

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

Monday, May 2, 2022
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
Bill McKeever
George Weber
Sam Karim
Joe Loskill
Absent: Chelsea Rebeck, Secretary (excused)
Jay James, Engineer/Building Official
Also Present: Dave Campbell, Township Planning Director
Paula Lankford, Planner
Jason Mayer, Township Engineer, Giffels Webster
Larry Gray, Township Supervisor
Mark Gall, Township Fire Marshal
Larry Haber, Former Chairperson
Debbie Watson, DDA Director

A1. RESOLUTION HONORING LARRY HABER

Dave Campbell read the resolution honoring Larry Haber, former Planning Commission Chairperson. Larry joined the Planning Commission on August 21, 2000, served as Chairperson from 2006 to 2021, and as Vice Chairperson from 2005 to 2006, participating in 261 Planning Commission meetings. He has consistently been a leader in the Planning Commission's efforts to guide responsible and successful growth across the Commerce Township community. Dave thanked Larry for 21 years of dedication.

[Applause]

Larry Haber – Paula, thank you for getting most of that right.

Chairperson Parel – Please step up to the microphone and give your name and address.

Larry Haber – I am Larry Haber, 3300 Mimosa. I'm proud to be here. It's funny to be looking this way. I'd like to thank you all for making my job easy. It's a pleasure to have served with all of you. I certainly do miss Tom Jones. We were onboard together for 20+ years. I wish you well.

You're doing one of my most unfavorable tasks now; the Master Plan. I've been through three Master Plans since I've been here.

Thank you. I miss you all and I miss being with you. I wish you the best and I thank you for this plaque. And, I promise I'm not staying.

[Applause]

Chairperson Parel – Keep in touch, Larry.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Winkler, supported by Loskill, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda of May 2, 2022, as presented.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Winkler, supported by Loskill, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of April 11, 2022, with one revision, on Page 21, Item I.4., first paragraph, correct *50' to reflect 15'*. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

D. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES

Bill McKeever – Zoning Board of Appeals

- Nothing to report from the ZBA.

George Weber – Township Board of Trustees

- A couple things from the April 12th Board meeting.
- We had two board appointments, Barb Garbutt and Barry Hiscox will be reappointed to the Library Board for a term ending May 31st, 2025.
- Under contracts and awards, we had several.
 - One, the Benstein Water Main, Phase I, was approved to move forward. Correct me if I'm wrong, Jason, that's on Benstein Road between the Airline Trail and Glengary.

Jason Mayer – It was from McCoy to Glengary.

Weber –

- The Hickory Glen park improvement is moving forward. Emily England, Director of Parks & Senior Services, was also able to acquire roughly 120 pine trees from Oakland County through an initiative they have. Basically, I think 40 of those are now planted at Hickory Glen. The rest of the improvements, mostly in parking, are scheduled to move forward shortly and will include a second entrance into that park for safety and traffic concerns.
- We are moving forward with the Lystek system, which is an initiative to take sludge that is being hauled to a dump from the water treatment plant, and it will turn the present waste into a Class-A fertilizer. That is roughly a \$7 million initiative, and the vast majority will be coming from federal funding and our funds.
- I know Jay is not here, but he has taken on the initiative to begin a rental inspection program. The purpose is to make sure that rental properties are safe and up to code. We get periodic concerns from residents, but they don't want us to contact landlords because they're fearful of being evicted, or having their rates increase substantially. We probably have 1,200 rental properties, single-family residences, within the Township. One of the first phases of the initiative is to get an understanding of how many rental properties we have and where they are. From there, we will have what hopefully will be a non-onerous process to have an inspection, probably on a 3-year cycle.
- Finally, we are moving forward with a sidewalk ordinance. This is something that has been kicked down the road for 20 years or so, therefore we are taking that initiative to put something on the books regarding sidewalks.

Chairperson Parel – With the rental inspection program, would there be an annual fee or registration?

Weber – There will be a one-time registration fee that will basically cover costs associated with identifying the properties and setting up a database to be able to understand and manage them. After the first inspection, it would be on a 3-year cycle. If it's new construction, they wouldn't be required to have an inspection for 5 years.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you.

