units over 30.57 net acres, after netting out the Glengary and Wixom Road right-of-way, and the wetland to the south, along with its buffers, which comes to 2.98 units to the acre. However, Commerce Meadows, west of the site, is 5.1 units to the acre. Stratford Villa, directly west of the site, is 5.8 units to the acre with 408 units on that 70-acre property.

Greenbriar, which lies south of Silver Ridge, is 4.3 units to the acre, and the Hills of Loon Lake is approximately 2.3 units to the gross acre, but it's probably closer to 2.5 with estimated removal of the pond/wetland.

The request to cluster the homes is directly encouraged by the Township Master Plan. One of the goals identified in Section 2.7 of the Master Plan is to achieve well-planned, safe and pleasant residential neighborhoods for all income levels within the Township.

Residents of the proposed Oak Hills, as well as the surrounding communities, will benefit in several ways.

Mr. Noles reiterated the benefits, discussing preservation of natural features, walkways and path networks, accessibility, reducing congestion and supporting resident health. He also addressed architectural standards, noting that the proposed product ranges from 2,376 to 3,052 square feet. Anti-monotony standards would be applied to the site to maintain an attractive streetscape. Three of the proposed plans, featuring five distinctive elevations, have been selected for the site. Additional plans may be added as the project progresses.

Pulte Homes believes that smart home design is about improving the function of the space, while enhancing its aesthetic. Pulte speaks to their homeowner's about how they live and what they most want in their homes and neighborhoods. The result is a collection of smart, life-tested designs with stylish features and functional spaces.

Joe Skore – I think Mike summed it up.

Commission Comments:

Chairperson Haber – I very rarely start comments. I usually tie things up at the end, but I really have a significant problem with the density. You're looking at close to a 40% reduction. If you want to build this, we'd love to have you there, but not at this density.

McKeever – I was concerned with the density also. Granted, it is right across the street from Stratford Villa, so it doesn't seem like what they're proposing is that out of line from what is in the immediate area, but there are much larger lots on the other side of Glengary. I don't know how those folks are going to feel about the increased density.

Weber – Great presentation. I enjoyed it and I liked hearing the benefits proposed. I'm not opposed to the PUD, but I also have issues with the density. I drove to the property, I walked it. I drove the Hills of Loon Lake to get a feeling for the difference, and it's substantial. I get that Stratford Villa is there, but I don't hold that as a comparative, right or wrong. My primary issue is the 40 homes that you have clustered in the center. At least the surrounding homes, based upon setbacks and the power line areas, have space. The 40 clustered in the center, they're shoehorned in there, even with the pathway.

Parel – I have nothing to add. I'm in agreement with everything that has been said so far.

Schinzing – George, you had mentioned something earlier. Can you explain why the Township Board wants to revert back to the original zoning on that other site nearby?

Weber – They are looking to revert back to the R-1A. I think it's in keeping with the lots and homes that are already in existence there, adjoining to those properties. It was a complicated discussion because the original site was going to be an equestrian village.

Schinzing – Would they see this project differently?

Weber – They would see it differently, but I'm sure the stark contrast on lot size would be a significant concern.

Schinzing – How long do site plan approvals stay valid?

Dave Campbell – It was approved in 2006. You get one year, valid site approval. You can request up to two, one-year extensions, so three years maximum.

Jones – I agree with all of the comments to this point. The absolute minimum I would feel comfortable with would be 9,000 square foot lots, because the people next door have 12,000 square foot lots. I don't see the comparison to the trailer park. You could have a basic plan of 120x75. This may not be acceptable to the other members of the Planning Commission, but I would offer that as my absolute minimum. I think the benefits you offer are terrific.

Winkler – What is the price point for these residences?

Joe Skore – It's a little early to say; however, we would look at base pricing approximately \$350,000, with upgrade options and premiums, so up to the \$400,000 range.

Winkler – I agree with the other comments regarding density. It's definitely an issue.

Dave Campbell – For my own benefit, is it a concern with density? Is it a concern with lot size, or is it a concern with both? I see opportunities to make the lots bigger, and keep the same number of units, but that would eat away at the preservation of the natural areas.

Or, there's opportunities to have less units. I want to make sure I understand. Is the concern with both the number of units and the size of the units?

McKeever – The density.

Chairperson Haber – The density; 91 units is just too much for this piece of property.

Dave Campbell – If they were able to configure it with 90-ish units, but bigger, that's not a solution?

