

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

Monday, August 11, 2025
2009 Township Drive
Commerce Township, Michigan 48390

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

ROLL CALL: Present:

Brian Parel, Chairperson
Brian Winkler, Vice Chairperson
Joe Loskill, Secretary
George Weber
Brady Phillips
Mickey McCanham

Absent: Caitlin Bearer (excused)

Also Present: Dave Campbell, Township Planning Director
Paula Lankford, Senior Planner
Nicolas PreFontaine, Associate Planner
Mark Gall, Township Fire Marshal
Nancy McClain, Township Engineer, Giffels Webster

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Loskill, supported by Philips, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda of August 11, 2025, as written.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Winkler, supported by Loskill, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of June 2, 2025, with two corrections; 1) Fix the page numbering error in the heading, and 2) on Page 11, Phillips' commentary, bottom of the page, correct the following sentence: *Traffic cut-through; if the Winewood stub was connected, I think that is a concern for both developments because there are **NOT** too many between Commerce Road and Sleeth.* **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

D. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES

Brian Winkler – Downtown Development Authority

- The July 15th DDA meeting was very routine and very short.
- There was only one item of note; Molly Phillips gave an update from the Township Board, and she reported that an audit of the Township's finances was recently completed by Plante Moran. The audit was clean, to the point that Plante Moran said it was the best audit that they had ever been through. Congratulations to the Board and to Molly Phillips in particular.

George Weber – Township Board of Trustees

- The most recent Board of Trustees meeting was on July 8th.
- Maybe following on Brian's note that Molly led us through a great audit, she also announced her intention to retire next year. Molly has been the Treasurer for more than 10 years and has done an outstanding job. She will be sorely missed.

- I might ask Mark, our Fire Marshal in the back, if I mess this up, but we had a citizen's recognition on July 8th that I think is noteworthy. One of our residents was coming home from a late shift at work. It was roughly 3:00 in the morning. He was on Benstein Road and noticed smoke coming out of a house. Rather than going on his way, or just calling 911 and leaving, he called 911, stopped his truck, got out and banged on the door and windows enough to wake the resident who was sleeping. He got her out of the house before the Fire Department could get there. He might have saved her life. We can all aspire to actions like that.
- Additionally, we had a presentation from our wastewater and water consultant on identifying how we're doing on our water and sewer funds. The cost increase that we will be getting from the Great Lakes Water Authority, basically the Detroit water provider for almost all of southeast Michigan, they are going to increase our water costs by roughly 7.5%. We are only going to pass on 2.9% of that to the residents starting next year. And regarding wastewater, basically the sewer charges, we're holding those flat. We have been able to do those through some good management from the history of the Township. Many years ago, the Township built a water tank on 14 Mile Road. That tank has allowed us to purchase water when it's cheap, hold it, and then distribute it as needed. That, and the fact that water usage is going down in the area, has allowed us to be able to absorb most of the price increase and still be smart with the way we do this going forward. In West Bloomfield, I think they are getting hit with a 10% increase for both water and sewer if I read that correctly. So, kudos to the previous Commerce Township management for having the insights to take those actions.
- Brian mentioned the audit, so I won't go through that again.
- Caitlin Bearer, who is absent and on vacation today, will now be the Planning Commission's liaison to the Zoning Board Appeals. She will be taking over for Bill McKeever who has retired from the Commission and the Board after 23 years.
- This gentleman to my right, Mickey McCanham, is taking Bill's place. This is his first meeting, so I'm glad to see so many people here.
- We're making a significant investment back into the Fire Department. As I have mentioned in the past, our Fire Department is going full advance life support, which means that virtually all of our fire and medical personnel will be paramedics, and as such, we are investing in more equipment so that they can do what they need to do to keep us all safe.
- And finally, if there are any pickleball players here, we are going to be building a new restroom facility for park users at the Richardson Center.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, do we have any updates for the ZBA in Caitlin's absence?

Dave Campbell –

- Well, Mr. Weber stole my thunder on a couple of things. First, I wanted to thank all of you for being willing to reschedule tonight's meeting.
- I also want to welcome Mr. McCanham to the Planning Commission. As we have talked about, he has some big shoes to fill with Mr. McKeever's retirement. We look forward to working with him.
- George mentioned that Caitlin Bearer is going to take Bill's role with the ZBA, so we look forward to that.

- I want to introduce Nicolas PreFontaine. He is our new Associate Planner. This is a new position that the Planning Department created because Paula here is going to retire on us, at the end of next year, after 37 years of service to Commerce Township. The idea is to take as much knowledge as we can from Paula's head and put it into Nicolas' head over the next 14 months. Nicolas is a very recent graduate of the planning school at Michigan State. We're not holding that against him. We're going to make it work. So, please introduce yourself to Nicolas if you haven't already.
- I apologize if it still feels warm in here. It was a lot warmer and stuffier about an hour ago, so we have the A/C cranking. If everyone could take full advantage of the microphones, and if I could ask everybody in the audience to keep the chatter down; the A/C is roaring pretty good, so let's make sure we can all hear each other.

Chairperson Parel – Thanks, Dave.

E. PUBLIC DISCUSSION ON MATTERS FOR WHICH THERE IS NO PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULED

Chairperson Parel opened to Public Discussion on matters for which there is no public hearing scheduled.

Chairperson Parel – We do have a public hearing scheduled regarding The Enclave at Stillwater, but I would welcome anyone up if they want to discuss anything else that's going on in the Township that is not on our agenda.

Dave Campbell – And if you're here for The Enclave, just hold your comments until we get to the actual public hearing for that item.

Doug McKibbon – Is waste removal covered in this?

Chairperson Parel – We'd be happy to hear your comment, and we can address it or find someone to do so.

Doug McKibbon – I live in the Crystal Lake development. I might be the only one that has a problem, but I moved in in April and we don't have a garbage can yet. We've called the city several times. They said there is a supply chain issue. I don't know if anybody here has any insight or leverage on that, but it's a pain not to have a garbage can, the rolling kind.

Dave Campbell – I don't know if I have leverage, but what is the address?

Doug McKibbon – 2388 Provencal Drive. We have the recycle, but not the garbage can.

Weber – Sir, is this unique to you, or is it your entire street?

Doug McKibbon – I've heard that other people who have moved in during the last couple of months have not gotten one either.

Weber – Okay.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you for your comment. We will see if we can get a can for you.

Chairperson Parel closed Public Discussion on matters for which there is no public hearing scheduled.

F. TABLED ITEMS

None.

G. OLD BUSINESS

None.

H. SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS

ITEM H.1. PPU25-01 – THE ENCLAVE AT STILLWATER – PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT – PUBLIC HEARING

Twin Ponds Investments Co. (Andrew Milia) is requesting a formal recommendation of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for a proposed single-family development of 90 new homes to be located on the north side of Sleeth Road, just east of The Reserve at Crystal Lake, upon the middle of the three former Sleeth Road gravel pits.
PIN# 17-08-400-004

Dave Campbell – So, maybe it's a good time to mention that there will be a public hearing. There will be a moment where the Planning Commission formally opens the public hearing, and then once everybody's had their opportunity to speak, the Planning Commission will close the public hearing. At that point, the conversation comes back to the Planning Commission. So, we ask that any comments that you may have after that have to be held. There's an opportunity for public comment, but once that public comment is closed, that's the opportunity.

When we do get to the public comment, what we always say is, this isn't a pep rally. We're all grown-ups. So, despite what you might see on YouTube, we're not here to cheer, or to boo and hiss. Let's all be respectful. Everybody wants what's best for Commerce Township. So, typically I give my introduction and try my best to explain the project. I know the development team wants to come up and give their own presentation on their own behalf, and then usually, Mr. Chair, after the public comments have been closed, a lot of times the applicant, the developer, will want an opportunity to address any questions, comments or concerns that may have come up over the course of the public hearing. So, I'm confident that Mr. Milia will want to have that opportunity after the public comments have closed.

The project to be discussed is The Enclave at Stillwater. Of the three decommissioned gravel pits along the north side of Sleeth Road, this would be the middle of the three. The site overall is 65 acres, so this is the site as it sits now. Keep in mind that north is now to your left, and Sleeth Road is to your right. The 65-acre site includes a 14-acre manmade lake from back during the gravel mining operation, so approximately 51 net acres of usable land, albeit with some pockets of State-regulated wetlands that are intended to remain.

What is proposed is the site that's on the screen. Again, north being to your left, so anyone from the Lake Sherwood neighborhood, which I'm guessing we have a few, you're on the left hand side of that site plan. What's proposed is 90 new single family homes. Approximately 14 of them would front upon the manmade lake, and the remaining 76 would be lots to the north. The lots surrounding the lake are larger lots,

both wider and deeper. The depth of the lots varies depending on the meandering shoreline of the lake. The lots to the north, along more of the grid layout to the north, those are mostly about 65 by 130 square foot lots. In terms of size, they are comparable to the existing lots in the northeast quadrant of The Reserve at Crystal Lake, which is the gravel pit development just next door to the west.

In terms of traffic, access and circulation, one new point of access is proposed along the northside of Sleeth Road with this boulevard entrance here, and the second point of access is via a connection to the road that's currently stubbed within The Reserve at Crystal Lake. It's currently stubbed at the property line and that road is called Hoppe Lane. That would be extended into The Enclave at Stillwater to provide two points of access, which satisfies the International Fire Code and satisfies our Fire Department, to provide two points of access for a development of 90 homes. A third point of nonmotorized access is proposed to be at Winewood Lane, which is the road that's stubbed at the north property line through Lake Sherwood. There was discussion when this project was brought to this Planning Commission back in June, at a conceptual level, of whether or not there should be a road access point or even a gated emergency road via Winewood. However, it was agreed upon by both the Planning Commission and the developer that with the two points of access that are being proposed via Sleeth Road and Hoppe Lane, that a third point of access, or even a gated emergency access, was not warranted. What this Planning Commission did feel was a good idea was to have a nonmotorized connection, a sidewalk that would lead to Winewood to connect the two neighborhoods, at least from a nonmotorized standpoint, and provide sidewalk connection to the internal sidewalks that are proposed along the road within The Enclave, and with the sidewalks that are under construction next door with The Reserve at Crystal Lake development.

Similar to The Reserve at Crystal Lake, this project is being proposed as a PUD, a planned unit development. So, as this Planning Commission is well aware, a PUD provides flexibility to both the Township and to the developer to deviate from the otherwise strict standards of the Zoning Ordinance. The intended outcome of any PUD is to achieve a better project than what could have otherwise been achieved if developed per the standards of the Zoning Ordinance. In this case, the property is zoned R-1A, which is our large lot single family zoning district. R-1A requires lots that are a minimum of 20,000 square feet and a minimum of 100 feet in width. What the developer is proposing is smaller lots, with the tradeoff being that the land that could otherwise be cleared from property line to property line to provide 20,000 square foot lots, as would be required in R-1A, instead of doing that, cluster smaller lots together in an effort to preserve some of the existing natural vegetation around the perimeter to provide more of a buffer between the adjacent neighborhoods, particularly to Lake Sherwood to the north, and to The Reserve at Crystal Lake to the west, and to provide more open space throughout the development. This also allows the developer to preserve some of the wetlands onsite. While it is a manmade lake, Mother Nature has reclaimed some of it as protected wetlands that are then regulated by the State of Michigan. The developer is not looking to acquire permits from the State to impact any of those wetlands. He wants to leave the wetlands in their natural state and part of doing that is to cluster the lots together and leave the wetlands undisturbed.

If you look at it from a density standpoint, the 90 lots that are proposed on the 51-ish net acres that are available, comes out to a density of about 1.76 units per acre, which is very comparable to the density next door in The Reserve at Crystal Lake, which I think was at 1.74. It should be noted that if you look at it from a mathematical standpoint, 51 acres, 20,000 square foot lots, under R-1A zoning, approximately 112 lots could be

achieved. The developer is asking for less than what the base zoning might allow by asking for 90 where 112 could be achieved under R-1A. And, the developer also points out that the PUD option allows him up to 3 units per acre, where what they're proposing is 1.76. So, the contention would be that they are proposing a less dense development and clustering the smaller lots in order to preserve more of the natural open space around the lake and around the perimeter of the development.

One of the objectives and requirements of a PUD is that the developer offer recognizable public benefits as something of a tradeoff for not having to meet the standards of the underlying R-1A zoning. We had some discussion back in June of what those recognizable public benefits could be for this project, keeping in mind that those benefits are meant to be proportionate to the deviation that the developer is seeking. So again, in this case, the developer is seeking smaller lots, but not necessarily more lots. The same number, or even less than what the R-1A zoning might allow, but clustering them together into smaller lots.

Within the review letter submitted by the Planning Department, and within the PUD agreement that the developer has submitted in draft form, it includes the recognizable public benefits that are being offered for the PUD. Our letter summarizes several of those, some of which I've mentioned; preservation of open space around the perimeter and within the interior, providing a buffer, providing the open space, and the protection of natural features. One of the public benefits that's taken right from our Zoning Ordinance is, *appropriate redevelopment of a site occupied by a prior obsolete non-residential use*. In this case, as we've mentioned, a decommissioned gravel pit that was not a use that would be permitted if it were proposed today in R-1A zoning. So, this is a reuse of an obsolete site with something that does comply with the Zoning Ordinance, and with the Township's master plan for land use, by proposing single-family homes on a property that was a gravel pit.