Brian Winkler – Downtown Development Authority

- The April 19th DDA meeting can be summarized as follows.
- It was a routine meeting, but it was also a DDA Informational meeting. Because it was informational, the Insite Commercial Report, as well as the Asset and Liability Report, were discussed.
- Insite Commercial Report:
 - B1 – Phase 1, the Aikens parcel: Bruce is attending the ICSC, a retail and commercial property convention in Las Vegas, in May. He will update the DDA Marketing Committee on June 7th at a special committee meeting.
 - Parcel C, the hard corner of Pontiac Trail and Haggerty: An Automotive Group and the DDA have come to agreement on a price for this parcel. A Letter of Intent has been approved.
 - Parcel L, 1.8 acres on Haggerty Road: Guidepost Montessori is still completing their due diligence. We will review their site plan at our meeting this evening.
- Asset & Liability Report: The DDA made our first bond payment of the year using \$600,000 from the winter tax capture to help fund the payment. Per DDA Treasurer Phillips, based upon interest rates for 10-year treasuries at the end of the year, the present value of the future liability to the Township went down more than \$8 million. Molly Phillips is owed a big thanks for that.
- Attorney's Report: As I mentioned, the DDA approved the Letter of Intent for Parcel C.
- Thanks to all who participated in the Adopt-A-Road event on April 23rd to clean up the shoulders and median on Martin Parkway, as organized by Jason Mayer.

Jay James – Building Department

- No report in Jay's absence.

Jason Mayer – Township Engineer

- Besides the projects that George mentioned, the Richardson Center; they just installed a sidewalk around the east side and they will be putting in modifications to the deck for ADA access.

E. PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Chairperson Parel opened to Public Discussion of Matters Not on the Agenda.

No comments.

Chairperson Parel closed Public Discussion of Matters Not on the Agenda.

F. TABLED ITEMS

None.

G. OLD BUSINESS

None.

H. SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

ITEM H.1. PPT22-01 – MARK COLONE – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – PUBLIC HEARING

Mark Colone of Commerce MI is requesting approval as provided for in Section 33.01.A of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance to construct a 3,200 square foot accessory structure in the southwest corner of his property at 6080 Ford Road. Sidwell No.: 17-06-200-032

David Campbell, Planning Director, gave a review. Mr. Colone appeared before the Planning Commission last month for a conceptual meeting regarding a proposed accessory structure on his unique flag lot. The size was reduced to 80x40, for 3,200 square feet. He will need site plan approval from the Planning Commission, and also a variance from the ZBA. If the Planning Commission is prepared to do so, they would take action on the site plan, a pole barn greater than 900 square feet. If approved, that approval would be conditional upon Mr. Colone advancing to the ZBA at their May 26th meeting for a variance to allow the structure in the defined front yard. If he is denied the requested variance for the location of the pole barn by the ZBA, he would still have the option to build a pole barn of these dimensions in a conforming location on his property without having to come back to the Planning Commission. That is included in the recommended motion language in the Planning Department's review letter dated April 27th.

Last month, the Planning Commission suggested improvements to the exterior of the building with upgraded building materials, windows, and other features to break up the expanse of the metal siding and have a more attractive appearance for neighboring property owners. In that same mindset, also potentially enhancing the landscape buffer to screen the view. Elevations were shown on the overhead and stone wainscoting was reviewed.

The recommended motion language was amended to address the existing accessory structure located in the northwest corner of Mr. Colone's property. Those dimensions are included in the language, for a grand total of 3,750 square feet.

A public hearing needs to be held. Two emails were received from neighboring residents which will be read into the record.

Mr. Colone – I have three more from my neighbors.

Dave Campbell – And of course, we want to give the petitioner the opportunity to present on his own behalf.

Chairperson Parel – Thanks, Dave. We will allow the petitioner to come up, and then we'll formally open the public hearing.

Dave Campbell – Correct, and then usually a petitioner would ask that they have an opportunity to address any comments that may have come up during the public hearing.