McKeever – I think we have a problem seeing 91 houses on this lot.

Joe Skore – Conversely, if density was lower, but the lot size remained the same, approximately 60x120, it still sounds like there's a problem with the lot size, irrespective of the density. Is that correct?

Weber – For me, yes.

Chairperson Haber – For me, I think it's the lot size. We have a reason that we have a 12,000 square foot lot. There's some leeway there, but not 40%.

Schinzing – I agree with George. The houses on the perimeter would have a feel of a larger lot size even though you don't own it. Those houses locked in the middle, they're on top of each other. That's where my problem is.

Chairperson Haber – I'm not sure that's what we want to see in this community.

Mr. Noles – We appreciate your feedback. There may be some confusion on the drawing. In the middle, do you see the three stars? Those are open spaces. There are approximately 500 trees that we'd be saving with this plan, as opposed to the other plan which was almost nothing. We were pursuing 18% over the initial number of units, or 14 additional units. We went from 1 acre of open space to 7 acres of open space. When you increase the open space by 6 acres, even on the underlying zoning of 2 per acre, we felt that the Township and community was getting open space that was worth 14 units. We felt it was an equitable proposal. In addition, that's why we wanted to go over and above that by adding the offsite path connections, and the onsite path network. We knew from the Master Plan that these were very important. We didn't come in here to insult you with too many units or too small of lots; we really thought through our proposal. We did a tree survey, looked at the engineering and topography. We looked at the paths, and maintaining handicap accessibility on those paths. We didn't take this on lightly.

The question tonight is, *Do you think this is an equitable trade-off?* Because your Master Plan and your Zoning Ordinance allows this. This is not something that we just made up. We identified a piece of property that has some serious challenges. It's right across the street from manufactured housing. It's sandwiched in between high tension power lines and it's on a corner. We said, *How can we make this work?* This is not the same site as Merrill Park. The starting base here would be brought down from that development. This would appeal to millennials and to those who are downsizing by going with smaller lots, and having it be less maintenance intensive.

We meant no disrespect by putting out 91 units on smaller lots. We put something forward that we knew we could make work, given the constraints and the challenges of the property, and it would work as a good transition with what was already there.

I've heard loud and clear tonight that manufactured housing is not really a consideration for looking at future density; however, it is a consideration for this 35 acres of property that sits across the street from it.

Weber – We hear you. I don't think anybody was insulted. We understand that you're putting a business case together, and trying to present something that would fit here. I don't see the transition and in my opinion, it doesn't meet the look and feel that we're trying to keep within the community.

Jones – Right.

Chairperson Haber – I think that summed it up really well. I think we all feel that it's too dense. If you'd like to come back with something that is less dense, we can look at it.

Mike Noles – Thank you for your time.

ITEM I3: COMMERCE VETERINARY HOSPITAL – CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Dr. Andrea Putt of Commerce MI is requesting a conceptual review of an expansion of the existing veterinary hospital located at 605 Commerce Road to include the building & property located next door at 613 Commerce Road. Sidwell No.: 17-10-403-042

Dr. Putt, 613 Commerce Road, Commerce Township, MI, was present to address the request. In 2012, she opened the Commerce Veterinary Hospital in the old fire station. The community has embraced them and the hospital is very successful. They won a beautification award, along with Best of the Best, Best Veterinary Hospital in Oakland County, and more. She and her staff really try hard.

Dave Campbell – Dr. Putt's existing practice is at the southwest corner of Ponderosa and West Commerce Road in the Commerce Village. In 2017, Dr. Putt purchased the residential property next door to the west. Her ultimate vision is to use this existing structure as a rehabilitation facility for pets.

Dr. Putt – Our clients are cutting edge. In Commerce Township, people want the best. I don't have the biggest practice, but it's very clean, very homey inside, and I've been doing this a long time.

That property is perfect for this type of service, animal rehabilitation. Right now, the service is offered. The appointments are long and the technicians are working with the patients for about two hours. We have a treadmill, balance boards, yoga balls, et cetera, and we have to bring it all out, set it all up, work with the pets, then take it all down. The new space is wonderful because it's quiet. My intent would be to get a little bit better treadmill, so it can be setup permanently in the new building. We can put rubber matting on the floors.

The house inside is actually really very quaint. It's got beautiful old woodwork, and I'm leaving everything the same. What I'm looking to do is to not have to move the equipment back and forth between appointments. It's just too labor-intensive. In addition, I'd also like to offer acupuncture.

