

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF COMMERCE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Monday, June 3, 2019
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
Tom Jones
Bill McKeever
Brian Parel
George Weber

Absent:

Brian Winkler, Secretary (excused)

Also Present:

Dave Campbell, Township Planning Director
Mark Stacey, DDA Director

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Schinzing, supported by Parel, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda of June 3, 2019, as presented.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Parel, supported by Schinzing, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of May 6, 2019, as written.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES

Bill McKeever – Zoning Board of Appeals

- I was unable to attend the last ZBA meeting. I would defer to Mr. Campbell.

Dave Campbell –

- The last ZBA meeting was the Thursday prior to Memorial weekend which was May 23rd. There were three petitions on that agenda.
- One was to tear down an existing home along Union Lake Road, just north of Richardson, and rebuild a new home that would be larger and closer to the road. The ZBA denied the dimensional variance that would be necessary to build a new house on that lot, which is actually three lots combined. The new home would have been too close to the road and too close to the waterfront.
- The ZBA approved a variance for an addition to an existing home on Bradshaw. They wanted to put an addition on the back of the house that would have been too close to the rear lot line.
- The last one was the party store, The Bottle Shop, on S. Commerce Road, across from the entrance to Dodge Park. They wanted a new freestanding sign that would have been too close to S. Commerce Road; it actually would have been out in the public right-of-way. The ZBA approved the location of the sign, but not the design. We don't typically allow pole signs, so the ZBA approved the exception to put the sign too close to the road, but only if it was a monument-style sign.

George Weber – Township Board of Trustees

- There were two key items from last month.
- First, we hired Plante Moran Cresa to assist us in the overall management of building the next firehouse. We will be leveling Fire Station #3 and building a new station on Welch Road.
- The second item of interest is that we awarded the Township's waste disposal management to GFL, effective at the beginning of January for a 5-year term.

Chairperson Haber – Since Brian's not here, Mark, could you update us on the DDA?

Director Mark Stacey – Downtown Development Authority

- The DDA is working closely with the Aikens' development team, pushing for it to close, which is scheduled for no later than the end of July. He seems to be making significant progress, so we're excited about that.
- In addition, we have had developer interest on some other parcels and we hope to be bringing conceptual ideas to you for your approval.

E. PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Dave Campbell – Mr. Chair, public discussion is intended to be about items not on the agenda, or on the agenda, whatever it may be. I know there are some folks in the audience who are interested specifically in the discussion of the potential for a new car wash. When I had conversations with them last week, I explained that tonight is not a public hearing per se, but there would be general public discussion at the beginning of the meeting and that would be their opportunity to be heard. Obviously, you typically hold those comments to 2 minutes or less.

Ray Golotta, 1595 Vanstone Drive, Commerce Township, distributed handouts to the Planning Commissioners.

Ray Golotta – At the last Planning Commission meeting, Granger came in and wanted a new addition. You guys loved it, and I loved it, but then you mentioned to him that there have been a lot of complaints about the design of the existing building. Brian mentioned a couple things to make it more appealing.

I started thinking about it. I didn't know that this Towne Place was within the DDA authority, until there was talk about having a drive through at 14 Mile Road and M-5. I thought to myself, wait a minute, the current Granger building is okay in my opinion, but I understand they could do some enhancements. Then, I looked at this building shown on the handouts and on the three slides (on the overhead) and I asked Dave, "How in the world did you approve this?" It looks like a project building by the colors. Dave said he wasn't here then, and the Planning Commission previously approved it.

Chairperson Haber – You should have seen what the first project looked like when they came in. Life is full of compromise. We compromise every day, on almost everything we do, not just here but in life. This actually is so far superior to what we first saw.

I have a problem with the building next to it, and they're both owned by the same people. This was a big improvement and we did the best we could with it. I just drove up from Florida. We went by a million of these things and this one is not bad.

Todd Gesund, 686 Elderberry Ct., Commerce Township – I own Super Car Wash, 8393 Richardson Road, and 3105 E. West Maple Road. I also have two locations in Walled Lake, one on Maple and one on Pontiac Trail.