Mr. Colone – I would stress again that my backyard is to the north and my front yard is in front of the house, which is everybody's backyard. Their houses face Ford Road. I'm essentially in the backyard. I'm not in anybody's front yard. (Approached the overhead.) The neighbor has a construction company that I get to look at every day out my front window. It's an odd lot. What is called my front yard is really my side yard. We talked about the flooding in the back. My septic field is right here. This is the optimal location on the property with dry land to be able to put the barn. I have the neighbor's letters. I put a picture on there so the neighbor's knew where I was going to put the pole barn. I don't know if you want to see these.

Weber – Maybe just include them and we will get them all on the record.

Dave Campbell – Again, procedurally, the question of whether it's appropriate in the front yard is more of a discussion with the ZBA. The discussion with the Planning Commission has to do with the size and design of the structure itself.

Chairperson Parel opened the Public Hearing.

Dave Campbell – Mr. Colone, am I correct that the body of this letter is the same, just with three different signatures?

Mr. Colone confirmed.

Dave Campbell – Okay, I will read it once and then give the names that signed it. This is Mr. Colone's language that they have signed.

To Our Neighbors:

My family and I would like to build a pole barn on our property. We have been working with the Township closely and it was suggested that I reach out to my neighbors with our plans. If you have no objections, a letter signed by you would be an acceptable form of acceptance for the proposed barn. The image of the site plan for the proposed barn is included on this letter. We plan on adding additional screening along the west side of the barn. Additionally, the outside of the barn will be finished to coordinate with our home. We appreciate your consideration of our proposed pole barn.

Sincerely,

Mark and the Colone Family.

Dave Campbell – As I mentioned, there are three signatures:

1. Emily Otten, 6070 Ford Road, Commerce Township
2. Brandon Stevens, 6100 Ford Road, Commerce Township
3. Corey Stowell, 6060 Ford Road, Commerce Township

Mr. Colone – Those are the three houses that abut the barn.

Dave Campbell – And then I mentioned the two emails:

1. Victor McCarty – *I am the neighbor to the south. I am ok with the pole barn on 6080 Ford Road.*
2. Victoria Taylor-Sluder – *I received a notice of the public hearing on May 2 regarding the approval request for the construction project outlined in PPT22-01. My public comment regarding this request is a question of what the weight of the neighbor's input will be on this approval? This property is quite close to mine and I am already disturbed at the number and extent of tree removal and additional lighting in many of the surrounding properties. I should not like to see a construction project that will introduce more of the same.*

Dave Campbell – I believe Paula replied to Ms. Sluder. Did she respond to your reply?

Paula Lankford – She did. I explained to her that he was adding additional landscaping and no lighting. She was happy.

Dave Campbell – It sounds like she was satisfied with what Mr. Colone is proposing as far as screening and lack of lighting.

Chairperson Parel closed the Public Hearing as there were not additional questions or comments.

Commission Comments:

Karim – No comments.

Winkler – No issues here.

Loskill – Nothing from me.

Weber – Just one question. One of the conditions was installation of enhanced landscaping consistent with a submitted site plan. I wasn't sure what the enhanced landscaping was on the site plan.

Mr. Colone – There are additional trees along the west side of the property, planting trees in between the pine trees to screen it more.

Weber – Do you have a number we can include in the motion?

Mr. Colone – About 15-20 additional pine trees, smaller, 6' to fit in between and blockade it. Remember, it's almost 4 acres. The property is fairly large. It's not a small lot.

Weber – I get it. I just wanted to make sure we include specificity in that.

McKeever – I have no questions.

Chairperson Parel – George, in regard to specificity, are you thinking that the motion language should include the number of trees, or the exact placement of the trees?

Weber – I think we can say something as simple as, on the west side, there would be between 15-20 additional evergreen trees planted.

Chairperson Parel – Okay. My last comment, the building materials themselves, Dave, you mentioned that we have a general idea on the materials.

Dave Campbell – This is where I may want to confirm with Mr. Colone. These are the elevations that were generated from Menard's. The stone would be along...

Mr. Colone – I thought we sent you additional pictures. It's going to be clay color, the same as the house. The cultured stone is Owens Corning, a fieldstone mix to match what I have on the front of house. I can wrap it around the front and bring it down maybe 10-15' to blend it. You really won't see the rest of it behind the trees.

Dave Campbell – Is that the elevation?

Mr. Colone – Yes.

Chairperson Parel – I like the idea of wrapping it around to protect the view on the south end.