As an objective of the PUD process, the Zoning Ordinance also speaks to a complementary variety of housing. What's being proposed is a mix of lot sizes, smaller lots that hopefully would be more attainable to a larger degree. The larger your lot is, the higher the price tag goes, and we have a lot of discussions around here about the escalating price of housing. So, by providing the narrower, smaller lots, that hopefully makes those units more attainable, particularly to starter families, and on the other end of the life spectrum, to the empty nesters.

One of the public benefits has to do with a provision of public utilities. This site will be serviced by municipal water and sanitary sewer, as is The Reserve at Crystal Lake. As the Planning Commission remembers, when The Reserve at Crystal Lake was approved, a big part of it was extending the municipal water and sanitary sewer westward along Sleeth Road to get to The Reserve at Crystal Lake. Once those mains were in place, then they're right at the front door for the other two gravel pits, including the one we're talking about tonight. Part of what is being proposed with this project is to connect to the water main along Sleeth Road, extend it through the site and connect up to the stubbed water main that currently exists at Winewood. It would be an upsized main, and an additional main, additional to what the developer would otherwise need to put in to service his site. What that upsize and additional main then creates is a regional loop. So, now you would have a loop from the transmission water main along Sleeth Road, all the way through the site, connecting up to Winewood, which then connects to the water main all the way up to Commerce Road. That regional loop is good for fire protection and redundancy. If we were to have a water main break at one location or the other, you could isolate the break, but still continue to serve the customers that are served by that water main. It's also good for water pressure. I know the engineers can

speaking to this better than I can, but the Township's master plan for water service envisions having such a regional loop, but the plan was to have it via a connection all the way up Duck Lake Road, about a half a mile further west from this site. So, what this connection allows is to have that regional connection, at least in the interim, until the Township is prepared to make that regional loop along Duck Lake Road sometime in the future. It takes away some of the urgency of the Township doing that Duck Lake connection.

We talked about the smaller lots and the density, and also sidewalks. We talked about the internal sidewalks that are proposed along all of the interior roads to this site. Typically, a developer would be required to put in a sidewalk along the project's frontage, in this case the north side of Sleeth Road. But what the Township's nonmotorized master plan envisions is a pathway along the south side of Sleeth Road, all the way from Duck Lake to Bass Lake Road, and to points beyond from there. The logic there is most of the land along the south side of Sleeth Road is State of Michigan land, Proud Lake State Recreation Area, so it would probably be easier and more economical to get the easements to do a pathway along the south side of the road than to go door to door and try to get easements from the property owners along the north side of the road, particularly the homes west of this site. So, because it would not make sense for the developer to put in a dead-end section of sidewalk along the frontage, instead what he would do is make a contribution to the Township's sidewalk fund, proportionate to what it would cost to otherwise put in a dead-end sidewalk along the north side of Sleeth. The developer would put that into the sidewalk fund so that when the day comes that we're ready to do a pathway along the south side of Sleeth, we have those funds available for that project.

From a procedural standpoint, tonight is one of the first main steps in the PUD review and approval process. By State law, we are required to have a public hearing, which is part of what we're here to do this evening. Following that public hearing, the Planning Commission has the option to make a formal recommendation to the Township Board. The Township Board would have the final authority to make a decision on the PUD. If the Planning Commission is ready to make their formal recommendation tonight, then this could be before the Township Board at their meeting on September 9th. That doesn't mean the Planning Commission has to make a formal recommendation tonight. Certainly, the Planning Commission wants to hear the public comments, questions and concerns and then go from there.

I should mention too that there was a traffic impact study done for this project by the Township's traffic engineer. Based on the existing volumes along Sleeth Road, the projected future volumes along Sleeth Road, including the future projected traffic for the full buildout of The Reserve at Crystal Lake next door, and based on the amount of new traffic to be generated by this development, the traffic consultant advises that a new eastbound passing lane would be required at the entrance for this development, so somewhere on the south side of Sleeth, right at the point of entrance, an eastbound passing lane, and then a westbound right turn lane. Enough new traffic will be generated by this project to warrant an inbound right turn lane to try to keep the traffic moving along Sleeth. They did look at the intersection of Bass Lake and Sleeth Road to the east, which is currently a stop controlled for Sleeth, and full movement for Bass Lake. Based on the volumes of traffic projected there, and based on the existing road configuration, they determined that no improvements would be needed at that intersection. Then, if you look to the west, at the goofy intersection of Wixom, Sleeth and Duck Lake roads, the RCOC has scheduled for around this time next year to build a big roundabout that would replace those two signalized intersections. I know they have

a public meeting coming up that they are trying to schedule in September. They're trying to work out a deal with Huron Valley Schools to hold it at Oak Valley Middle School. If not, their fall back option is the Outdoor Learning Center for Walled Lake Schools. Regardless, they do want to have a public meeting and once we know when that is, we will let everybody know.

I'm trying to think if there is anything else I want to cover before we turn it over to the development team led by Andy Milia. I know Mr. Milia wants to make a presentation on his own behalf. I will look to Paula to see if she can think of anything I've missed. By the way, Nancy McClain is here. Usually it's Jason Mayer, from our Township Engineer, Giffels Webster. She can speak to any questions regarding the engineering, the drainage, utilities, water, sewer, et cetera.

Chairperson Parel – Any questions from anyone up here? Hearing none, Mr. Milia, we welcome you up. As you make your way up, Dave, I just have one question. We talked about the developer's request to waive some of the capital costs for the project. I apologize if you mentioned it, but I know when we talked earlier, you and I chatted a little bit about how the lines of responsibility fall between the Planning Commission and the Township Board of Trustees. Can we touch base on that?

Dave Campbell – Sure, we can. So, because it is a PUD, there is a development agreement that lays out the terms of what the developer is offering with respect to recognizable public benefits for the project, and also lays out any requests or asks that the developer is making of the Township. Relative to municipal water and sewer, the developer is asking that the capital charges, or what we all call tap fees, be waived for this project for the 90 units that are proposed. The developer is also asking that 50% of the of the sewer capital charges be waived. I will let Mr. Milia speak for himself, but I think his contention would be that the additional charge of looping the 12" water main through this site is a verify significant benefit to the Township and to the Township's water system, but a benefit that comes at a significant cost to him as a developer. So, he is seeking something of a trade with the Township to provide that benefit, but offset some of the costs by waiving the tap fees.

Now, to your question Mr. Parel, the Township's municipal water system and sanitary sewer system are both enterprise funds that are managed and administered by the Township Board. The Planning Commission doesn't often get involved in financial decisions as they pertain to those enterprise funds. The Planning Commission's role, as it should be, has to do with land use; directing the land use of Commerce Township, and how land is utilized, developed or redeveloped. That being said, you are being asked to make a formal recommendation on this PUD agreement that includes this waiver of 100% of the water taps, and 50% of the sewer taps. On one hand, it really should be a decision of the Township Board whether that is a fair trade for Commerce Township for our water and sewer systems, but it's certainly with your role to make your opinions known because it is part of the PUD agreement. I know Mr. Weber wears both hats as the Township Board's liaison to the Planning Commission, so he will have to make this decision when he is wearing his Township Board hat.

So, as the Planning Department always does, we provide recommended motion language to the Planning Commission if you are prepared to take action tonight with a formal recommendation. Within that motion language, there is language specific to this request for the waiver of the water and sewer taps. It's certainly something that could be discussed tonight, but I think the ultimate decision rests with the Township Board.

Chairperson Parel – I just wanted to make sure it was out there because I have a feeling the question might arise up here.

Dave Campbell – It's a very important question.

Chairperson Parel – Mr. Milia, to you.

Andy Milia – Thank you. I'm President of Franklin Property Corporation. My partner, Gary Jonna of Whitehall is also with us this evening.

Mr. Campbell stated that Mr. Weber stole his thunder, and he stole my thunder and gave a very nice presentation. So, I will talk quickly as some of it is redundant. As you may recall, we were before you on June 2nd and we gave you a preliminary overview of the plan. Not a lot has changed in terms of the actual site plan, but we did learn a lot from you on some of the issues, concerns and comments that you have and we've refined some of those elements subsequent to that. About 10 days ago, we also met with the neighbors predominantly to the north and to the west. We gave them a similar presentation, determined some of their issues and concerns, and further incorporated some of those into the plan. So, what we're going to show you tonight is an overall plan, as well as we'll drill down into some of those other issues.

This is the site on Sleeth Road, between Benstein and Duck Lake Road. This property here is The Reserve at Crystal Lake, which Gary and I also developed. We're in our second year of development. That has gone very well. We've bought the two pits. This one, which is the subject property that we're going to discuss tonight. It's separated by power lines, and then this as well. This is not for consideration. That may come at a future date, or it may just be held.

A close-up view of it. Again, The Reserve at Crystal Lake, the subject property. By way of the dimensions, The Reserve at Crystal Lake is 159 acres, with a 42-acre lake, and Enclave is 65 acres with a 14-acre lake. Both are manmade lakes. They were [unreclaimed] (sic) gravel pits left in disrepair. This one required the movement of 1.5 million cubic yards of overburden soil, which we did over a one-year period. This one is much more tame and will require about 100,000 to 150,000 yards, and the majority of it will stay onsite. So, it's a much less intensive site, but a lot of problems to deal with in terms of grades, utilities and some wetlands, which we'll discuss.

This is the property with Sleeth Road down here, facing north. Again, The Reserve here, and this is The Enclave. It goes from Sleeth Road here to the north, to just south of the Lake Sherwood subdivision. The power lines are along here. This is being developed, as Mr. Campbell indicated, as a PUD. It's well integrated, it's a low density neighborhood that we believe complements the Township's vision for smart land use. It preserves the natural features. And very importantly, it offers a variety of housing to meet the current and future needs. As Mr. Campbell indicated, The Reserve lots were 60x125. These lots will be 60x135, offering some additional depth which will allow for some additional buffer and some slightly larger homes in that area, and larger lots along the lake are 105x140, and larger. We believe that it upholds the character, the intent, and there's a lot of social, environmental and economic vitality to this.

We're pleased to report that the residents of The Reserve, which has 203 homes planned there, approximately 70 are either built or under construction. There are over 30 new residents, and we're seeing new friendships develop, families developing. It has turned out to be very nice. It has enabled people to have a move up community, coming into it from an apartment or a small home, or allowing residents who are in a larger

home in Commerce to downsize. It's serving the vision that we had intended and we hope that this one will as well.

The developer profile; Gary and I have completed over 40 communities, residential subdivisions in over 20 municipalities, including over 4,000 home sites. We've worked with the Top 10 largest builders in the state, including national builders. We're doing this under a PUD. We kind of pioneered the PUD. We did the first PUD in the City of Troy, the first PUD in Franklin, the first PUD in Dexter, and we've built in 20 different communities in southern and northern Michigan.

We are not developers. We handpick the builders that go into the development. We sometimes partner with them, and sometimes we sell them, but the end product is very important to us and the builders that we choose is very important. The same development team; PEA Group that has worked closely with Giffels during the process. They're also our geo-tech consultant. Barr Engineering is our wetland and environmental consultant.

I'll give you a quick update on Crystal Lake because there are some similarities between the two. This is the entrance sign along Sleeth Road, for those of you who've driven by or hopefully driven through it. When we got approved a couple years ago, we had kind of a minimalistic landscape plan. We far exceeded what we promised on the plan and we spent over \$1.5 million on landscaping common areas and the beach home. If you've driven through, you can see that the quality that's gone into it and the care that's going into it now.

This again is The Reserve. What I want to highlight is the vision for this is similar to the vision that we're proposing; we have four different neighborhoods. We have this neighborhood that has the 60-foot lots, we have the lake lot neighborhood, we have this area which are non-lake lots but larger lots and larger homes, and then we have these which are medium size lots. This was sold to Robertson Brothers. This was sold to Evergreen Homes. This was sold to Toll Brothers, which is the largest luxury builder in the country. And then we've been very successful in retailing these lake lots to individual home buyers. You'll see that we're getting a lot of custom homes, different architects and different builders and custom homes.

So, we're very pleased that the vision that we put forward, you know, at the beginning of COVID is coming to fruition and we're able to achieve attainable housing. I'm hesitant to say the word affordable housing anymore because it's an overused term, but attainable housing in the \$500,000 to \$700,000 price range in in this area, \$700,000 price range here, \$800,000 to \$1 million here, and the lake lot homes are going from \$1.5 million to \$3 million. We're very pleased. This development will capture the Brownfield much sooner and the Township will be into their tax and revenue stage at a much quicker pace, and we're getting the quality of the homes and the quality of residents that we envisioned.

This is the first home that was built in The Reserve. This is on the corner lake lot. I don't want to discuss the price, but it's a multimillion dollar home, high quality. We had several discussions on materials and the world has kind of changed in the five years since we started this, and we were able to go back and meet with staff, under Mr. Weber's direction, and be allowed to reduce some of the stone in consideration for higher materials. This is kind of the new product that's going on today, where the homes used to be all brick or all stone in the front; this is what is popular today and it's been very well received.