We already have the staff, and I'm not hiring any other staff to do this. It will just make it easier on us, and the patients, in a space that is quiet. We need quiet space, especially for the acupuncture with multiple needles. We want a low-stress environment.

Chairperson Haber – That will be a standalone structure; you're not going to connect it?

Dr. Putt – That's correct.

Dave Campbell – To get to the point where Dr. Putt can do all of these things within the structure, this property would have to be rezoned. Currently it is single-family, R-1D zoning. It's probably relevant that this probably was once zoned B-1, up until 2010, when the owner asked that it be rezoned to single-family residential. The owner at that time was living in the residence and did not want to have a nonconforming situation. Dr. Putt obviously has a different vision for the property than the previous owner. The history of Dr. Putt's practice is relevant because in 2012, she applied for and received approval for a Conditional Rezoning for this property here (indicated on the overhead). She needed this rezoned from single-family to B-1 Local Business so that she could

expand her parking lot into this area. She got approval. What I see as the most efficient path for Dr. Putt and for the Township is to amend that Conditional Rezoning, that got recorded in 2014, to include this property, so that this property could be Conditionally Rezoned from R-1D to B-1 to do all of the activities and treatments she has described. To amend a Conditional Rezoning is effectively the same process as creating a new Conditional Rezoning agreement; however, we have that existing agreement as kind of a baseline, and therefore, it makes more sense to amend that, than to start with a new Conditional Rezoning agreement.

Chairperson Haber – Are you going to change any of the physical façade?

Dr. Putt – At this point, no. I would like to update it and paint it.

Chairperson Haber – But you're not doing anything structural?

Dr. Putt – No, just painting, and continuing with the landscaping. I want it to look nice and professional.

Chairperson Haber – You do understand that what we tell you today is absolutely non-binding?

Dr. Putt – Yes.

McKeever – I agree with Mr. Campbell's suggestion regarding amending the existing Conditional Rezoning agreement.

Weber – No issues.

Parel – Would there be any signage on this property?

Dr. Putt – No, it's not needed because we get so many internal referrals.

Parel – Would you consider extending the sidewalk in front as a potential condition of the rezoning?

Dr. Putt – Whatever, I don't mind, but no one uses the front.

Chairperson Haber – It's what's going on in the Township.

Dr. Putt – Yes.

Parel – There is an existing sidewalk in front of your current facility.

Dr. Putt – Yes, but it stops.

Dave Campbell – If I may jump in on the sidewalk discussion. I know there are visions of the Township one day having a continuous sidewalk going all the way from the

hospital up to Union Lake Road, a couple miles to the east. Anytime we pick up little sections here and there as developers such as Dr. Putt come in front of us, that's something we strive to do.

Schinzing – No comments.

Jones – I'm in agreement with what Dave's proposing.

Winkler – Have you seen the three items suggested in Dave's report? Any objections?

Dr. Putt – I did see them. The sidewalk was new to me, but I'm not opposed to that.

Chairperson Haber – Okay, so there's no objection here. We've got the intent of the proposal. Now you'll need to work with Dave. Is she going to need additional parking?

Dave Campbell – That's one of the things that should be spoken to in the Conditional Rezoning. Dr. Putt obviously knows her practice better than we do. One of the thoughts was that there's already a paved parking area here, and there are lines there from when this used to be a daycare.

Dr. Putt – There's also additional parking. (She explained on the overhead.)

Dave Campbell – As part of the Conditional Rezoning agreement, or an amendment thereto, the petitioner would offer conditions. It would be up to the Township to decide whether or not to accept those conditions. One of those conditions perhaps could be using this paved area as parking only for employees, so that the customer traffic uses the parking area behind the building and in the front, rather than introducing a commercial traffic pattern to what had been a single-family home.

Chairperson Haber – I think you've got what you need here, so you can go over it with Dave.

Dr. Putt – Thank you, gentlemen.

Dave Campbell – I think Dr. Putt wants to be back in front of the Planning Commission on October 1st for a public hearing. We will talk about that schedule.