Mr. Colone – I was thinking of coming down the front side a little way, past the window, maybe 10-15'. No one will see the back of the barn because the neighbor put a 7' privacy fence all the way down, and there's pine trees all the way down.

Chairperson Parel – Could I trouble you to show us on the overhead where you're thinking the stone wraps around?

Mr. Colone – We would put stone across the front of the barn, so when you pull in, you would see the stone. Then I can wrap it down the side a way.

Mr. Colone indicated that the north side of the barn is the front where stone would be included, and it would wrap around the east side of the building.

Dave Campbell – Within the recommended motion language that the Planning Commission seems close to acting upon, one of the conditions would be that the structure cannot be used for purposes that are otherwise not permitted in the R-1A zoning district, such as running a commercial business out of it.

Mr. Colone – I have a space in Wixom for that. I just want to store my stuff in the barn.

Chairperson Parel – And you're familiar with the deed restriction that will be placed on this in regard to splitting the property in the future?

Mr. Colone – Yes, you can't split that property. It's not splittable. I just want to store my stuff and nothing commercial or business.

MOTION by Weber, supported by Loskill, to approve, **with conditions**, Item PPT22-01, Mark Colone – Accessory Structure, the request by Mark Colone of Commerce MI for approval as provided for in Section 33.01.A of the Commerce Township Zoning

Ordinance to construct a 3,200 square foot accessory structure in the southwest corner of his property at 6080 Ford Road. Sidwell No.: 17-06-200-032

Move to conditionally approve PPT22-01, an application submitted by Mark Colone for a new 3,200 square foot accessory structure at 6080 Ford Road which when combined with the existing 550 square foot detached structure in the property's northwest corner would bring the total area of accessory structures to approximately 3,750 square feet. The Planning Commission finds that the proposed structure satisfies all applicable criteria of Section 33.01.A of the Township's Zoning Ordinance, and the specific requirements for an accessory structure greater than 900 square feet on a property greater than two acres, with the notable exception of the proposed structure's location within the property's defined front yard where accessory structures are only permitted by the Zoning Ordinance in the side or rear yards.

The proposed accessory structure's location in the front yard will require a variance from the Township's Zoning Board of Appeals. Consistent with the procedure established by Sec. 35.09 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Commission is acting upon the approval of the accessory structure's site plan prior to ZBA consideration of the variance. The Planning Commission further finds that should the ZBA deny the variance to locate the structure in the front yard, Mr. Colone shall retain site plan approval to construct the accessory structure in a location on his property that complies with the Zoning Ordinance as determined administratively by the Building Official.

Site plan approval is conditional upon the following:

1. Approval by the Township's Zoning Board of Appeals to allow the accessory structure in the defined front yard.
2. A deed restriction recorded with the Oakland County Register of Deeds shall be provided to the Township's Building Department prior to the issuance of any building permits. The deed restriction shall prohibit any land division creating a parcel of less than 2 acres for the property the structure is located upon.
3. The existing evergreen buffer to be maintained along the perimeter of the property.
4. The installation of the enhanced landscaping, including 15-20 evergreen trees located on the west side of the property.
5. The accessory structure shall not be used for any purpose other than those principally permitted in the R-1A zoning district, including the operation of a commercial business within the structure.
6. The applicant will include a fieldstone wainscoting on the north side of the building, and wrapping around the northeast corner to continue along the east side of the building for 10-15'.

Discussion –

Parel – Dave, we validate that the trees went in upon permit inspections?

Campbell – Yes, that would be something that the Building Official would have to confirm prior to finalizing the building permit.

Parel – Perfect.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM H.2. PZ22-02 – COMMERCE TOWNSHIP – TEXT AMENDMENT – PUBLIC HEARING

An amendment to the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance No. 3.000, to amend Article 30, Signs, to amend the language for setback minimums for freestanding signs,

and provide a means for the minimum setback for a new freestanding sign to be determined by the average setback of existing signs in the vicinity.

David Campbell, Planning Director, gave a review. The proposed amendment is based on recommendations from the ZBA, who hopes the proposed amendment will reduce the appeals for Sign Exceptions that are frequently brought before them. The amendment is proposing language to average the setbacks for freestanding signs along major thoroughfares from other existing monument signs within 1,500 feet on the same side of the street.