I'm here today just to talk about the conceptual review for a new Zips car wash. The property is not zoned for a car wash. They will argue that their car wash is different. First, let me say that there's six car wash locations all in 3.5 miles of each other in the 48390 zip code. Five of those car washes operate exactly the same as Zips does. Zips will argue they have an unlimited wash program, they have free vacuums, you're in and out of your wash process in 2-3 minutes, they have automated tellers. We have all those same things. It's nothing new that they're selling. Thank you.

Bennett Lublin, 613 Pine Tree Court, Walled Lake – I have property in Commerce Township and I'm here on behalf of the Super Car Wash, our neighbors and also our tenant. I'm opposed to granting the Special Land Use for another car wash. You know that there are 5 or 6 in the area and that there is nothing unique about what the Zips Car Wash does versus what the others do. These car washes have waited for the new development to occur. I think it would be wrong to oversaturate the area. That would not be beneficial to them. There's nothing unique about the proposed development. They would provide the same services. These existing entities are taxpaying members of the community. I hope that you will deny the Special Land Use request for the car wash.

Chairperson Haber closed the public discussion as there were no further comments or questions.

F. TABLED ITEMS

None.

G. OLD BUSINESS

None.

H. SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

None.

I. NEW BUSINESS

ITEM I1: ZIPS EXPRESS CAR WASH – CONCEPT REVIEW

Robert Sweet of McBride Dale Clarion of Cincinnati OH representing Zips Express Car Wash is requesting a conceptual review for a new car wash establishment located on the east side of Pontiac Trail, at 3252 & 3260 N. Pontiac Trail.

Sidwell No.'s: 17-24-476-021 & 17-24-476-023

Chairperson Haber – This is a conceptual review. I just like to remind the people that are coming forward, we are going to give you our opinion but this is non-binding. It's just our thoughts.

David Campbell – The proposed location for the Zips Car Wash is on the south side of Pontiac Trail, at the site of these two existing houses, adjacent to Sonic and across from the Walmart parking lot. The proposal would be to combine the two properties and

demolish the existing homes for the purpose of building a drive-through car wash. The layout would include a driveway coming off the south side of Pontiac Trail, circulating around the back of the site to enter the car wash, then exiting back out the same driveway.

The potential developer is Mark Battista. He is represented this evening by Robert Sweet who is the consultant on the project. Rob and I have had several conversations, and a meeting with Mr. Battista where we talked through a number of issues. I do want to go into the zoning and land issues on those.

We also talked about potential design and layout issues. To their credit, we discussed the placement of the 16 vacuum stations. Typically car wash establishments want vacuum stations out in front, but based upon our conversations he thought a better approach was to present an attractive building along the road, and use that to screen the service area. You'll also notice the overhead doors are not facing out onto Pontiac Trail. They've oriented the building parallel to the road.

From a land use perspective, obviously we're talking about these two houses along Pontiac Trail, but there's a back story here that I want to go through which has to do with this property along the west side of Haggerty. A year or so ago, there was a group that came to the Planning Commission looking to do a similar land use, drive-through car wash, on this vacant Haggerty property. The reason why it's relevant is because this property, along with the two properties we're speaking to this evening, neither of them have a base zoning that allows for a car wash establishment. The Zoning Ordinance only allows a car wash in the B-3 General Business zoning district. The Haggerty property was zoned TLM, and these two Pontiac Trail properties are zoned B-2 Community Business. What these two properties do have in common is that they are both within the Haggerty Road Corridor Overlay, or the HRC. The HRC allows land uses that are not otherwise allowed under the base zoning, so long as those land uses are built to the higher and better design standards of the HRC overlay.