So, we're very pleased with the quality of this and all of the homes in the area. These are the first floor lake lots. You can see this one has been landscaping. These are the first people that put a boat in and finished off the beach nicely. These are under

construction but will be similarly finished in the back. So, really taking advantage of the amenity of the view across the lake. These are on the east side. This is the second home built in the development, and again, they've landscaped it beautifully as well. In our master deed, we maintain very high standards and we adhere to those that every resident has to put money in escrow to finish landscaping the homes. So often, what you see in many communities is the homeowner under budgets or runs out of money and is not able to landscape. They may say they'll get to it the next year and they seldom do. We're maintaining that these people put money in escrow and complete the landscape, and it's coming out very well.

These were the homes in the upper east quadrant, the Robertson Homes and Toll Brothers. This is their model home. Evergreen Homes, again, building more of the farm style. And this was the first lake home. We're pleased with all of the products that are being built.

This is our bath house. As you may recall, we did a public beach area in here, finished it, landscaped it. Furniture has been delayed due to some supply chain issues, but it should be delivered next week. But people are already enjoying the public beach area here. The residents on the lake can have their own boat, but the residents that are not on the lake can enjoy the beach as well and can launch canoes and rafts in there as well.

Now, an introduction into the subject property tonight. We call it The Enclave at Stillwater. This is the site plan. This is the proper orientation, with Sleeth Road here, Crystal Lake here, and our 65-acre development here. As Mr. Campbell indicated, these lots here will be considered lake lots. They'll feature views of the lake. Unlike Crystal Lake, these will not feature beaches in here because we're going to preserve all this area and preserve all the wetlands on this, so these residents will not have their own private beach. The lake will be shared by everybody, but will not be finished right to the beach level.

The boulevard entranceway is here. The second means of access is here. We discussed this at the last meeting and it was the desire for the majority of the Planning Commission to use this as a sidewalk to be able to connect these so that people in Lake Sherwood could enjoy a nice walking trail throughout here. When we presented this to the people of Lake Sherwood, there were kind of mixed feelings. We are willing to do whatever the Planning Commission ultimately decides on that.

Some of the key features, and I've got subsequent slides which will show it, there is a very significant buffer area on the north, west and east sides, and we will be rebuilding this berm here. A lot of discussion was held on here and I've got other slides that will show this in greater detail, but it was important to us to maintain buffer areas, common areas as one of the reasons why we're proposing a PUD. If we didn't do a PUD, it would be necessary to really use every inch of the property and clear to the property line in every direction. We wouldn't be able to do these park areas or preserve these areas. We think this plan, similar to The Reserve is really well thought out in terms of utilization of the site.

Another thing that this does is it allows for a more attainable home; still having a high quality home, but more attainable. If we had to develop these as 100x200 foot lots, they would be \$250,000 lots and they'd have to be \$1 million homes. By making the lot sizes a little smaller, we can do a more attainable home and a home price that will be affordable to many more people. So, this would have three price points.

Again, this is Sleeth Road down here and this is the entranceway. This is the first time you're seeing this rendering. It was very important to be able to come in and see the development, to have a very nice visual experience. So, rather than put some more lots

in this area, we wanted to keep this as a beautiful entranceway so everybody driving into the development has a nice view of the water. This would be a protected common area and never built on. This drive along the east side would all be a nice view as well. We want to be good stewards of the land and incorporate it into the site plan.

This buffer shows all the common area in green driving into the site. All of this would be common areas. I'll talk a little bit more about more of these lots, because this is a change in deviation based on what you recommended last time.

This slide shows a cross section. This is the north side of the development that will be facing north there. This is the Lake Sherwood area. Our property line is here, and what we're proposing is a 34-foot buffer area to leave the natural vegetation, enhance it a little bit more. These lots are 135 feet deep versus 125 feet deep. They have 10 extra feet of depth on them, and we propose additional plantings in here as well as enhancing this 65 feet. There's natural vegetation on these lots as well, so there's a very significant distance between these homes and very significant buffer area as well. So, this is one of the things that was important to you as Planning Commission members, and something that we took very seriously, and something that the residents raised as well. Areas on the previous plan that we submitted showed these lots as being a little bit longer, and this lot being a little bit larger here. The subsequent plan shows that we've cut this back to match the 34 feet, so this will be a continuous 34-foot buffer throughout here. These lots have been carved back so there is a continuous buffer throughout there that would coincide and match.

Some of the residents raised a question, so this is a new slide that we developed based on that last meeting. This is the common area buffer to the north. We're going to keep all the vegetation. Some of the questions were raised; Are you going to go clear it and replant some trees? The blue line represents the clearing line, so we're not going to clear that vegetation. We're going to clear to 34-feet from the existing vegetation, and then we're moving the rear yard swale in to be in the middle of the back yard. This is at a significant concession versus grading this and putting the rear yard swale on the property line which is typical. We're moving this swale in to maintain the natural buffer there. So, we're impairing our own lots to an extent to maintain this buffer to act hopefully in satisfaction to the neighbors.

This is a brighter picture of the rear yard swale and storm drain. We've moved it into the interior of the property, taking it off the residents' property line. In most cases, this would actually be up there where we'd clear to the property line. We're not going to clear to their property line. We're going to put the swale in this area. This would all go to a detention area, which goes through mechanical filters to silt, and then this eventually goes into the retention pond, similar to how The Reserve was built.

PUD benefits; Mr. Campbell had touched on them. This is a low density design, open space preservation, environmental stewardship. We were going to keep the majority of the wetlands in place rather than seek a permit to clear it. Three different diverse housing options. We would have an anti-monotony provision in the PUD agreement to have a variety of homes. This is a smart development where we turn potential liabilities into community assets.

Mr. Campbell touched on the loop water main system. The way that we originally designed this, and we met with your engineers, is that we would do the water main that we brought in when we did the previous development along here. We not only extended it from what was our entranceway here; we had extended it all the way to the property line. Those were some last minute negotiations that your engineers required. So, we've already looped the water main at the Township's request, at an additional cost of

\$400,000 to \$500,000, from here all the way to the property line, which wasn't necessary for here, but it was a requirement at the time that we did development. On this development, the only thing that's necessary for us to do is a water main to come in here and feed this, and then the water main to come through here and then feed this development. The water main in this area is not necessary for this development. Your engineers asked or required that a new water main be installed here, which is a 12-inch water main, and that this water main be upgraded from an 8-inch to a 12-inch water main. So, this would be redundant. Not necessary for this development, but for the benefit of this community, and a benefit for all this area to the west of The Reserve at Crystal Lake. The cost to do this is over \$400,000. The tap requests that we're asking for on the water main is roughly \$2,000 per unit, or \$180,000. The cost to do this for the public benefit far exceeds the request that we're making on it. Mr. Campbell also touched on the density. The property is 65 acres, minus 14.5 acres for the lake leaves 51 buildable acres. Based on your current zoning, 112 lots would be permitted. We're only proposing 90. Your PUD ordinance allows 3 units per buildable acre, which would be 153. And again, we're just seeking 90 units. We think that's the best use of the land. Again, we're not putting lots at the entranceway and not putting them in the common areas, but really preserving those areas. As a comparison, in The Reserve we had 117 net acres. We did 1.74, and in this development, we're at 1.76. So, the same density as that development. If you drive in that development, there's tremendous open space and good lot sizes. This is keeping with that pattern of development. Thank you. I'm available to answer any questions, either now, or after the public speaks.

Chairperson Parel – Mr. Milia, I just wanted to clarify one thing. You mentioned that the cost to the developer for the increase diameter of the sewer is over \$400,000?

Andy Milia – Yes, and it's not just an increase in the diameter. It's a whole new water main here that's not necessary for this development, but will be necessary for the loop. So, this would be an all new 12-inch water main, which is the majority of the cost, and this would be an upgrade of an 8-inch water main to a 12-inch water main.

Chairperson Parel – And then the request in lieu of that is a 50% waiver of the tap fee for sanitary, which is about \$220,000.

Andy Milia – Correct, and part of that is that this development, although the improvements were put in here, these don't properly service this development. This development will require another \$800,000 pump station, and this will be sized for future development over here. It's our shock value; this is an \$800,000 cost, and this is a \$400,000 cost. That's \$1.2 million costs for which we're seeking approximately \$400,000 reimbursement.

Chairperson Parel – Got it, for the unrequired extension and the upgrade, that's \$1.2 million.

Andy Milia – Correct.

Dave Campbell – If I may, Mr. Milia, I heard you say that the intent with the new pump station is that it would serve not only this development but whatever develops next door to the east; it would be sized and engineered ...

Andy Milia – This would be sized for that, correct.

Chairperson Parel – And what is the value of the regular municipal water tap per home?

Andy Milia - \$2,000, so it would be \$180,000 there, and approximately \$180,000 on the other.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you. Are there any other questions prior to us opening the public hearing?

Chairperson Parel opened the public hearing.

Chairperson Parel – I would just like to reiterate some comments Dave made earlier. Please be respectful. Be respectful of everyone's time. Know that if you say something, we may not respond, but we're listening and we hear you. We will take it into consideration. And in regard to time, if something is said, you don't necessarily need to repeat it. With that, I will invite anyone up who would like to speak.

Dave Campbell – Before we start, we typically try to keep comments to 2 minutes or less. This is not meant to be a back and forth because that can devolve into everybody chiming in, which doesn't do any of us any good. Part of what Ms. Watson wants to do here is record everything that gets said, so that's why there needs to be one person talking and everybody else listening. So, one at a time, and if everybody can provide their name and address, we'll go from there.

Peter Bock, 2376 Provencal Dr, Commerce Township, The Reserve at Crystal Lake – I've lived in Commerce Township for over 30 years now, and most of that was in Commerce Lake Woods subdivision. My main concern is the buffer zone running along the Crystal Lake subdivision there. What I see looks pretty good. I've walked back there and there are a number of really old oak trees back in there that I would love to have preserved. Some of these are almost 3-feet in diameter, which would be nice to keep. They may be on that buffer zone, or slightly off of it, but that's my concern. We need to maintain that, and I know we're putting a sewer line in there, and that sometimes results in us taking out more trees than we plan on. With Dave's help, we look back at historical photos and it looks like the same property was farmland, gravel pit and now subdivision. That little section of trees has been there through all of that, so it would be nice to keep those old trees in there for the view. Our lot backs to those trees. If they were taken out, I might have a direct line of sight at the power lines and that's not something I wanted to see when I moved into that subdivision.

Relative to the housing density, I was quite surprised to see that this is really comparable to The Reserve at Crystal Lake, just because it seems like we have a lot more bigger lots in that subdivision than this one. I don't know if you have driven through there, but as you start stacking the tight lots in rows, it just doesn't look like Commerce Township to me. It looks more like townhomes if you will. As they go around corners, it sort of masks that and makes it look much better, but when you have them in line like that, it seems like the density is too tight.

Doug McKibbin, 2388 Provencal Dr, Commerce Township, The Reserve at Crystal Lake – You guys talked about that you're going to be doing some road updates on Sleeth Road next year. I ride my bike. Milford is a very bike friendly city, and you can get on the trails to go to Kensington. I ride on Sleeth west to get to Milford downtown, as well as to get on the trails. I just ask that when you have those passing lanes, make sure you keep a shoulder for bike riding – not gravel. Right now on Sleeth, there is probably 2 feet of cement with the white line, so you can ride on there. It's a little scary because it's a 50mph road. If it changes to 40, that would be a lot better, but please keep a bike lane of some sort on the road. I do see a lot of bike riders on Sleeth. I'm not the only one. Especially with more people moving into this sub, there will be more people that want to take advantage of that, so I think that's going to be really important.

Andy Sarkisian, 3398 Tiquewood Cir, Commerce Township, Lake Sherwood – I've been a resident for almost 34 years. On Sleeth Road, it would be nice when that construction happens it's coordinated so that we don't have Sleeth closed off to both east and west when they're doing the roundabout. A lot of us rely on that road.

As a Lake Sherwood resident, we've had many comments. There's a few of us here today. We're happy that there is not a pass-through driving lane. Thank you very much on that. I think a lot of people here in Lake Sherwood would not want to see the walk-through. Already, when the Woodland Ridge subdivision went in, we got a lot more traffic on Winewood. We also have a lot more people trespassing on the private Lake Sherwood. We don't see a function or a need for this walking path to encourage more trespassing.

The sewer hookup fees; we did a survey of our membership and we're concerned about the high cost of sewer hookup fees. From a water quality perspective, we'd love to see it more affordable. If Lake Sherwood residents find out that there's, for lack of a better term, an abatement for a developer of sewer hookup fees, this room will get crowded with people complaining. I'd be careful about that.

Regarding R-1A, I'd like to also echo the thought about the character of the Township to the west, in particular Commerce Township in the western part, west of Martin Road. When we input it as a total community of Lake Sherwood to the master plan, we talked about preserving the semi-rural nature of Commerce Township, at least west of Maple Road. In that regard, if anything, we encourage you guys to think about developing a classification of lot sizes larger than R-1A, estate things that you often see in Milford Township, maybe an acre or so. Unfortunately, these developments that happen in our back yards, literally, go in the opposite direction. So, if you can just plant that for the future.