Chairperson Parel opened the Public Hearing.

No comments.

Chairperson Parel closed the Public Hearing.

Commission Comments:

McKeever – I have no comments.

Weber – I'm good.

Loskill – I'm good.

Winkler – I'm okay.

Karim – No comment.

Parel – No further comment from me either.

MOTION by Loskill, supported by Winkler, to recommend approval, to the Commerce Township Board of Trustees, of Item PZ22-02, Commerce Township Text Amendment, the request for an amendment to the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance No. 3.000, to amend Article 30, Signs, to amend the language for setback minimums for freestanding signs, and provide a means for the minimum setback for a new freestanding sign to be determined by the average setback of existing signs in the vicinity.

Move to recommend the Commerce Township Board approve PZ22-02, amendments to Article 30 - Signs of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance, to amend the language for setback minimums for new freestanding signs where a pattern of existing non-conforming signs in the vicinity exists, and to correct an error in the existing text. The Planning Commission's recommendation is based on a finding that the proposed amendment would create an administrative process to prudently address a setback requirement that generates frequent petitions for Sign Exceptions to the Zoning Board of Appeals.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

I. NEW BUSINESS (2):

ITEM 11. PSP22-01 – GUIDEPOST MONTESSORI

Murphy Development Group, LLC/NVS Properties 19 LLC of Chicago IL is requesting site plan approval for a new daycare facility located at 2855 Haggerty Road, between Oakley Park Road and Pontiac Trail. Sidwell No.: 17-24-200-052

Dave Campbell, Planning Director, gave a review of the submitted site plan for a new 11,470 square foot Montessori daycare on a vacant property along the west side of Haggerty Road between Oakley Park and Pontiac Trail. The property is owned by the Commerce Township Downtown Development Authority, the DDA, who markets the property as Parcel L. The prospective developer would purchase the property from the DDA if and when site plan approval is received.

Dave provided history regarding the split of this parcel from the larger property when the Merrill Park subdivision was developed, along with previous developments proposed for this site, including the proposal from Goddard Schools.

The property is currently zoned TLM and daycare uses are a permitted use in that zoning district. However, Section 26.202 of the Zoning Ordinance states that a childcare center shall be located a minimum of 1,500 feet from another State-licensed care facility, unless that minimum separation is reduced by the Planning Commission. Therefore, in addition to requesting site plan approval, Guidepost is also seeking a waiver from the Planning Commission since its proposed location is less than 1,500 feet from the existing KinderCare facility.

Dave identified parking as shown on the Haggerty Road side, and along the south side of the building, along with the play areas to the west and north of the building. They are proposing a sidewalk along the Haggerty Road frontage. They had to work with the RCOC on the design and location of the driveway as Haggerty widens to two southbound lanes directly in front of their entrance. Guidepost will need to extend the taper further northward.

Revisions were received for the landscape plan after the packet had gone out. If the Planning Commission opts to approve the site plan, it should be conditional upon the updated landscape plan, along with the revisions noted by the Township's Landscape Architect in the review letter.

Building materials and percentages were reviewed, and none of the materials exceed 50%, which is the threshold particularly for cement board siding. Elevations were presented on the overhead. The main entrance would be on the south side of the building. Although wall signs are deferred to the Building Department, Dave noted that the wall sign is being shown on their entrance on the south; however, the Zoning Ordinance requires that wall signs be on the addressed side of the building, which is the Haggerty Road side. Without a sign exception from the ZBA, they would be required to have their principal wall sign on the east side elevation.

In early conversations, the Planning Department asked Guidepost to do some enhancements to the building elevations with respect to materials, providing vertical stone elements to break up long expanses of the siding. They were able to do that along the columns at the entrance, along the pilasters, and on the south side of the building. The Planning Commission should discuss opportunities for similar treatment along the north side of the building. Operationally, this is the rear of their building, but it would be most prominent if you are southbound on Haggerty Road, and it's a fairly long stretch of horizontal siding.