When the party that wanted to build a drive-through car wash on the Haggerty property came to the Planning Commission, the question was, *Could a drive-through car wash be a Special Land Use in the HRC?* Typically the drive-through is meant to be accessory to the principal permitted use. With a car wash, the drive-through is not really accessory to anything – the principal use is the drive-through component of the car wash. What you as a Planning Commission determined was, we can allow a drive-through car wash as a potential Special Land Use in the HRC overlay, but like with any Special Land Use in any zoning district throughout the Township, the petitioner would have to establish, to the satisfaction of the Planning Commission, that there is an immediate and demonstrated need for that use.

What the Planning Commission told the previous party was, we can accept a Special Land Use car wash on this property, but you're going to have a hard time convincing us that there is an immediate and demonstrated need for the land use at this location, based upon the proximity of other car washes in the neighborhood. That was a year ago.

Now we move down the street to these properties here. The property is zoned B-2 and we only allow car washes in B-3. The properties are within the HRC. The Planning Commission has determined that, yes, a car wash could be allowed as a Special Land Use within the HRC; but again, they will have to show an immediate and demonstrated need for the use.

In my conversations with Mr. Sweet, he and I both agreed that it would be in his party's best interest to appear before the Planning Commission on a conceptual level to gauge your receptiveness as to whether you feel you could be convinced that there is an immediate and demonstrated need for a drive-through car wash at this location. They have provided conceptual layouts and architectural renderings. We talked about having a mix of quality building materials, and that's what they're striving for here with true brick and glass on the side of the building most prominent from Pontiac Trail. They've provided a narrative, all of which is in your packet, of how they feel their car wash is a unique business model that would be unique to this area. They offer something that the potential competitors in the vicinity don't offer. That would be something you as a Planning Commission would want to take into consideration. I do want to mention that typically it's not the job of the Planning Commission to regulate competition. If we have a general commercial zoning district, and there's a Pizza Hut on one corner, and Papa John's wants to locate on the other corner, it's not the job of the Planning Commission to say we won't approve the Papa John's because we already have the Pizza Hut. If the zoning is correct for the land use, then as long as they meet the standards of the Zoning Ordinance, it would be tough to deny it. The difference here is that the car wash would be a Special Land Use. There is a higher standard for Special Land Use and the key point being the immediate and demonstrated need for the use.

Robert Sweet of McBride Dale Clarion, 5721 Dragon Way Ste. 300, Cincinnati, OH, was present on behalf of Mr. Battista, 127 Westbury Road, Fort Wayne, IN. Mr. Sweet provided handouts of the presentation to the Planning Commissioners, which was also displayed on the overhead.

Mr. Sweet – I am a planner by nature. I'm not an engineer or an architect. Mark Battista is with Zips Express Car Wash. He's also here tonight to talk about the immediate need.

Mr. Sweet gave an overview of the site on the overhead and discussed the adjacent businesses. He reiterated the zoning of B-2, surrounded by B-2 and B-3 zoning, in the HRC overlay. The existing structures are either houses or home-based businesses. The proposed development is a 3,500 square foot car wash building, with a conveyor, offices and storages. There's a bay canopy, 18 parking spaces, 2 of which are for employees, and 16 for the vacuum stations. There's a sidewalk, and one driveway on Pontiac Trail. Mr. Sweet described the traffic circulation, the drive-through entry, the automated fast-pass system, and the location of the vacuum stations. He elaborated on service station designs, screening, the dumpster enclosure to match the building, the building materials, and potential storm water management areas. He also discussed a stub connection with Sonic, which would require ensuring the grades can align. Mr. Sweet reviewed the building elevations in detail, the brick building with a soldier course, Hardiplank, the standard Zip Car Wash colors, and faux windows. The building is about 17' tall, with the parapet at 25' tall, which adds verticality to the street. Mr. Sweet also review proposed conceptual screening and landscaping of approximately 15-20 shade trees onsite, 18-20 evergreens and additionally a combination of evergreen and deciduous shrubs. A landscape architecture is employed for the project.