ITEM I4: UNIT 4 BOULDER COURT – CONCEPTUAL REVIEW

Tom Smith of Commerce MI is requesting a conceptual review for a proposed light manufacturing/office building on a vacant lot located at 8681 Boulder Court, Unit 4 of the Boulder Industrial Park. Sidwell No.: 17-13-300-100

Dave Campbell gave a review of the conceptual proposal. He noted that everything discussed between the Planning Commission, the property owner and the developer is a non-binding, informal conversation. The property owner, Mr. Smith, wanted to take advantage of the conceptual review to ensure he was on the right track before investing in engineering plans and a fully developed site plan.

The property is at the end of the Boulder Court cul-de-sac, the southwest property. Boulder Court is on the west side of Martin Road between Oakley Park and Richardson Road. Mr. Smith is the original developer of the Boulder Court industrial park, and he currently owns three of the properties.

They want to build a third building on the property. In terms of size, scale and design it's comparable to the two buildings he already has. From a land use standpoint, it's a light manufacturing building with an office component, which are uses that are allowable in the TLM zoning district. This would be straightforward site plan approval.

The biggest thing to be discussed is the design of the building, specifically the building materials and the architecture.

At the end of the Boulder Court cul-de-sac, there is an existing shared driveway that this proposed building would take its access from. The office portion would be toward the front of the site, and the open span, light industrial warehouse portion of the building would be toward the south and to the west. Mr. Smith would like to know, *What is your expectation in terms of design and building materials?* Mr. Smith would contend that most of the viewing public, and the small portion of the public that actually travels down Boulder Court, will see the office building up front, and that will screen to a large degree the bigger warehouse building to the rear. The office portion of the building would consist of brick, stone and glass; while the warehouse portion would be a combination of metal siding, some windows on the north side, and some colored, split-faced block on the bottom half of the building. The south elevation would be the same, with the exception of the windows, given that the south side is really only visible from the other industrial users in the Richardson Industrial Park.

Tom Smith, 8681 Boulder Court, Commerce Township, was present to address the request.

Mr. Smith – I'm not sure if anyone has driven down into my park. I built it in 1994. I designed it with common driveways between the 7 units. My building is the one to the north, that overhangs the pond. I have pictures here if you want to look at the views from the street. The balance of that building is split block. It's basically designed to blend in with the surrounding trees.

On this new site here, you'd only be seeing the front office portion of the building, the way the trees are along the pond, and the way it's situated on the site, back off of the road. We have designed it so you only see the office primarily. Obviously, you can see some of the building beyond it, but not very much.

Mr. Smith presented a video on the overhead and described the views of the existing driveway, the current building, the vacant land where the proposed building would be constructed, and the tree lines on the site. Mr. Smith also noted that they plan to occupy the new building themselves.

McKeever – No issues.

Weber – No issues.

Parel – It says in the summary, *It's not believed that the proposed use would necessitate any outdoor storage or outdoor practices.* Is that at this time?

Mr. Smith – We don't utilize any outdoor storage, and we don't foresee needing any in the future.

Jones – No issues.

Schinzing – No issues.

Winkler – I'm okay with it.

Chairperson Haber – Come back to us. Sorry it took so long tonight.

Mr. Smith – That's all right, thank you gentlemen.

J: OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION:

Dave Campbell – The non-motorized bridge over M-5 will connect the Michigan Airline Trail. There has been substantial progress in the construction of the bridge, but it has slowed recently. The delay is because the fencing that goes along the main span of the bridge had to be re-engineered to accommodate attachment of the decorative wave panels. That fence is a 6' fence set upon a 2' parapet wall. When the contractor and subcontractor bid the job, they underestimated the associated costs as they assumed that this fence was typical. They realized later that the fence actually has to support the steel wave panels, which obviously have their own weight and wind load. The fence will now have custom fabricated steel posts. That's taking extra time, along with installation. Last I heard from MDOT, the bridge will be open for public use in October. However, installation of the wave panels, logo and signage will not be completed until approximately February 2019. Mr. Scott and I have a conference call tomorrow, along with Township Attorney Adkison, to discuss issues with MDOT on who will bear responsibility for the costs.

K: PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- Dave Campbell initiated discussion regarding the second evaluation being performed by the RCOC at the Pontiac Trail roundabout. This is to verify the findings of the first evaluation, which was done for the Five & Main development. The RCOC stated that the solution with roundabouts is not making them bigger, but actually making them smaller. Constricting the number of lanes cuts down on lane confusion, and thereby reduces accidents.
- **NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: OCTOBER 1, 2018 @ 7PM**

L: ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Schinzing, supported by Jones, to adjourn the meeting at 9:31pm.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Brian Winkler, Secretary