The roof was brought up in the review letter. There is an opportunity, especially on the north side of the building, to break up the roofline. It's a pitched asphalt shingled roof without much variance as far as the way it projects. It may be incorporating the dormer

elements, as included on the other sides of the building, to provide a break to that roofline.

Lastly, Dave discussed cross-access with adjacent parcels. He asked the Planning Commission and the developer to consider including on the site plan granting of a future easement for cross-access, if and when adjacent parcels are redeveloped with land uses that have a better synergy with the daycare use. Language is included in the recommended motion.

Chris Horney, Managing Director, NVS Properties 19 LLC/Murphy Development Group, 227 West Monroe Street, Ste 5040, Chicago, IL, was present to address the request.

Chris Horney – I'll talk a little bit about Murphy Development Group, who we are as a company, who the tenant is, and walk through the typical things we do. We are a Chicago-based development firm. We do mixed-use, office, hotel, apartments, and we also do retail, specifically for specific tenants. We're doing a build-to-suit program with Guidepost right now. We've done 10 of these with them across the country. In Michigan, we have one going in Kentwood which is right outside Grand Rapids. We also have one in Columbus, Ohio, 4-5 in the greater Indy area, Illinois, Wisconsin, et cetera. We use the same contractor, they travel with us, and typically the same architect and civil engineer. We tailor developments to the requirements of the cities. This is not a cookie-cutter solution. Each group has specific requests and we try our best to accommodate all of those prior to us getting here, so we address the concerns. Every site is a little bit different. We tried our best to fit within the guidelines that Commerce Township was asking for.

Guidepost is a nationwide daycare group. They have 99 schools as of today. They were established in 2016 and they're growing rapidly. It's a Montessori-based daycare, with children ages 0-6. This is not a school, it's a daycare. There will not be elementary school kids or anything like that. We will get into the timing of pickup and drop-off because that is typically something that gets requested. The request right now; it's a vacant lot, it's a daycare. NVS properties is just a single-purpose entity that's purchasing it, but we are the developer. Guidepost signs a 20-year long-term lease with us and we hold that.

There will be up to 135 children here. Children will be dropped off between 7am-10am, and picked up between 3pm-6pm. There is not a defined start time. It is not an elementary school where class starts at 8:15am, so there is not this queue outside that will jam up traffic. It's basically when parents are on their way to work or on their way home. Also, because it is 0-6, we do not have a drop-off. You have to park and walk your child into the classroom, check-in and then depart. That is the reason for the amount of parking and it doesn't create queueing because they have to stop and walk in. 135 children is dictated by the State, depending on the number of classrooms. Classrooms are split up by age, and then depending on the amount of square footage that you have in each of the classrooms, that allows for your occupancy. Daycares are highly regulated by the State and each has their own regulations, and we have to follow those guidelines.

We've done our best to be amenable to the changes, and we can continue to work with staff to address the requests, adding additional dormers or bump-outs on the north elevation. It is the back of the building but we can address that with staff to the extent that there's additional requests to break up that façade. That's not an issue. Essentially, it is a one-story building. You see a combination of both windows and doors. Effectively,

every classroom has an exit out into the fenced off playground area. This site is fantastic for us because there's almost 20,000 square feet of greenspace. The playground is broken up into three different playgrounds. We will have an exterior black aluminum fence that surrounds it, and then internal fencing to keep the toddlers away from the 5 to 6-year-old children.

The facade is made up of a combination of stone, Hardie board, shake, vertical or horizontal, there is some batten vertical. The windows are specifically low. We have the stone band up to 18", and then we keep the windows low because primarily, we want the kids to be able to look outside. We actually have windows in between the classrooms to keep that open vibe.

The landscaping plans were slightly adjusted and the updated plans were provided.

Dave Campbell – I think this is the older layout of the building. We just want there to be consistency with the site plan and landscape plan.

Mr. Horney – Absolutely. Photometrics are on the right. Effectively, we have site lighting to light up the parking lot only. We do not have lighting for the playground. This school is open 7am-6pm. When we're gone, we're only lighting the egress doors.

Dave already went through the elevations, but they had asked that we comply with the regulations. We can address the concerns with site signage. We've had that request before, so we can transfer that sign to the dormer on the east side. To the extent that we have the ability to put up a monument sign, we will work with you to make sure it complies.