Mr. Sweet discussed consistency with the surrounding area, with drive-throughs at Walmart, Sonic and Tim Horton's, in addition to a gas station with a car wash, and some automotive repair businesses. He also addressed consistency with the Master Plan, regional draw and support businesses, and meeting the requirements of the HRC. Mr. Sweet reviewed traffic; 78 trips are estimated in peak hours and the busiest times are on the weekends. The average time is about one car every 2 to 3 minutes, depending upon the length of it. With six car washes in the area, he feels this is an added bonus to take some pressure off.

Weather has a direct impact on the facility operations. Hours of operation are typically 7am-7pm, 7 days a week. There are no loud systems or PA. Vacuums are screened and blowers are inside, which average about 75 decibels about 100' from the unit, and the screening helps to control the noise.

Mr. Battista began his presentation on the overhead. He explained that he has developed car washes in 5 states. Zips is a national chain with about 150 locations in 9 states. He discussed building new facilities to their standards as opposed to converting older washes. He presented a car wash from Owensborough, KY. He reviewed the style, concept, the comfort level, and the demographics of their customer base. They want their environment to be open and clean, as they sell clean, so they want to put out a good product in a good location. The facilities cost on average \$3.8 million, so they choose the location correctly. They would not want to put a car wash where it isn't needed.

Mr. Battista gave a detailed review of the facility, its operations, today's car wash technology advancements, building materials and optional finishes. He stated that the typical customer washes their car about 3.5 times per month with the club membership, which is \$16 a month and allows customers to wash their car every day, once a day. Mr. Battista proceeded to address whether or not there is a need for the car wash in this location. He described their methodologies, including a 5-mile radius method, which shows 62,000 households for this location. There's 2.1 cars per household. The national average of car washes per year is 6, and Michigan is probably a little higher. Theoretically, there would be 781,000 car washes within a 5-mile radius per year. There are 4 tunnel washes in the area, averaging 72,000 cars per year. Those 4 at 72,000 each are about 288,000 cars per year currently. With 781,000 total volume, there are 493,000 cars not getting serviced. It is also assumed that 20% wash their cars at home. Therefore, they figure there are 394,000 cars in this 5-mile radius per year that are not getting serviced by a car wash. Zips does not go into a market unless they can capture at least 90,000 to 120,000 cars per year.

There's also a capture rate method. Pontiac Trail has 28,000 cars a day, 840,000 per month, or 10 million cars per year. The typical capture rate is between 1 to 1.5%. Based on the capture rate of Pontiac Trail, it would generate 100,000 to 150,000.

Weber – The number of households, where did that figure come from?

Mr. Battista – We pulled demographics of this area. There are multiple sites that show these figures. This is a pretty dense area.

Weber – I'll take your word for it.

Mr. Battista – We're going to capture the traffic going east and west on Pontiac Trail.

McKeever – Is that accounting for the other six car washes in the 3-mile radius?

Mr. Battista – Yes. We figured there's 4 actually that have tunnels, that we consider similar operations. This is probably one of the more underserved markets where I've put these washes in.

McKeever – You're going to have a hard time convincing me of that.

Mr. Battista – This is what we look at when we go into areas, and obviously growth in retail. We are not a destination. The goal is to get people to wash their cars 10 times per year. A car is the third or fourth largest investment a family has.

Mr. Sweet and Mr. Battista explained the water reclamation system, which includes three reclaim tanks and an ultraviolet light that kills the bacteria as the water runs through it. This eliminates the foul odor that is sometimes prevalent at other car washes with older systems. Zips reclaims about 85% of their water, which is used on anything below the mirror and down. Anything hitting the top of the car is always freshwater. The nozzles are set up to qualify for drought restrictions, which is submitted to the State. They are trying to use less water.

Commission Comments:

Chairperson Haber – I'll reiterate, this is non-binding.

Dave Campbell – If the petitioners were to opt to proceed with this process, the next step in the process would be a formal application for a Special Land Use, and that would include a public hearing before the Planning Commission.

The approach they wanted to take was to have an informal conversation, to gauge your first impressions, so that they could make a more informed decision of whether they want to proceed with the more formal application process.