I will rely on and defer to a neighbor regarding an issue that we've had from a safety perspective. Thank you very much.

Nick Polcyn, 2847 Ravinewood Drive, Commerce Township, Lake Sherwood – I've been a Commerce Township resident for about 20 years now. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I apologize in advance if this is not actually a Planning Commission topic, but it seemed appropriate being the public hearing for the development that is being discussed today.

The developers and I did discuss the following incident on July 30th. It was met with their surprise and sympathy, which I appreciated at that time. Back on May 11th, which was Mother's Day afternoon, we observed gunfire coming from this property. The Oakland County Sheriffs confirmed it was AR-15s being fired. In that afternoon, we actually observed bullets flying over our head and we believe struck one of the homes in our

neighborhood. I'm happy to share more details at a later date, but for the sake of brevity, we will get to my request. I did send this request via email again, but it was not met with any response from Twin Ponds development, but there may be a server issue. I never received a delivered message.

I want confirmation from the property owners that there will no longer be firearm shooting permitted on any of the Twin Ponds properties that exist in Commerce, including the property to the east that they also own. Additionally, as a sign of good neighborly conduct, I appreciate and would continue the dialogue of maintaining greenspace to create the security buffer between the two neighborhoods.

Lastly, for Commerce Township, I'd like to work with you and whoever the appropriate group is to examine what the current firearm ordinance is in Commerce, and maybe use this incident as an example. If it's not updated to prevent this type of target shooting, it really should be in the law. Even at that time, it seemed the officers weren't totally sure what was and what wasn't permitted.

Weber – I will check on that. I'm 90% sure that rifle usage on private property is not allowed and would be an illegal action. However, shotguns on private property during hunting season; I think that's a different animal, but not a rifle, and not anywhere near residential. That's abhorrent. This is the first I think we're all hearing of this, but I hope the Sheriffs' office is taking action or you've received feedback.

Nick Polcyn – Yes, so there is action underway. Really, what I'm waiting to see is what the response is from the development company. I'm really hoping we don't have any more of these instances going forward, and fortunately, no one was hurt. So, there's not a lot that needs to be done, other than prevention of any future potential risks that might occur.

Chairperson Parel – I do have a point of clarification. I want to make sure I heard you correctly. Did you mention that you think this action was permitted by the developer?

Nick Polcyn – So, at the time, the Sheriffs, after coming to our residence, went onto the subject property and made contact with the shooters. I have all of the information in the police report that was taken that day. At that time, they confirmed that they made contact with one of the property owners who gave permission for this to be taking place.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you.

Greg Woelfel, 4911 Winewood Lane, Commerce Township, Lake Sherwood – I'd like to bolster and support Andy's comment regarding the passage from the north part of this property into Lake Sherwood. As I understand it, originally it was considered perhaps to be a road network allowing traffic to pass between the two subdivisions. We have no sidewalks in Lake Sherwood. There is a lot of pedestrian traffic on Winewood Lane. There are mothers pushing babies carts, there are kids riding bicycles. I truly do not want to see that become an issue where additional road traffic comes through from this property into Lake Sherwood. We're very concerned. My reason for being here is because numerous people have come to me and asked me to find out. A lot of us live on Winewood and are concerned about that. I don't know that anyone can say to me tonight that I can be assured that's not going to happen. We'd also like to suggest that even the pedestrian traffic sidewalk is not necessary.

The other question I was going to have for the developer, or you folks, is you were mentioning about the main being enlarged from 8 to 12-inch, and that will connect to the main at Winewood going through our neighborhood, correct? That creates the loop. My concern and my question is whether that will then involve a changeout of the size of the main that runs on Winewood currently, or does that main stay as is and you connect to that? I'll leave it at that and maybe someone can answer me. I would prefer not to see the main dug up on Winewood. Thank you.

Nancy McClain – There are no plans to change the size of the main on Winewood. It is sufficient. The only construction will be right there at the hydrant where the tap is going to be made, so maybe about 30 feet of disturbance right at the end of Winewood.

Greg Woelfel – Thank you for the clarification. I appreciate it.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you, sir.

Mike Huehn, 4075 Wildwood Court, Commerce Township – I've been a Commerce Township resident pretty much my whole life. We moved out here in the 60's when it was still Milford and I remember the Milford zip code. This is a good looking development, but good looking is subjective. I think making it a better development is subjective as well. It depends on what you like. I personally would like to see you guys not allow so much deviation from the R-1A. I don't care for these smaller homes. It kind of looks like West Bloomfield, Wixom. It just doesn't have the appeal that Commerce typically does. Those are my comments. Maybe for future developments, we could just leave the zoning as is.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you, sir.

Jeff Dowbenko, 3065 Sleeth Road, Commerce Township – I actually sent an email with comments.

Chairperson Parel – I'm looking at it.

Jeff Dowbenko – Okay, great. My comment is, and I will summarize it real quick, along Sleeth Road, the landscaping frontage at The Reserve at Crystal Lake used to be like a tunnel of trees and that's gone. What was replaced looks kind of trashy. There's no landscaping on the Sleeth Road frontage, except for the entrance, and that looks great. But the rest of it, where all the utilities went through, the tunnel of trees is gone. I don't know if there's anything you can do to help landscape Sleeth Road.

The other comment I have that I made too is drainage along Sleeth. If you'll remember during the construction a couple years ago, we got kind of flooded. Hopefully you can do things so that all the rainwater that goes on the north side of Sleeth stays there. Last but not least, I sent you an email years ago, before Crystal Lake started about our mailboxes on Sleeth. All of our mailboxes are on the north side of the road, so everybody who lives on the south side has to cross Sleeth Road to get to our mail. I was hoping you could help us. I was looking through the post office website trying to figure out where to get started. You mentioned way back then that you could help. Now with the traffic, it's getting really hard to get our mail with 50mph, and especially the trucks that come out the construction, the gravel haulers.

Kelly Essenbacher, 2775 Sleeth Road, Commerce Township – I've lived in Commerce Township for 23 years now, and I live right on Sleeth Road. We knew that property was going to get developed at some point. We did not think that it would be as densely populated as it is. I have a concern with the speed of the road with the amount of traffic that has increased. I would think some people that live in Lake Sherwood would be that way too because sometimes people are moving really fast coming out of there. I personally would like to see a walkway through from The Enclave to Lake Sherwood. I think it would be good for people who live in Lake Sherwood that maybe have friends over there to walk it and not be driving everywhere.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you very much.

Josh Isser, 2793 Ravinewood Drive, Commerce Township – Just a couple comments. One, I know from a couple of the Lake Sherwood guys on that pathway, I'm part of Woodland Ridge, the adjacent sub, and I feel the same as these guys do. I'm right up against that, so all these people that would be coming in from the new sub, Stillwater, would be walking right by my house along that easement. So, from my standpoint, and some of the other folks in Woodland Ridge, we wouldn't be for it. That's one comment I have.

Loskill – Would or would not?

Josh Isser – Would not. I don't want it. I'm going to have people walking by my house. It's extra noise and people throwing beer cans in my area. It's a possibility but it certainly concerns me. Another one is, if you look at some of the homes just north in Lake Sherwood, they have the mounds built up against those homes. I don't know if you drive by and see that. Those people have lived there for 30+ years. I don't know what it's going to be like for us. I heard you talk about the swales earlier, but I don't know how that's going to affect what we're going to be looking at in Woodland Ridge. That's a big concern for me as well.

Brad Reitenga, 2380 Provencal Dr., Commerce Township, The Reserve at Crystal Lake – A few questions I had regarding ... Well, the speed limit was already addressed. From a driver standpoint, when we go to leave the subdivision at 50mph, and the way that, if you look to the left especially, the cars are coming at a rate which, we'd like to say 50 is 50, but that's not always the case. I'm in agreement that a speed limit reduction of some sort would be advantageous, not to mention safer for both the residents coming and going from the subdivision, but also for people driving down Sleeth. With that being said, I've noticed when we go down Sleeth and pull into our subdivision, it's kind of a hard right. In other words, the distance that's allowed, if you're coming westbound on Sleeth, you have to get to the right relatively fast. It would be nice, if they couldn't do anything with our current development, to see more footage to give the people making a right into the new proposed site more time to slow down without being such a hindrance to the vehicles behind them.

I will say in terms of the size of the lots, it seems to be almost exclusive in terms of opinion here that larger lots are preferred and I'm in agreement with my direct neighbor to the south, Pete, who spoke first this evening. And, in the sense of the bigger lots actually are selling at a faster rate. If you were to look at what has been sold in 2025, the lots in Toll Brothers are selling at a much faster rate, followed closely by Evergreen and Robertson has actually slowed down in the recent months in terms of sales. So, to

the point of getting more homes into this new development, I don't see that as being a benefit.

Then real quick, Mr. Milia, would it be possible for us to see a cross section of the rear. In other words, looking at this, the northwest end of the property, in relation to where Pete and I back up on that upper left corner. It's really nice to see that cross section on the north, but it would be nice to see that as well.

Also, for the same gentleman, he did mention that the beach in Crystal Lake, our current development, he may have misspoke, I think you said public two different times. I just wanted to make sure that's actually a private beach.

Also, the drawings here, the east part, we kind of knew Hoppe Drive, coming from Crystal Lake, we knew probably it was coming, but it's kind of unclear here to tell if there's going to be a proposed development to the east of that, and if there is going to be another Hoppe Drive as a preliminary. Longer term thinking, it would not be to have a thoroughfare coming from Sleeth Road through these subdivisions to get out and back onto Sleeth. Less is more in my opinion from that aspect.

Fire Marshal Gall – I just wanted to check with the developer that he received my Fire Marshal review.

Andy Milia – Yes.

Chairperson Parel closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Comments:

Chairperson Parel – Maybe it would be a good time to have Mr. Milia come up.

Weber – Yes, if he can answer some of the questions.

Andy Milia – Thank you. I'm happy to answer any specific questions you have, based on what was raised, or I can comment.

Chairperson Parel – Maybe the best thing to do is to comment on some of the things you heard, and while you're up here, we can comment.

Andy Milia – Sure. The gentleman who submitted a letter today, Mr. Dowbenko; he made reference to four items which I'd like to address. One was that the utility contractor left the site in disarray. I don't disagree with that. The utility contractor was DVM, which was a contractor of the Township that put in the underground utilities, and we were complaining about that contractor for two years. Mr. Campbell is tired of hearing me complain, but we do agree that wasn't done properly.

In terms of cutting the trees down in the middle of that, that was a DTE requirement for their poles. They required a 20-foot easement and DTE actually sent in a 20-person crew and cleared that. They need to maintain that. So, we agree it's an open area, but that's part of the DTE easement.

In terms of the maintenance of the drainage, that's a Road Commission issue. Road Commission maintains the drainage easement. Water is designed to go from the north side through a pipe on the south side. That is clogged. We've requested that the Road Commission work on that. They've indicated that they will.

As it relates to the mailboxes, I did receive that call a couple of years ago. We have made subsequent calls to the Postmaster. If any of you have ever dealt with the post

office, it's very difficult. We will continue to try it. We're trying to get mailboxes in our own subdivision as well, but that is noted.

In terms of that site, the entranceway is beautiful. We did spend \$1.5 million on it. The site plan for that development was built exactly how it was promised. It was supposed to be left in a rural, natural state. We enhanced it on the north side of the common area between the houses, we planted trees in there, but until that grows back it's going to look more rural.

Several comments were made about the speed limit. That's a Road Commission issue. I'm all about safety. If the Road Commission wants to reduce the speed limit, we would have no problem with that, but we have no control over that.

A comment was made about the beach. I did say that it's a public beach. It's public to the residents of Crystal Lake. It's a private beach and no outside residents are permitted to use that, and we're not even permitting residents in The Enclave to use that.

I'm here to answer any other questions you may have based on the public comments.

Loskill – Regarding the question about the rifle gunfire. Is that something you had permitted?

Andy Milia – No. Let me address that for clarity. A gentleman did raise the issue at our July 30th meeting. It's the first time we'd heard of it. He said he sent us an email. We have unfortunately not gotten those emails. Kelly, my associate, is here. We gave him our emails again. We have not gotten any emails. As Paula and Dave will attest to, I respond to all of my emails and texts within minutes, probably an hour at the latest. I respond to everything.

I'm very concerned with that. What we did determine is that one of our investors in the property allowed a friend to do some target shooting on the property. It was not known to us. We have since called that investor and told him that is not permitted, even if it's permitted by law, we don't want it occurring on the property. We've had "no trespassing" signs posted. We have trail cams posted on it. We don't want people riding dirt bikes on this particular property. We are all in agreement with this gentleman. We are sorry that it happened. It was not permission that Gary or I gave. We believe it's a police matter, and this gentleman should follow up with the police.

Dave Campbell – I did speak to Lt. Hix who is our Commerce substation commander for the OCSO. He did confirm there is a report. I did not ask for a copy as it would all have to be redacted anyway. He said attached to the report, there were a couple pictures that indicated that it looked like one of the rounds did strike the house. My understanding is it would now be turned to the Oakland County prosecutor to determine what, if anything, they want to move ahead with.