Dave Campbell – Now the sign amendment we just discussed would not apply to this because this is new construction. It would have to comply with the Haggerty Road setback.

Mr. Horney – Right, yes. And that's what a typical sign looks like.

Site fencing, I've talked about a little bit. This is also license regulated. It's a high-quality aluminum fence. Again, they're signing a 20-year lease. We intend to be here a long time; we want to be good neighbors and we want to build high-quality products. This is not a cheap exercise. We want to invest in the community and in this place.

This is a typical example of the traffic patterns that we see at the schools. For 135 kids, you're never going to have more than effectively 16% of that, which is just north of 20 parents dropping off in any one 15-minute interval. Pickup and drop-off are each somewhere between 5-10 minutes. Generally, most students are dropped off between 7am-9am, and most are picked up between 3pm-6pm. Because it is Montessori, it's less structured than typical, and that's why there's no need for them to get there at a specific time.

Additional renderings of other Guidepost locations were shown on the overhead.

Commission Comments:

Karim – No questions.

Winkler – I have no questions. I do agree with the Planning Director's suggestions about livening up the north elevation with some stone pilasters and other elements to match what's on the south side. Otherwise, I like it.

Chairperson Parel – You mentioned a dormer on the east side of the building where you anticipate moving the sign to.

Mr. Horney – We ended up having to bring that out so that there's a flat face.

Chairperson Parel – It would break up the building even more.

Mr. Horney – Yes, we would have to bump it out a little bit.

Dave Campbell – It's tricky because the Planning Commission doesn't typically get involved in signs, but when a building's architecture and design elements are being designed around a sign, then I want to have that discussion at this level so there's no surprises when they come back for their sign permits.

Mr. Horney – I'd rather have that conversation now so no one is blindsided late in the game.

Chairperson Parel – Appreciate it. I'll pass it on to Joe, but my guess is you're going to hear a little bit more about the north side of the building and breaking that up as well.

Loskill – The fence you're putting around the perimeter; the uses on both sides of you, north and south, are essentially junkyards in the back. I would recommend maybe a solid fence in lieu of a picket fence, just so the kids aren't staring at the piles all day long. I know you can't dictate what goes on north and south, but I went by there this afternoon. Neither of those are attractive views. You may want to consider a different fence for that.

Mr. Horney – We've definitely done that in the past. What I've shown you in the pictures is the minimum required spacing of what's typical in a friendlier environment, but no doubt, there have been times where we have done a more solid fence, either requested by neighbors or ...

Loskill – To the north they have trucks and debris out back, and to the south, there are a bunch of junk cars, construction equipment and other debris stacked behind the building.

Dave Campbell – We don't call it a junkyard. We call it pre-existing, nonconforming outdoor storage.

Loskill – You don't have a loading zone. You say you don't have food deliveries. How are kids fed? You don't have a kitchen either.

Mr. Horney – Correct, we don't have a kitchen. We have a catering van. We have catering every day. It will show up in a box van. They don't prepare food onsite. There are liability purposes with allergies, et cetera. It's easier.

Loskill – Wouldn't a loading zone be appropriate for that situation?

Mr. Horney – Honestly, we don't have it. Outside of the two-hour pickup and drop-off, the parking lot is effectively empty. You've got 15 employees for 48 spots. No one else parks there during that time. It's a traditional van. It's not like a semi.

Dave Campbell – Is it like a Ford Transit? I picture something that can just pull into a regular parking space.

Mr. Horney – Exactly, correct.

Loskill – If it will fit in a regular parking space, that's fine.

Dave Campbell – Speaking of the loading zone, I think we've included in the motion, it's up to the Planning Commission whether to require a loading zone. They're asking for it not be required for this use.

Loskill – My only other comment. You've got good areas to distribute the snow in the wintertime on the east side. Your south side, you may want to consider how you're going to get snow removal done there. You may want to consider a flare south of the dumpster enclosure in order to allow a spot to deposit snow.