Jones – You gave a nice presentation, however, the B-2 zoning district does not allow a car wash. With regard to demonstrated need, the fact is that we have six car washes in that area. I live at Benstein close to Sleeth. I have to go probably 6 miles to find one, but in any case, I'm not in favor of this. I feel that we have a sufficient number of car washes, especially with some just a ½ mile away from this location, so I'm opposed.

Schinzing – I do know we're not fully queued all the time at the car washes we have today. We don't wait that long. What he's proposing is that he thinks he can capture those who wouldn't stop at those others, going east/west on Pontiac Trail. I'm not sure of that. I know we feel like this area, just like over by Commerce and Haggerty we're saturated by gas stations, this area is somewhat saturated by car washes.

Parel – I have trouble understanding the documented, immediate need for the use. I agree that the area is saturated. I don't believe this to be a unique type of use. I think

the building is aesthetically pleasing and you did a good job on the design. I appreciate the numbers you presented. My biggest challenge is with the immediate need.

Weber – I also don't see an immediate need.

McKeever – I agree with everybody else. I don't see where there is a justified, immediate need when your competitors are so close.

Schinzing – One more thing too is that you would not be able to take a left out of there. I don't know how that would work for people who want to go west. You'd probably only capture the people heading eastbound.

Chairperson Haber – Mr. Sweet and Mr. Battista, this is one of the best presentations I've seen in a long time, and I compliment you both on that. I agree with the comments made here. I don't have a problem with car washes, I think it's a good thing, but that's not what I envisioned in this area. I think there's a better use for that piece of property. I appreciate you coming in and I hope you got the answers that you wanted.

Mr. Battista – You've got a vibrant, growing community, and your car washes are 25-30 years old. When does a car wash need to be upgraded? I'm not arguing with you. I'm just trying to understand. When we go through the numbers, and we're ready to spend \$4 million on a facility, and then you say that there's not a need.

Chairperson Haber – I think there's another use for this particular piece of property. There's nothing wrong with your car wash. I think what you presented is really aesthetic and functional, but we do have other car washes in the area, and I think that this land would better suit another type of use.

Schinzing – If you put it in a B-3, it's not an issue.

Dave Campbell – I just wanted to make sure I understood. Your concern is not necessarily with the layout, or the design of the building, or the method of how they operate their business – it's more the location. It's the location, and the fact that there are similar uses.

Chairperson Haber – There are similar uses in the area, and I think there's something else that could go there that would better serve the community.

Weber – I think the key is, immediate need, and I don't think we see that.

Dave Campbell – If they were inclined to look elsewhere in Commerce Township, in an appropriate zoning district...

Chairperson Haber – I'd like to talk to them again. Thank you very much.

ITEM 12: ZONING ORDINANCE TEXT DISCUSSION – Article 30, Signs

David Campbell, Planning Director, gave an overview of the discussion regarding commercial signage, primarily wall signs and freestanding signs. Much of what the Zoning Board of Appeals sees are called sign exceptions. They're very similar to dimensional variances, except there is a specific category for someone who wants to put a sign too close to the road, or a sign that is too large. In those instances, those have to go to the ZBA for a sign exception.

A large portion of these requests is to place a sign too close to the road. What that means is that most of the major commercial thoroughfares in Commerce Township are classified as major thoroughfares, a classification the RCOC uses. It's relevant because any major thoroughfare has a 120' planned right-of-way, or a 60' half right-of-way. The Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance requires that any new sign, or replacement of an existing sign, be 15' behind that 60' line, so that requires 75' behind the centerline of the road right-of-way. For a lot of the older businesses and commercial buildings, to comply with these requirements, it would put their sign in the middle of their store or office. The ZBA sees a lot of those, so anytime the ZBA sees repetitive and similar requests, it gives staff reason to consider looking at the rule book again, versus rehashing the same arguments for various business owners. The sign regulations might need to be opened to see if there's any room for improvement.