Andy Milia – This topic brings up another thing. Part of the benefit of developing properties like this is taking derelict properties out of this kind of use. I met onsite with a contractor a couple days ago who told me he grew up in Commerce Township and for 40 years, rode his dirt bike and did all kinds of illicit things on the property, and he was sorry to see it being developed. But, we think that it should be developed. A lot of these issues will go away, and we're sorry that this happened, but it was not permission we gave. We would agree that no one is allowed to enter that property again. We did allow somebody to bow hunt this year, and I don't know that we're going to even allow that to go on.

Chairperson Parel – Did that answer your question, Joe?

Loskill – Yes.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you for that clarification. That is pretty serious. I hope you gave your investor an earful because that bullet could have hit someone. I know it's not our job, but that's pretty serious. With that, Brian, do you have any questions or comments?

Winkler – I have no questions at this point, but I was pleasantly surprised to hear that the developer reached out to the adjacent subdivisions, Lake Sherwood and The Reserve, to try to obtain their comments. That's not something we've seen very much in the past. The only concern I have is making sure that the anti-monotony standards apply and are enforced, particularly on the smaller lots on the west side of the property, the north side of the subdivision. Otherwise, no other comments.

Andy Milia – If I may address that. We agree with that last comment. The anti-monotony laws I think have already been written into the new PUD agreement, or will be written into the master deed. Jay James and Judy Golden do an excellent job of reviewing builder's plans and kicking anything back that doesn't work. We wholeheartedly agree with that. One of the appeals of The Reserve has been the different types of architecture, the multiple styles, the number of different architects. So, we agree with that provision.

Phillips – I was pleased to see additional attention to the buffer between the development and the existing subdivision. I agree with the concern about a motorized connection between the two, and I expressed that previously. I personally don't have an issue with the nonmotorized connection. I think part of our master plan is connectivity for nonmotorized for pedestrians and bicycles throughout the community. Other than that, I think it's a better use of the property than what is presently there.

Chairperson Parel – Can I put you on the spot? You're a resident of Sherwood?
Phillips – I am. In fact, the bullet came very close to my house.

Chairperson Parel – In regard to the nonmotorized pathway, do you have a preference one way or the other? Do you prefer it be there?

Phillips – I personally would prefer to have the access to be able to walk in different areas of the community and the neighborhood. We walk our dog, and yes, there are families walking and children on their bikes. I don't have a problem connecting the two and giving people more space to explore.

Andy Milia – Mr. Parel, for clarity, we have offered to do the sidewalk, but we will gladly take direction from the Planning Commission whatever way it decides to go on this.

Loskill – I went through the site plan and did some calculations. Based on when I run the numbers, you're overvaluing the buildable area on that site. I come up with about 38 acres of buildable area rather than 51, which is strictly just minus the lake. You have to take out the wetland areas, the areas you can't build on. I think your numbers are little high. With that being said, my biggest concern is that I have not seen the recognizable

public benefits. You're asking for us to reduce the lot size by 60% or more, and I'm really not seeing the public benefit. You mentioned keeping natural features. Well, there are no natural features here, and the lake, it was a gravel pit. You're not saving the trees behind on the north side of the site. You're clear cutting those, except for a few around the perimeter. You mentioned about upsizing the water main, but then you're asking for us to pay it back. I'm not seeing substantial public benefit. Not that I have a huge problem with what you're doing, but I'm just not seeing that part of it. The only other thing I would mention just so everybody recognizes this; these houses along Sleeth Road, you've got 14 to 16-foot retaining walls along the back sides of those houses. Our engineers, I don't know if you've taken a look at that. They've got a break in that retaining wall. I've seen that done in other spots and it's horrible in Michigan. That's something I think you should take a look at. If you want, I can give you examples of where that has been done in the past and it has been a complete disaster.

Dave Campbell – Because it fails?

Loskill – Water and ice buildup and it makes the whole area unwalkable, because they've got a break on the north side of the homes off the drive for the development. It's 14-foot on one side and 16-foot on the other, and there is a break in the middle of that wall, which means you have a pretty substantial slope. Mostly slopes around this area are 3:1, which are barely mowable, or I mean mowable with special equipment. These are some very steep areas of land. I think a couple of these are going to pretty unusable. You're going to have a backyard that's not going to be very adaptable for any use besides just viewing.

These homes on the north side of Sleeth, are they going to have walkout basements as well? Because I noticed there is a pretty steep drop off from the access road to the top of the retaining wall. You've got some pretty serious drops coming off there and I'm not sure that's a great aesthetic look, but what are you planning on doing for that retaining wall? Are you using something on a large block scale, or small landscaping blocks? How are you going to be detailing a wall of that size?

Andy Milia – Good question. The retaining wall is there for safety, to minimize the slopes.

Loskill – Right, I understand that. Still, it's a 16-foot drop.

Andy Milia – The purpose of it is to create a usable backyard in this area, and then there will be steps down, and they'll have additional usable yard here. The retaining wall is a safety feature. This wall has been priced out at \$850,000. It's a large block, structurally sound wall that will be designed by a structural engineer. We're involved in the Northville Downs development right now and we're rebuilding a river, so we have a lot of experience in structural issues. We've gotten a price from the same contractor that has built the walls on the new Northville Downs river. So, this is for safety purposes, these will be walkouts, and there will be a two-tier backyard. Aesthetically, it will be great, and safety wise it will be great. It's a large block wall. You can't see the front of it, but the blocks are larger than these panels here. It's a very high-quality commercial wall, but also very aesthetic as well. It's not a landscape timber wall.

I also want to respectfully disagree with some of the comments here about the size. All of this could be buildable under EGLE's jurisdiction right now, with reclamation of gravel pits. We could get a permit and build these areas, and mitigate offsite, but we purposely

want to maintain this natural look. It is buildable. We're only taking out a couple pockets of wetlands here. This is a very significant benefit to maintain these natural areas. That helps the entire area as a lot of animals from the area will stay in here. It doesn't just benefit this community; it benefits others. Maintaining this buffer area predominantly for the benefit of the residents is a very significant public benefit. We would much prefer-

Loskill – Right, but you're taking out most of that.

Andy Milia – No-

Loskill – You're taking out everything in the middle. You're going to save the east side, the west side and north side, and you're going to gut everything in the middle.

Andy Milia – Well, to develop property, you do have to take down some trees. We're taking down a section of trees in here to develop it. It's not feasible to look at a piece of property and say, "save every tree on this property". When this was developed, they took down the trees in there to develop that.

Loskill – I understand, but you're saying that you're saving all of these natural features, but you're not. You're clear cutting everything.

Andy Milia – We're not clear cutting. We're saving a very significant buffer here. We're enhancing and creating a new buffer here and here. That's not cheap. Trees are \$1,000 a piece today. To add 100 trees here, and 50 trees there, it's a very expensive endeavor and it's a very significant public benefit.

Loskill – That's why you're doing this, because you're going to make a lot of money off of this. That's the whole plan. Like I said, my biggest concern is that I really don't see the substantial public benefit. When the last one went in, there were sewer extensions and other things that were taken care of. That's part of a PUD. We alter the requirements for this area, and you're supposed to provide something to the community – not just your residents, but to the community to offset this work. I'm just not seeing it.

Weber – I've got to follow that. This is the beauty of government, where all opinions matter and we are lucky to have two architects on our Commission that can help guide those of us that are not architects.

I do have some comments and some questions. The first comment is on the speed limit on Sleeth Road. Just as an FYI, Mr. Campbell, myself and Larry Gray, our Supervisor, and some of the leadership of Wolverine Lake met with the Oakland County Road Commission this week. We talked about a myriad of subjects. Sleeth Road was one of those. We also talked a lot about speed limits within the Township, and we got educated. Even the Road Commission doesn't have the authority to change speed limits. It comes down to the State Police that ultimately have the final say. To the Road Commission's knowledge, it's a process that takes years, and it's exceptionally rare that they change the speed limit, sometimes to our chagrin. I would say that all of you that have an interest or a desire, contact the Road Commission and let yourself be heard. We also have similar concerns on the speed limit for several other roads within the Township. Dave, anything that I missed on that preamble?

Dave Campbell – No, I don't think so. The way the Michigan State Police determine speed limits is a process that takes a lot longer than any of us realized is that they basically clock and log, I don't know, 1,000 vehicles and they base the speed limit on the 85th percentile speeds. That's what was determined for Sleeth Road.

Another thought I have, I'm sitting next to some folks who have lived here for a long time and know Sleeth Road since before there was any development along Sleeth. I've heard people call it the Sleeth Road drag way. It's a historical fact that Sleeth Road has been a road where people go to test the speed of their vehicles for quite a while. My point is that I think there is a valid argument that, as Sleeth Road develops with developments like The Reserve at Crystal Lake, and potentially this one we're talking about tonight, and whatever might happen with the gravel pit to the east, as those develop and drivers feel the homes and landscaping around them, they naturally have a proclivity to slow down. You feel like you're in an occupied area rather than just out in the wide open. I think there is something to be said that folks may just naturally slow down. That's another consideration when we're speaking of speed.

I'll also mention, you can set the speed limit at whatever you want, but it comes down to enforcement. If there's no police presence out there issuing citations, then the speed limit is just keeping the honest people honest. So, if it is the desire of Township leadership, we can talk to our Sheriff's Department about getting more presence out there, getting folks to slow down and issuing some tickets. What we say though is, be careful what you wish for, because a lot of times the people who wind up getting a ticket are the people who were complaining that people were driving too fast on their road. I'm sure Mr. Weber and I can take the conversation to Supervisor Gray to see if we want to get the Sheriff's Department out there and maybe get things to settle down.

Weber – Speaking from experience, we had that exact request from a community a few months ago. At their request, the Sheriffs did come out and wrote tickets, and the tickets written were for people who happen to be living there. As you can imagine, 85% of the people going down the road are people living there. To Mr. Campbell's point, let us know if you want us to get the Sheriffs out there on a more regular basis.

Another comment on the clear cutting and what DTE has done. It's kind of a love/hate relationship. Unbeknownst to us, as an example, DTE came through Wise Woods, which is one of our parks along Wise Road, with 260 acres of mature trees. The power line runs along Wise Road. Before we knew it, they clear cut it. No warning. No notice. We were shocked to see what happened. Now on the other side, we lose power because limbs fall on the power lines during an ice storm in the winter, so we recognize that as well. There are certain things we can't control along the easements, specifically along power lines.

I'm glad that Nancy is here and that she heard some of the questions and concerns on water management and drainage. Yes, that is the jurisdiction and authority of the Oakland County Road Commission, but we're also in those meetings. Water management is a huge issue throughout the entire Township. When every development or new neighborhood is getting built, it's a priority to make sure that not only the water runoff is managed, not only for the new development, but also for developments that are already in existence. It is a very high priority. It's a question that gets answered on every development. Jay James, our Building Official, is here as well. It's something we take very seriously as part of the development process to make sure that we are minimizing any unintended consequences on that.

We talked a little bit and there were some questions on the anti-monotony standards. Yes, we have anti-monotony standards, but I think we get a little bit smarter with every

development we see. While we've had the anti-monotony standards in place for a long time, I'll point out the Pulte development along Wixom Road and Glengary, which is also subject to the anti-monotony standards. If you're in the front of those homes, they meet the standards. Unfortunately, a very large percentage of those homeowners all chose the same color paint. So, as you're coming up Wixom Road, they're all blue gray, or at least a large number of them. So, I'm going to ask Mr. Milia, and we will make this an administrative portion as part of any conditions that no more than two homes next to each other can be the same paint color, or something along that line, so that the backs are not all the same color.

Dave Campbell – If I may, Mr. Weber, keep in mind where we are in this stage of the process. If this PUD were to be approved by the Township Board in September or whenever, this project would still have to come back to you as a Planning Commission for the PUD site plan, where we will get more into the details of things like home design, home colors, anti-monotony standards, landscaping, buffering, et cetera. You will get another bite at this apple if the Township Board approves it. What you have in front of you tonight is effectively a concept plan. It's a development plan that shows the basic parameters, the layout, the number of units, and the access points. If the Township Board is agreeable to that, then a much more detailed site plan, including preliminary engineering will come back before you sometime in the future.

Weber – I'm just making sure there are no surprises as to my thoughts as we go forward. Buffer, evergreen tree border, Sleeth Road, landscaping are all going to be very importance. I appreciate, Mr. Milia, you heard us the first time on ensuring that we have a greater buffer between The Reserve at Crystal Lake and the Lake Sherwood communities. I would like to see something where there are a few of those large oak trees that look like they can be saved based upon your renderings, and I may be interested in a priority with that. But also, even though we're talking about 35 feet, and moving the swale, I would still be looking for a significant number of evergreen trees that could act as a recognizable buffer, particularly in the winter when the hardwoods or deciduous trees lose their leaves.

Finally, to me, the balance on the recognizable public benefits as it is based upon the conditions that have been laid out is a lower density than would normally be required. We struggle with this as a Planning Commission, and as the Township's Planning Department. We want to keep it as, I'll call it "the bed and breakfast" community that we are. We want to be very mindful of density, not just because it's housing density, but because of what it does to everything else. It's taxing on police and fire resources, traffic, and overall quality of life. My personal opinion is, if I'm looking at a development and based upon it's R-1A zoning, a developer could jam in 112 homes, I am very okay with having 90 homes on smaller lots. To me, some people want larger lots, and some want smaller lots, but people get to choose. That's public free will, but what we can try to affect is having less of an impact on the surrounding community. I'm okay on the plan, specifically because it is less density than what a developer could put on that.