Another significant request is for the size of a wall sign. Obviously every business wants their wall sign as big as they can make it, and the community has an obligation to have certain parameters on the size and limitations. Rather than drafting a bunch of sign regulation amendments to be brought before the Planning Commission for a public hearing, ultimately staff was hopeful about having a brainstorming session regarding commercial signage. Ultimately, the goal is to take some of the burden off of the ZBA, as those meetings cost the taxpayers money. If staff can address some of the issues administratively, and allow the Building and Planning Departments some discretion to make some administrative exceptions, it could relieve some of that burden.

In addition, Dave explained the timeline and delays that can be encountered by business owners if they have to apply for a variance. The ZBA only meets every other month. That lag with regard to signage, especially for a new business owner, can create difficulties. With administrative discretion, this could possibly be expedited. In addition, staff would also be given an opportunity to work with existing business owners. For example, if a sign exception were made, the business owner may be required to take down all of their nonconforming signs, or clean up outdoor storage, or address any other site issues that otherwise might not be corrected.

Recently, the Planning Commission and ultimately the Township Board adopted an amendment that would allow an applicant to put an addition onto an existing structure, and it could be closer to the road than what the front setbacks would typically allow, so long as they were in line with what everybody else in the neighborhood had based upon averaging. This would be similar to one of the things to look at within the sign regulations. If there's 15 signs on the road that are X-feet from the road, and the applicant wants to do one that's right in line with what everybody else has, then maybe an exception can be made administratively without pushing it to the ZBA.

Commission Comments:

Chairperson Haber – What do you want from us today?

Dave Campbell – Any strong opinions you may have to share on anything I've discussed, or anything else related to signage that is worth fixing, if we're going to make some amendments anyway.

Chairperson Haber – I'm a very visual person. I'd like to see some visual presentations if you can do that. In addition, we already are heavily committed to you and Jay on your expertise. A lot of the time we grant approval with conditions of administrative approval, and one of those conditions is signage. As far as I'm concerned, let's see what you come back with. I'm game for anything, but I'd like visuals.

Dave Campbell – I think one thing we can do is to bring you some examples of the petitions that the ZBA has seen over the past few years, of signs that they considered and approved, and how they turned out in the real world.

Schinzing – I would think those scenarios where it keeps going to the ZBA, and they approve them almost every time, makes the most sense. Is that what you're talking about?

Dave Campbell – If something is a major deviation from what we require, then it should still go back to the ZBA. The challenge is figuring out where to draw that line. I would say more often than not, when a business owner comes to the ZBA looking to put their sign too close to the road, the ZBA has approved them. I can think of a couple examples where they didn't, but usually there is a legitimate reason why a business needs to have some visual representation out along the road and for some reason they can't meet the 75' setback.

McKeever – Everything David said is true. I think it's nearly impossible to come up with some sort of blanket ordinance to cover everybody, but if you had the fall back of averages, and maybe not just one or two signs on the adjacent properties, but maybe a half dozen. Then always keeping in mind the safety and visual sight lines; that always comes into play. We really are pretty receptive on people's signage requests. For the most part everything falls within the size and layout of the ordinance, except for the location off the street. With a lot of older, existing buildings, it's tough to meet the ordinance requirements.

Chairperson Haber – I just don't want to see Orchard Lake Road. It's like a zoo. If we can prevent that from happening in our community, that's good.

Dave Campbell – When you say that, is it a zoo because there's too many signs, they're too big, or they're too close to the road?

Chairperson Haber – All of the above.

McKeever – The old Commerce Township was a pole sign in front of every business. It was like going down the Vegas strip almost. That has really been reigned in, just in the time that I've been on the Planning Commission and Zoning Board, to come up with

something a little less in-your-face, which is definitely not the sign people want, but it's really been tempered back a lot. Now, I think it's being pulled back the other way.

Dave Campbell discussed an example of a pole sign along Haggerty Road, at the building with the fireplace shop. They want to remove the pole sign and replace it with a monument sign. The problem is they want to put it in the same spot. Unfortunately the same spot is too close to the road. Now they would have to go to the ZBA. Instead, they will probably just keep the big, tall, unattractive sign they currently have. If there was an opportunity for staff to work with them administratively, there could be a very attractive sign here, with a nice foundation, et cetera. That may give them the motivation to do it right.

McKeever – There was a similar situation with CJ's.

Weber – Dave, I echo Bill's comments. If the signage location is based upon averages, that brings a level of common sense.

Parel – Do we want electronic signs?

Dave Campbell – We do allow electronic signs only in certain zoning districts, and where we do allow them, we say the message can only change every 30 seconds, it can't flash, or scroll, et cetera.

Weber – My concern with electronic signs is from a safety standpoint. There are enough distractions for drivers already, and even if a sign is changing every 30 seconds, those types of signs that are close to roadways are concerning.

Schinzing – Even worse, when they're further away from the road, you're drawing your eyes even further away to watch it.

Extensive discussions ensued regarding electronic signs, locations that currently have them, enforcement, illumination, changeable message board signs, and potential amendments to be addressed. The consensus was that the Planning Commissioners are not in favor of electronic signs. Dave would consult counsel further on this matter. Weber added that a sign should promote the location of a business; it should not be a digital stream running a commercial.

McKeever reiterated the potential for staff being able to review sign exceptions administratively.

Dave Campbell – What I've heard is that you'd be open to us bringing something back that creates some sort of a mathematical averaging for a possible sign location exception to be at the discretion of administration.

McKeever – With safety sight lines being a definite denial.

Chairperson Haber – I think it needs to be cleaned up, so let's see what you come up with.

Dave Campbell – Jay is ultimately the one who reviews and approves the sign permits. When we bring this back, I hope he will be an active part of that conversation too.

Jones – The other thing you indicated too is that, other than the sign itself, you might be able to negotiate some site improvements, and that is a good thing in my opinion.

Dave Campbell – That's something we always try to do. We will take our time with this and bring it back to you in the future.

J: OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION:

Schinzing stated that he went by the Side Car Slider Bar and it looks great. It's clean and the outdoor patio is nice.

K: PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Supervisor Scott and I met with Dennis Kolar, the Director of the RCOC. Most of our conversation was about Martin Road and Martin Parkway, and how it connects to Union Lake Road. There's an idea we have, and we have some sketches, to swing Martin Road through the old Commerce Drive-In property to line up with Union Lake Road, with a new roundabout at Union Lake Road, and the new Martin Road at Richardson. And then another new roundabout where new Martin would split off of old Martin. The idea is to keep traffic flowing from where M-5 effectively stops at Pontiac Trail and dumps all that traffic on the county road network that was never designed to take it, and trying to keep that traffic flowing northward, primarily on weekday afternoons. The RCOC liked the idea. Now it's a question of how it will be paid for. We came away from that meeting knowing that the RCOC was interested enough to want to figure out what the concept might cost. They will talk to some consultants, come up with a scope and hopefully conduct a study to tell us what this might cost.

McKeever – Basically, they could do something similar to what they did in downtown Wixom. They got rid of the jog between the intersections.

Discussions continued regarding potential reconfigurations and widening of local roadways.

Dave Campbell – Another part of the discussion with the RCOC was with regard to the Aikens project and the Pontiac Trail/M-5 roundabout. Aikens said, "I've paid to look at that roundabout twice. I'm not too excited to pay to look at it a third time." That was relayed to Mr. Kolar.

The Township's position on this matter is, the Township and the DDA built that roundabout and Martin Parkway. We did that 10 years ago in anticipation of major development along that corridor. It took 10 years, but now we're here and this major development is coming. For the RCOC to come back to us and say, "Now you've got to fix it again," I think our position is, "We already paid \$12 million to fix it once."

McKeever – The RCOC is the one that talked us out of building the larger roundabout that we wanted, and we were fully prepared to build that original roundabout.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: JULY 8, 2019 @ 7PM

Dave Campbell – At the next meeting, we may see Rock Ridge. In addition, we should see a request for a new light industrial building along Rig Street.

L: ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Schinzing, supported by Parel, to adjourn the meeting at 8:22pm.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Brian Winkler, Secretary