Loskill – My only comment is, if you look at what they can and cannot build on, they were very pro-developer in their calculations. If you look at the wetlands and the areas that are unbuildable, the density would be even lower than what they're asking for.

Weber – So let's say they could make larger lots, add lots that they presently don't have, but still come in at 90 homes. I would still be okay with the smaller lot size, with the greater green space in the surrounding area.

One last thing; I'm okay with the water tap fees. I'm not okay with the sewer tap fees. I'm okay with the water tap fees because it's basically for 50% of what the cost would be. I think it's a benefit to the Township to get the redundancy in the water. It's more and more of a priority for the Township to have redundancy, so if one water main breaks, we can shut it off and we'll still have service until it gets repaired. We've all heard horror stories of what has happened in West Bloomfield, Novi or Highland where a water main breaks and people are without water for weeks. So, building redundancy is critical for the Township as it relates to that.

In addition, I am in support of the walking path. I know it's a sensitive subject, but there is a lot of work being done to create greater walkability throughout the Township; being able to have access through Lake Sherwood, through this development, to what will hopefully be a pathway along Sleeth Road, which will help connect us to Milford and ultimately to the Michigan Airline Trail and the eastern side of the Township. I do not support, under any means, a motorized connection or even a safety gate.

McCanham – I would only mention that on the firearms issue, the Township on that side has very specific ordinances preventing the discharge of firearms, except for in the State Recreation area, where it's posted, and in the gun ranges approved by the Board of Trustees. So, that area there, specifically along those power lines, Edison had something to do with those ordinances too because they don't like their lines being shot up.

Andy Milia – We're in total agreement with you.

Chairperson Parel – Just a couple comments. Dave, we talked about the developer paying into the sidewalk fund to potentially complete sidewalks on the south end of the property at a later date.

Dave Campbell – The nonmotorized master plan for pathways throughout the Township envisions a pathway along the south side of Sleeth Road. The logic here is to not require the developer to put 1,100 feet of sidewalk on the north side of Sleeth Road because it would be a sidewalk to nowhere that would likely never get connected to anything else. We agree with the public comment that we would love to see there be a nonmotorized route from Commerce Township into Milford. I did chuckle a little bit because the Village of Milford is very pro-nonmotorized amenities. The Township of Milford has different opinions. We will cross that bridge when we come to it. So, yes, we want there to be a pathway along the south side of Sleeth Road, and therefore the intent would be for the developer to make a contribution to fund that would someday build that, and have that be proportionate to what it would cost to have him put his section on the north side, but not actually build it on the north.

Chairperson Parel – But wouldn't you agree that if it just gets paid into a fund, it's going to get used somewhere else?

Dave Campbell – No. Our Township Attorney is very particular, and understandably so. You can't take money that was dedicated here and spend it for a completely different purpose way over there.

Chairperson Parel – Could it be utilized within a few blocks of there?

Dave Campbell – We would have to make a reasonable case that the money was be expended in an area that would ultimately serve the same the people that would use it if it were built right at the front door of this development.

Chairperson Parel – I was thinking, why not do it now? But then I understand what you're saying.

Dave Campbell – Did you bring your checkbook, because we will knock it out tomorrow.

Chairperson Parel – He brought his checkbook.

Dave Campbell – Just so all the residents in the room understand where we are. The Township's intent is to put a nonmotorized millage on the ballot, probably for the gubernatorial election in November of 2026, to see whether the residents, the voters, the taxpayers of Commerce Township, want to support a millage to try to start accomplishing some of these goals of the nonmotorized master plan and building some of these pathways, including the one we're talking about tonight along the south side of Sleeth Road.

Chairperson Parel – Okay, that's good. The other thing is, I do support a nonmotorized pathway between the new and existing developments. Obviously, I don't live there, but I can see both sides to it. I think we have at least three votes for that. Is that something that needs to be determined tonight, or is that for the next stage?

Dave Campbell – Currently, it is shown on the development plan. Your role is to make a recommendation on that development plan. The Township Board's role would be to make a formal decision. I would think if it's the majority of the Planning Commission, that would be something you'd want to get decided this evening. I think it is an important enough element to the development plan that we wouldn't want to see it change one way or the other, if and when this project comes back to you for detailed site plan.

Chairperson Parel – Okay. Last thing, I also support waiving of the tap fees as they relate to municipal water, but I can't support the same for the sewer. Again, much like one person up here. With that, does anybody have any other questions or comments?

Dave Campbell – If I may, one element that was not included as an exhibit to the development agreement, and we touched on it a little bit when we talked about the anti-monotony standards, is that we spent a lot of time with The Reserve at Crystal Lake, and really we spend a lot of time with lots of our new, single-family residential developments, relative to not just anti-monotony standards, but also architectural standards, building materials standards, minimums and maximums for certain materials, whether they're for brick, stone or siding materials. So, there's kind of a placeholder in the current development agreement for architectural standards. If the Township Board is to make a decision on this development agreement, then that exhibit, those architectural standards need to be a part of that agreement. I wanted to ask, at this level, beyond the anti-monotony standards that we touched on a little bit tonight, any other direction for the developer as far as what should go into those architectural standards that the Township Board would potentially be ruling on in the next couple months.

Weber – I think with the elevations we've seen, this is going to be consistent with the materials being used for similar homes from the developers, as with The Reserve at Crystal Lake.

Andy Milia – Yes, that's correct.

Weber – So, we're back to no vinyl, use of Hardiplank, giving some leeway for farmhouse versus stone. So, the quality materials, the same look and feel that we're seeing at The Reserve.

Andy Milia – What we agreed to at The Reserve was in the 60-foot lots, we said we could use vinyl. On the 83-foot lots, we said we could use the high-quality vinyl, that was the shake style vinyl.

Weber – But it wasn't for the entire siding, it was for the architectural elements, for the shake only.

Andy Milia – Correct. What I would propose to do that I think will make you happy is that requirement for the architectural vinyl, enforce that on the 60-foot lots as well. We would up the standard on this, beyond the standard in The Reserve.

Weber – So, in essence, we get another bite at that apple, so we can get into the details when we get to site plan.

Andy Milia – Yes, but I think I'm agreeing to you up front that we would maintain even a higher standard than what we agreed to in The Reserve because we would limit the type of vinyl that could be used on the 60-foot lots.

Weber – So that's in the PUD?

Dave Campbell – Right now, there's a placeholder, Exhibit G, of the draft PUD agreement for architectural and design. If Township Board is going to make a decision on the PUD agreement, then seemingly those standards would need to be memorialized in that agreement.

Weber – We haven't seen Exhibit G.

Dave Campbell – That's right. I'm thinking out loud here. If you wanted to kick the can to site plan approval, I think you could and have it baked into the condominium master deed and the bylaws, which you're going to see in the future if this project progresses. My question to Mr. Milia, do you think you're in a position to formalize those architectural standards and have them ready for the agreement that the Township Board would be making a final decision on?

Andy Milia – I think I'm even ready to do it right now if I could provide this document. This is the document that was agreed to in The Reserve, and I could use this exhibit, and even strengthen it. As I just said, to make this clause here applicable to the 60-foot lots as well. I'll let Mr. Weber review it.

Dave Campbell – Mr. Weber, I know you're trying to read. Building materials are very often very important to our new residential approval process. If this is something where, rather than everybody trying to read through it quickly tonight, if it's something where we want to have a work group between now and whenever the Township Board is in a position to act, and make sure everybody is in agreement before it proceeds ...

Weber – I think that's very smart.

Andy Milia – I'm comfortable with that as well.

Weber – We have some architects here that we can leverage on that, and I think if we're holding it to the standards of the larger lots, and we have the ability to go see it in reality, I think that's a good way to go.

Andy Milia – I'm comfortable with that as well.

Dave Campbell – I think what I heard you say, Mr. Milia, is the composite siding, with the exception of where it has a shake element to it, that would be the only application of vinyl?

Andy Milia – Correct, and we make it applicable to the 60-foot lots where that is not currently in place.

Loskill – You can get all the shapes you want in the cement board siding now; dog ears, diamonds, anything shakes. You don't have to go back to vinyl for doing the shake side.

Andy Milia – This is an important issue. I'm comfortable deferring this portion of it to a work study meeting and getting everybody comfortable with it. We're all on the same page on this issue.

Dave Campbell – So, if you want to include that approach, if you are looking to make a motion tonight, and if you did want to utilize the recommended motion language provided by the Planning Department, you may want to adjust Condition #5 to reflect this approach of having a work group prior to any action by the Township Board.

Chairperson Parel – Are you good with that?

Weber – Yes.

Chairperson Parel – It sounds like we are ready to make a motion, and to your point, Dave, we need to address the nonmotorized pathway. We're going to decide on that. And then the second piece is going to be the tap fees. I'm hoping we can finalize these before we make the motion. Is there anything else?

Dave Campbell – You mentioned earlier that you got the impression it's a 3-3, and that's a fair guess. Keep in mind, your options tonight are to make a recommendation, which could be to approve or deny, or to not take any action tonight to give the developer an opportunity to make adjustments. My question back to you, Mr. Parel, is whether you think that the pathway issue is significant enough that it could dictate whether it's a recommendation to approve or deny?

Chairperson Parel – Is there any reason why we can't ask for it now?

Dave Campbell – I can't think of any. The other question is, is it something you would be comfortable deferring until this project comes back for site plan?

Chairperson Parel – I think you recommended taking care of it right now. Is there anyone outside of George, myself and Brady who support the nonmotorized path?
McCanham – Yes.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you. Okay, we're going to put the path in.

Dave Campbell – Okay, as far as the water and sewer taps, I'll say again, it's my opinion that it's the realm of the Township Board to make what is a very important financial decision, but you are making a recommendation on this entire project. A key component of this entire project is water and sewer connectivity. Again, the Planning Department provided some recommended motion language. The second paragraph, starting on Page 12 is our effort at allowing you to address it.

Chairperson Parel – This is the updated motion language.

Dave Campbell – It is, which by the way, there was a very modest tweak that was made in there.

Weber – Dave, part of the process is, a motion is made, and at that point in time, there is an opportunity for further discussion based upon the language of the motion. Maybe we can sort out some of those things. So, I'm going to take a stab at the motion that I think has captured some of this. I'm also going to include, just as a forewarning, we're going to have a work group that's going to speak to the architectural design standards. I'm going to suggest that the same work group also tackle the detailed landscape plan with attention to screening and buffering.

Dave Campbell – Sure, keeping in mind that the landscape plan is definitely something that you're going to get another bite at the apple.

Weber – I know, but I think the Township Board is very sensitive to it. The more we can do up front for that, they will have better information, and hopefully we'll have a better product at the end.

Chairperson Parel – Will the results of these work groups be presented prior to the next meeting of the Trustees?

Weber – I think that is the intent, to get it done prior to September.

Dave Campbell – It has to be, especially as it pertains to architectural and design because again, that is a component of the agreement itself.

Weber – Because we have so many interested parties, bear with me as I'm going to read the entire motion language.

MOTION by Weber, supported by Phillips, to recommend approval, to the Commerce Township Board of Trustees, of Item PPU25-01, The Enclave at Stillwater, Planned Unit Development, the request by Twin Ponds Investments Co. (Andrew Milia) for a formal recommendation of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) for a proposed single-family development of 90 new homes to be located on the north side of Sleeth Road, just east of The Reserve at Crystal Lake, upon the middle of the three former Sleeth Road gravel pits. PIN# 17-08-400-004

Move to recommend approval of PPU#25-01, a PUD application for The Enclave at Stillwater, a single family residential site condominium by Twin Ponds Investment Company, LLC (Andrew Milia and Gary Jonna) consisting of 90 single family homes on approximately 65 acres on the north side of Sleeth Road, between Bass Lake Road and Duck Lake Road.

The Planning Commission's recommendation of approval is based on a finding that the PUD application satisfies the requirements as outlined in Article 38 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance; that the proposed development is consistent with the goals of the Commerce Township Master Plan as well as the Township's water & sewer master plan; that The Enclave at Stillwater offers recognizable and substantial public benefits proportionate to the deviations from the Zoning Ordinance being requested by the developer; that the subject property was formerly occupied by an obsolete land use incompatible with the surrounding single-family neighborhoods, requiring a spirit of cooperation in restoring the property to a productive and compatible use; that the PUD Development Agreement achieves the goals of both the Township and the developer to create a high quality residential community that the Planning Commission is confident can be approved in a future PUD Condominium Site Plan; and that Twin Ponds Investment Company, LLC, or their successors and assigns, will capably serve as the master developer with unified control over the entire Enclave at Stillwater project. In making this recommendation of PUD approval, the Planning Commission recognizes the developer's request as part of the PUD Agreement for a waiver of 100% of the capital charges for municipal water for all 90 proposed homes. A waiver for the capital charges for the sanitary sewer for 90 homes is not recommended. The Planning Commission will defer that very important decision to the Commerce Township Board of Trustees given the Board's role in managing the Township's water and sanitary sewer enterprise funds.

The Planning Commission's recommendation of PUD approval is conditional upon the following:

1. Approval by the Commerce Township Board of Trustees of the PUD Agreement and Development Plan;
2. A detailed PUD Condominium Site Plan to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission and Township Board subsequent to Township Board approval of the PUD;
3. Dedication of a 60-foot half right-of-way to the Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) along the site's 1,100 feet of Sleeth Road frontage;
4. The PUD Condominium Site Plan to comply with the recommendations of the Traffic Impact Assessment from the Township's Traffic Engineer relative to the public road improvements warranted at the site's proposed entry point on the north side of Sleeth Road (eastbound left-turn passing lane, and westbound right-turn lane);
5. The PUD Agreement to include an exhibit of Architectural and General Site Design Guidelines to include standards for building design and materials, including but not limited to standards for exterior siding materials as well as

- compliance with the spirit of the Township's "anti-monotony standards", to be designed, developed and recommended for approval by a work group to meet and agree prior to the September 9, 2025, Township Board meeting;
6. The PUD Condominium Site Plan submittal to include a landscape plan with particular attention to the screening & buffering to be provided where adjacent to existing homes to the site's north (Lake Sherwood) and west (Reserve at Crystal Lake), where homes reside. Additionally, the work group will work with the developer to design and approve prior to the Township Board meeting on September 9, 2025;
 7. Approval by the Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) for all public road improvements within their Sleeth Road right-of-way, as well as the new public residential roads to be constructed within the project that will be dedicated to the RCOC;
 8. The Planning Commission recommends the adjoining of the Lake Sherwood community to The Enclave at Stillwater through a nonmotorized pathway.

Discussion:

Parel – George, thank you for making that motion. As everybody noticed, George made the recommendation that we will not recommended waiving of the sewer tap fees. Does anybody have questions or comments?

(None)

AYES: Weber, Phillips, McCanham, Parel, Winkler

NAYS: Loskill

ABSENT: Bearer

MOTION CARRIED 5-1

Andy Milia – Thank you very much.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you.

Weber – And thank you to everybody that came to give their thoughts. That's truly appreciated.

[5-minute break 9:22-9:27pm]

I. NEW BUSINESS

ITEM I.1. SWC PONTIAC TRAIL & WELCH – CONCEPUTAL REVIEW

Christopher George with TF Capital of Royal Oak MI is requesting conceptual review of a multi-tenant retail building w/ drive-through on the southwest corner of Pontiac Trail and Welch Road. PIN#'s 17-26-278-011 & 17-26-278-021

Dave Campbell – I want to find the balance of recognizing that we've been here a while and the Planning Commission has seen some concepts on this corner in the past, so there's some familiarity there. I also want to be respectful to Mr. George and Mr. Thomas for sitting through all that with the rest of us and give them an opportunity to hear some quality feedback from the Planning Commission on what's being considered. So, we're talking about the southwest corner of Pontiac Trail and Welch Road. I think all of you have been here long enough that you remember the prior concept that came in the fall of last year.

Chairperson Parel – Except Mickey.

Dave Campbell – Yes, except for Mickey. So, currently what's there is a single-family home. Although that home, through the years, I think has been used as an adult group home, maybe a child daycare home. It's sitting unoccupied right now, to the best of our knowledge. So, what's being proposed is to redevelop the property with the house, along with the undeveloped property just next door to it to the west, and redevelop it with a multitenant retail building. So, comparable to the concepts that you did see starting back in the fall of last year. To help everybody get their bearings, this is the southwest corner of Welch and Pontiac Trail. This is the house I mentioned, and this is the undeveloped property next door to the west. This is the plaza across the street with the 7-Eleven, the Happy's Pizza, and the former Chase Bank. I know we're not thrilled about that one. And the oil change guy is over here on this corner.

Going back to the concept plan, as you can see, two proposed points of full access, one on the south side of Pontiac Trail, and one on the west side of Welch Road. The building would be approximately 8,600 square feet and it would include a drive-through operation. So, the vehicles would circulate in a counterclockwise rotation around the building, with the pickup window on the north side. The Planning Commission might recall that in some of the iterations we saw in two previous concepts, there was talk of perhaps having the pickup window on the what would be the east side of the building. But in this configuration is proposed on the north side. When we've had prior conversations about this concept, and particularly about the drive-through operation, there were questions and concerns about the intensity and the impacts of the proposed drive-through. The intensity and impacts relative to traffic, relative to headlights, relative to noise. And I'm sure those are going to be conversation points that we will have this evening.

From a procedural standpoint, a zoning standpoint, the property is currently zoned single-family, but it's designated on our Township's Future Land Use Map as neighborhood commercial. So, anytime you are proposing a rezoning, which to accomplish what the prospective developer wants to accomplish, these properties would have to be rezoned, the first thing the Township, the Planning Commission and the Township Board, look at is the designation on the Township's Master Plan and the Future Land Use Map within that Master Plan to determine whether or not there is consistency with the Future Land Use plan. In this case, there's an argument that these properties are planned to be commercial, albeit neighborhood commercial.

Neighborhood commercial is most consistent with the Township's B-1 zoning district, which is meant to be low intensity commercial, and it is a zoning district that does not typically allow for drive-throughs. The drive-through then pushes you into either B-2 or B-3 zoning designation, and even then, only with Special Land Use approval.

So, when I spoke to Mr. George and Mr. Thomas a couple of times, they were well aware that the drive-through is probably going to be the most challenging element of what is being proposed. Prior iterations did show a two-story building with retail on the ground floor and office above. At this level, the conceptual level, that's not what's being envisioned here. They would just want to focus on one floor retail. Given the square footage, probably four tenants would be envisioned, although that might be determined based on the user.

They did include within your packet some pictures of a recently constructed building on the West Bloomfield side of Haggerty, at Haggerty and Maple. I don't know that that picture was meant to necessarily represent the use or the intensity, but it was more meant to represent the architecture, the materials blend and the aesthetic of what they are envisioning.

With respect to rezoning this property, we talked about that the Planning Commission and the Township Board would almost certainly be looking for a Conditional Rezoning. As the Planning Commission is well aware, Conditional Rezoning is contract zoning where the Township and the developer agree upon what the development is going to be as a condition of the rezoning. Essentially, give us the zoning we need and we promise we will build this and only this. Within that Conditional Rezoning agreement would be a Conditional Rezoning plan that would look fairly comparable to what you have in front of you tonight, but it would also have conditions built into the agreement. Those conditions need to be volunteered by the prospective petitioner, and either accepted or not accepted by the Planning Commission and the Township Board. Part of what can be discussed tonight is what those conditions might look like in order for this project to see a path forward.

We did provide the earlier iterations of this concept to the RCOC and to the Township's traffic engineer for their 30,000 foot view, understanding that the drive-throughs were more or less in the same location on those previous iterations. There were questions and concerns about access, particularly along Pontiac Trail, left turns in and out. If we go back to the aerial, where the driveway is proposed is right around where the existing left turn lane for eastbound Pontiac Trail starts to taper down. So, there's the potential where that turn lane might have to be reconfigured, restriped to change its function in order to allow left turns in.

Similar concerns, obviously Pontiac Trail and Welch is a very busy intersection, and there will certainly need to be some analysis from our traffic engineer and the Road Commission on the Welch Road driveway as well and how that's going to function. It's possible that the outcome of that might be some turn restrictions, such as no left turns in/out. That would be something that the developer would want to investigate, if and when he opts to pursue the rezoning, and probably a Conditional Rezoning. That decision might be based in part on some of the feedback he gets this evening. Mr. Thomasma and Mr. George are here. I'm sure they would like to introduce themselves and speak to this project on their own behalf.

Chairperson Parel – Welcome.

Chris George, 628 Parent, Royal Oak, MI – Thanks for taking the time to consider this and give us feedback. I'm very excited about this project and the location. This would be my first foray into Commerce. Your Planning and Administrative staff did a great job getting me up to speed on the former project, and what's possible here on this project. I'm going to let Randy talk about the technical aspects of it, but TF Capital, my company, has 20 years of history doing projects like this, and other things that are residential as well. I think this is really a great opportunity for both of us. We really like this site.

Randy Thomas, 3797 Carrie Ln, Commerce Township – I know everyone has been here for a long time today, so I'm probably best suited to give you a couple comments and then answer any questions. We're really just looking for your feedback today. We did readjust the drive-through, as Dave mentioned, putting the delivery of items on the north side of the building. We are cognizant of the noise from the order boards. There's new technology on the order boards where they direct the sound down. I can get Dave information on that. We realize that's an issue, especially for the neighbors to the east.

We have proposed a line of heavy vegetation along the east side to buffer the cars while they're stacking. You can see, it's a pretty heavy stack as well and we don't anticipate that it would ever be that stacked.

We would propose some directional signage. To utilize the drive-through, they will be driving in and around the site in a counterclockwise motion. That's to get any traffic coming off Welch, and everybody else coming in off Pontiac Trail would just take that straight down until they see the directional pointing into the drive-through. Those would all have signage to help people navigate.

We put some heavy vegetative screening on the west side for the residents. That would be 33 feet. Then on the south side, we're proposing to land bank 6 parking spots and utilize that for more vegetative screening for the resident to the south.

This is far less intense than the last plan that you saw, which had two stories. Initially we were going to put our office there. So, we're moving to another location and this probably makes more sense with this scale. This is only four tenants. It's not anything that we would anticipate would be out of character for the area. If you look at that building we had submitted to you, something similar in design like that. It may have some different features, but that's very reflective of what Chris thought he would like to see on this property.

We are proposing putting in a sidewalk along the north and west sides. We would also propose putting in a park bench feature on the corner. We are open to other suggestions of what you want there, because quite honestly, that sidewalk really won't go anywhere. I don't know how much it's going to be used because there's no sidewalk going further west, or further south.

I'm more than happy to answer questions and listen to your feedback.

Dave Campbell – Randy, you're well aware of the questions and thoughts about intensity and impacts. Any thoughts of who the tenant mix could be in a building like this, and particularly who the drive-through user could be, and the intensity?

Randy Thomas – I would say, we're not going to bring a Taco Bell here or any of the typical fast foods. Something like this could be a coffee shop, it could be a finance institution. We don't know yet as we haven't talked to any tenants yet, but we're not looking for anything of high intensity for the drive-through. I can tell you, drive-throughs, based on what happened in covid, all tenants are asking for them. We want to make sure we at least have a provision for it. We think it's important to have as part of this development.

Commissioner Comments:

Chairperson Parel – The purpose is to have an informal conversation about this, and nothing is binding. My initial thought was, last time we looked at this site, we had a subcommittee. We looked at this and from my recollection, we said, we don't want intensity on this corner. I think the reason the gentleman got his foot in the door because he came with a concept that was a less intense coffee shop. He presented it more like a place where you would come in and study. If it had a drive-through, it would have limited hours. It wasn't going to be a Starbucks or Tim Horton's. That got him to the table. My initial thought is, without having those restrictions, it would be hard for me to support something any more intense than that on this corner.

Loskill – Can you bring up Page 166 of the packet? That right there. That is the view we are going to see from Pontiac Trail – the back side of a building. There's no way I can support this. This building needs to face out and project an image toward the street, not put its butt toward the street. There's nothing about that that is attractive. That's one of the main entrances into our community. Once you get off M-5 and turn left, this is the first thing you're going to see. I think this whole thing needs to be spun around so it projects an image toward the street, not turns away from the street.

Randy Thomas – So flip it to the west side?

Loskill – Yes, something, because I don't want to look at that.

Chairperson Parel – Correct me if I'm wrong; if you flip it to the west side, it brings the traffic from the drive-through closer to residential.

Loskill – That's just my opinion. I would not be happy if I saw that ...

Randy Thomas – I don't disagree with you. It's the same thing that the developer at 5 & Main has to wrestle with. You don't want to do what's on Haggerty Road. We're all cognizant of that. I think there are some architectural features you could do with the building up on top to break up the massing. Again, there's also going to be vegetative screening, so you're only going to see the top portion.

Loskill – Yes, but I think with the traffic shining its lights into the residences across the street to the east, and the overall look of this is not something I want to project. I think that's a really important corner for the Township. I think the development at least needs to face the street, not turn its back to the street.

Chairperson Parel – Was the previous one oriented that way?

Loskill – But they were nicer buildings.

Weber – Dave, can you bring up the last coffee shop rendering?

Dave Campbell – Bear in mind, we saw a few iterations of this. Some of them came to the Planning Commission and some were at internal meetings. I think this was the most recent one we saw from the prior prospective developer.

Dave reviewed the perspectives on the renderings for the Planning Commission.

Dave Campbell – Maybe a key difference here is that this iteration showed the pickup window on the Welch Road side, while what's in front of you this evening shows the pickup window on the Pontiac Trail side.

Loskill – It's also projecting a nicer image this way rather than the back side of the building. It's two stories. It has architectural interest. This is just retail.

Dave Campbell – So, maybe the development team want to hear more about the second story. There were concerns of the mass of having a two-story building. Now with this one, the second story is kind of recessed and that probably makes a difference. Where is the balance between what's appropriate on this corner versus what's too big?

Loskill – I want to project a beautiful image toward both Pontiac Trail and Welch. I think that's a very important corner and we should have the image projecting toward the street, not turning its back. No matter how you doll up the back side of the building, you're going to see tenant doors, electrical panels, the drive-through. It's not what I would want to see at that prominent corner.

Dave Campbell – If they wanted to borrow any other elements from this rendering, and it is a rendering that's meant to be a pretty picture, but are there any other elements that they would want to think about borrowing?

Loskill – I don't want to get that detailed. That one was nice because they were using multiple materials, lots of glass, a lot of transparency, two stories, and there was a lot of relief to it. It's a very interesting architectural building. Whereas what is being proposed is a very generic retail building.

McCanham – I took a drive by here and I had my wife in the car. I showed her the map and I didn't say anything about it. I said just give me your upfront opinion. She said, "Why would I want to look at the butt of the building when I'm driving up Welch Road?" I think the storefront should be looking out toward the street. Do your tenants have any value with people not being able to see their shops? And, is it safe? When police drive by, they can't look into the front of the shop. They can't even see if anybody is being held up in the parking lot. I think turning things around and making the corner look like it's alive, instead of just driving by something.

Chairperson Parel – It's a difficult lot. We recognize that.

McCanham – And not every lot is built for a drive-through.

Chairperson Parel – That's right.

McCanham – You could put a dentist office and all sorts of stuff in there. Just to fill up space to fill up space so somebody can make money, other than having community benefit, I don't get that.

Chairperson Parel – One potential solution can be heavy landscaping on the east side.

Weber – I'm not the design guy. I did like the other rendering, maybe because of the use that was in it as well. I think the building can be figured out by architects and engineers to find something that's acceptable or reasonable. My concern is the intensity. It's surrounded by residential on three sides. I know we've got B-2 and B-3 on the other side of the road, but this is significantly changing the intensity. I can wrap my head around the community gathering place of a coffee shop, which had limited drive-through. Nobody was going through the coffee shop when the residential area was having dinner. I could get behind that as a community gathering place where a drive-through was purely ancillary to it, and probably with what was being discussed, not a Starbucks or Tim Horton's kind of intensity. But to me, that's what we've got to get past, is how we can limit the intensity related to the fact that it's surrounded by residential on three sides.

Phillips – I recall that the drive-through was such an issue the last time we reviewed it. I understand from a business perspective, that's something you need, but that seems to be a showstopper.

Winkler – To Randy and your partner, you certainly know the hoops you have to jump through, and there are a lot of them. I wouldn't frown on that development, but at the same time, Joe's comments about the back of the building and also the need to screen the headlights, and then screening rooftop units. It's a lot of difficulties and obstacles to overcome. I do like the idea of the one story building. It picks up on what's across the street to the north.

Weber – When we define neighborhood commercial, that's like bakery, florist ...

Dave Campbell – Barber shop, those are the types of uses we throw out there. Restaurants and coffee are permitted, but mostly as a take-out model, with very limited seating and not a drive-through. Yes, it's meant to be low intensity, but also meant to serve more of the surrounding neighborhood, as opposed to having more of a regional draw. Serving the immediate 1-3 mile neighborhood versus 5-10 mile.

Chairperson Parel – Is Chase Bank vacated across the street?

Dave Campbell – I don't know whether they have locked the door.

Discussion continued regarding the status of Chase Bank, speculation that it is now empty, and the approval of the new location on Haggerty.

Chairperson Parel – Randy, I think you have an uphill battle here.

Randy Thomas – On the site plan, there was a couple things here. The reason why the orientation of the drive-through is here was to get it away. Do you want us to flip it 90 degrees?

Loskill – I just can't get behind looking at the back side of that building.

Randy Thomas – I don't disagree with you.

Loskill – I go back to what we have on Haggerty in front of Meijer. If you're inside Meijer it looks great. If you're driving along Haggerty, it's hideous. I don't want to be responsible for another one of those.

Randy Thomas – I hear you on that. There were some questions about screening headlights. This is the area that I was telling you would be screened with vegetation to screen light and noise. I think the users we would be talking to would be along the ones you're going to see going all around us right now. Putting yourself at a detriment by not having a drive-through, that's a tough call.

Discussion continued regarding potential rotation of the building, the drive-through configuration and stacking. Loskill noted that it would be helpful if the developers had the piece of land in the southeast corner of the site. It is an odd shaped site that does not lend itself well to these developments.

Dave Campbell – If they're to go back and do some different test fits, based on this feedback, and potentially reorient the building, is that a worthwhile endeavor for them? Whatever they're going to test fit, they're going to want to have it include a drive-through.

Loskill – I just don't want to see the back of the building.

Dave Campbell – Is it worth their while to keep playing with this one?

Weber – I think this gets back to, one, we're talking Conditional Rezoning if something were to happen.

Dave Campbell – That would be up to the Board, but I don't see it happening without a Conditional Rezoning.

Weber – To me, the last thing we want you doing is spending money on this if there isn't a glimmer of hope. For me, there's not a glimmer of hope without clear limits on intensity, and something comparable to neighborhood commercial.

Randy Thomas – George, I'm not sure I understand what the intensity means. Is that the tenant?

Weber – Yes, I think it's the tenant and the hours of operation of a drive-through.

Randy Thomas – I think we would be open to discussion on the drive-through operation and hours. We just need to come up with something reasonable, but I think we'd be open to that discussion.

Weber – I'm not sure how to describe a tenant, that will live for 10 years. So, saying yes, you can have a drive-through for some kind of low intensity food, maybe a bagel shop. That bagel shop maybe could turn into a Taco Bell. I don't know, and I don't know how you craft language. I'm sure we can pay lawyers enough money to figure something out, but I think there needs to be a conceptual understanding of how this can best fit into neighborhood commercial, a community gathering place. Not a place that people are just buzzing by on their way to and from work, with lots of traffic coming in.

Chairperson Parel – George, isn't that-

Weber – That's where office came into the previous discussion we had; a community coffee shop, gathering place, some office space. Those were the primary desired or proposed tenants.

Randy Thomas – I'm not sure that's economically viable.

Weber – I don't know the answer to that.

Randy Thomas – Okay, we would be open to discussing limiting the types of users. For example, like a Taco Bell or any of those uses; that's not what we envision. We think this could either be a financial institution, or it could be a coffee shop, a bagel shop. I don't know yet, George. We haven't gone to the market to really test it. I have talked to

a coffee user. I know there's interest because they did their study along the corridor. I think arguably, this is a busy morning corridor. The traffic that would be driving by is going to be coming up Pontiac Trail. I don't think we'd be generating any more traffic than already exists there. If anything, you'd pull it off and it would cycle through. I think we'd be open to also discussing limitations; you're not going to have your typical quick service restaurant (QSR). We would not have any of the typical QSRs in there. That would be something we could talk about as a condition.

Chairperson Parel – I think that's interesting. I definitely think that's something we should consider. George, when you talked about having so many cars buzzing in, to me, that reflects the whole purpose of the drive-through, which is to get in and out in 2-3 minutes. It's a massive number of cars in a short amount of time.

Weber – That's where it gets to the use. If it's a bank drive-through, to me, that's low intensity.

McCanham – And it's local.

Weber – And it's local.

Dave Campbell – And it's bankers hours, 9-5, Monday through Friday.

Weber – Except for the ATM.

Chairperson Parel – Honestly, I wouldn't have a problem with that. I think that's similar to what we've been talking about, low intensity. My concern is 100 cars in a half hour or an hour.

Weber – And I don't know what the other tenants are, but it's the combination of all the different tenants, what they are and how they fit. Intensity is a hard word to define, but it is recognizing existing residential homeowners and the impact upon them.

Chairperson Parel – And not to be the downer here, but Dave, if we made this recommendation to the Board of Trustees, they would have to then vote on it, right?

Dave Campbell – That's correct.

Chairperson Parel – That could be an uphill battle.

Dave Campbell – Kroger at 14 Mile and Haggerty being an example; the Board does sometimes see things differently than the Planning Commission sees them. For the most part, they follow your expertise, but there are two hurdles that would have to be cleared for sure.

Chairperson Parel – Yes, and I think they're both pretty high. I'm not saying it's impossible.

McCanham – I'm new to this stuff. One of the things I'm learning in everything I'm reading and hearing is that there's a big difference between being a public benefit and a community benefit. I think this is a piece of property that, because of the density of people around it, I think this is more community benefit. Now, as an investor trying to

build something there, it's problematic to try to make some money off of it. I see that. But maybe it's not the right place. I think community benefit is the local people; a bank services the local people. If you're talking about a morning coffee place, you're going to be banking on the morning drive. What percent of that is non-residents? We are a pass through community. Is this your first project?

Chris George – In Commerce.

McCanham – Oh, okay.

Chris George – About intensity, I'm curious what your opinions are. Is Starbucks too intense for this location regarding a drive-through and the position? Just so I can get a gauge that speaks to intensity.

Chairperson Parel – My opinion would be yes.

Weber – I would agree. I would envision the coffee shop at 14 Mile and M-5. I can't recall the name of it, but it has been there for 3 or 4 years. It's down from Leo's and it starts with a Q.

Dave Campbell – The Yemeni coffee place?

Weber – Yes, it's a gathering place. It does not have a drive-through.

Dave Campbell – They would love a drive-through too, the coffee users and the landlord.

Weber – Anyway, to me, a Starbucks would be above the threshold for intensity.

Chris George – I ask because the past applicant had ... that portion of their development called for it. I think it was a local coffee place, but it was a bigger building.

Weber – We specifically discussed Starbucks and said that wasn't ...

Chris George – Right, I'm just trying to gauge your feel in terms of intensity, and that's a good indicator.

Chairperson Parel – He was willing to significantly reduce the hours. I don't see Starbucks doing that.

Randy Thomas – I'm not sure Brad really thought out the full impact. I know there are a lot of restrictions people like to put on, and then it becomes so constrained.

Chairperson Parel – Sure, then you can't find tenants.

Randy Thomas – Any other questions?

Chris George – Just about the rotation. I think I heard, in terms of the butt of the building, so being rotated 90 degrees clockwise to get the face of the building on Pontiac Trail versus Welch.

Chairperson Parel – I think that's a fair question to the group because, to Dave's point, do we send you back and have you look at the orientation and spend money doing that? It's not free.

Chris George – We have to make a decision internally about this intensity and what kind of project we want.

Chairperson Parel – Correct, because if the answer is no on the intensity, I don't want you spending...

Dave Campbell – That's why I asked the question; would they be wasting their time and money to play with different orientations?

Weber – I hope we gave you an opinion on intensity, and thinking about neighborhood commercial, and something that strikes that balance. If you don't think you can get the tenants to achieve that, the universal tenants that might fit into something that we've tried our best to describe, then the orientation of the building doesn't make a difference.

Dave Campbell – And rotating the building, I understand Mr. Loskill's intent with that, but if you rotate the building, now you're changing the circulation pattern, the whole orientation, where the driveways are and it may create more challenges that we're not thinking of.

Loskill – It's not a good site to try to fit something like this on. I understand that.

Dave Campbell – Corner lots are tricky.

Chairperson Parel – Small corner sites.

Chris George – And the angle.

Loskill – And that weird leg on the bottom.

Dave Campbell – So if it's a coffee shop, you want like a hipster coffee shop. Lawyers have to be able to define what a hipster coffee shop is. We'll have Nick do it, the young guy.

Weber – We talked about the Red Dot in Northville which had the residential look and feel to it. Basically, we drank the Kool-Aid from the previous guy, so now anything more intense than that is an uphill battle.

Chairperson Parel – If you want to go back and think about it, Dave is here, and if you need us, ask questions. Intensity...

Dave Campbell – The word you've heard a bunch of times is intensity.

Randy Thomas – Thank you for the time.

Chairperson Parel – Anytime.

J: OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION:

None.

K: PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2025, AT 7:00PM.

- It sounds like we will have two absentees for the September meeting; Mr. Winkler and Mr. Weber.
- As I said in an email, Kroger has been pushed to the September meeting.
- The DDA has someone tire kicking on the southwest corner of Oakley Park and Haggerty, the piece of property in front of Public Storage.
- The other item on the September agenda is the Huron Watershed; they would like to make a presentation to the Planning Commission. I think a point of their presentation is, here are some great ideas to change your Zoning Ordinance in an effort to protect the watersheds of this region, and particularly, the Huron River Watershed. So, things like how we design parking lots and rain gardens, doing things to slow down the flow of water before it makes it to the Huron River Watershed, slow it down and remove the sediment. I'll tell them 10-15 minutes.
- On our website, Nick's first project was to create an interactive development map where you can see all of the developments in the Township. They're color-coded; red for commercial, yellow for residential, and so forth. You click on them, and it provides more information. Included within that information is site plan and building elevations. It's meant to be for our residents and people who are passing by and wondering what is being built there. I think it turned out really well and it's something that will be a living, breathing thing that will be updated every time a new project comes along.

L: ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Loskill, supported by Phillips, to adjourn the meeting at 10:15pm.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Joe Loskill, Secretary