Weber – Because we have some new members on the Planning Commission, when we discussed this with Goddard Schools, waiving the 1,500-foot requirement; that requirement was put into place primarily to discourage excessive daycares popping up in residential areas. We know we have some, but we didn't want residential areas to become over-populated with daycares. That was some of the rationale for that. On Joe's comments regarding fencing; on the northwest corner where the path comes in there, and I know we don't want a whole lot of lighting, but I think some level of lighting is needed back in that corner for security. There is a path behind there and there will be people doing lots of walking back in there. For a daycare, you just don't want people hopping the fence, et cetera.

Dave Campbell – Can I jump in there?

Weber – Sure.

Dave Campbell – Ms. Watson might help me here too. This is the paved walking trail that goes around the pond areas of the Merrill Park neighborhood, which is open to the public. At one time, it was unknown what would be developed on Parcel L. Therefore, this stub was installed in anticipation of there potentially being a pathway along the northern perimeter of whatever developed on Parcel L. After much discussion with the DDA and the Township, it was agreed that routing traffic along this, out to Haggerty Road, and particularly inviting a back door into what is proposed to be a daycare center might not be the most secure option. If Guidepost were to be approved, this spur would be removed. There would no longer be this invitation to hop the fence. Deb, can you speak to the sequence for getting that removed, assuming Guidepost were to be approved?

Ms. Watson – Upon closing the sale of the property, we will schedule that stub to be removed. We will get permission from Merrill Park, as it's on their property, and then

also from Murphy to go through their site. That is the responsibility of the DDA. We accepted that at the time you, Dave, were approved to have administrative authority over removal of that pathway connection. Township Board gave the Planning Director that authority, and we agreed that upon sale of the property, if you saw fit not to extend the pathway through the parcel, that we would remove the connecting stub. The DDA will take care of that, and we can either work with Murphy's contractor or with our own.

Dave Campbell – Zooming out on the aerial. Ultimately, what we want to get is a connection from Haggerty Road to the pathway system within the Commerce Towne Place nature preserve area. What we think is a more appropriate location to do that is when Parcel C gets developed, which is something we will discuss. Having a connection at the corner of Haggerty and Pontiac Trail, hooking up to where the pathway currently dead-ends in the Walmart parking lot. We think that's a better means for foot traffic along Haggerty Road to find their way into the pathway system.

Chairperson Parel – On that point of potential lighting at the back of the building, I know it's heavily wooded area between Merrill Park and these buildings, but can those residents see light coming from these buildings on Haggerty Road?

Dave Campbell – If we're talking about Guidepost, I think what we just heard from Mr. Horney was that it is not their intention to have their parking lot lights on past 7pm.

Mr. Horney agreed.

Dave Campbell – To see what sort of lighting is on the adjacent sites, I guess I would need to go back at nighttime and see what sort of illumination is spilling into the Merrill Park property.

Weber – I think that back corner is going to be a really dark spot, early in the morning and in the evening.

I found your data on the drop-off and pickup interesting. Is that Guidepost specific data, or is that industry data?

Mr. Horney – It's specific to ours. That's the typical pickup and drop-off. That was run over a 4-month time period for a typical school. You have to thumbprint your child in and out, so it's all digital data and it's pretty easy to track.

Weber – I agree with the previous comments on the north elevation, and whether that's 3 or 4 vertical stone columns to break it up, or gables or dormers, just something to break up the giant roofline.

Dave, you talked about cross-access and you made a comment that if it makes sense based upon surrounding uses, that we would want the petitioner to include cross-access. Who makes the determination if that makes sense?

Dave Campbell – The Planning Commission. If a site plan were to come in to knock down the neighboring building and redevelop it, depending on the use and layout, if it were a location that made sense to have cross-access between the two properties, we would want to have the opportunity to do that.

Weber – So we're not asking Guidepost to provide cross-access. It's only when these other facilities might change.

Dave Campbell – Correct. I think it would be premature to have them put in a driveway stub without knowing.

Weber – That's all I have.

McKeever – It has been covered.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, did we talk about sidewalks in front?

Dave Campbell – I mentioned that they are proposing a sidewalk along their Haggerty Road frontage.

Chairperson Parel – Perfect, thank you. Dave, can you talk a little more on the monument sign and the comment you made about the text amendment we just approved?

Dave Campbell – You recommended approval and the Township Board will potentially approve it at their meeting next week Tuesday. That allowance for averaging existing signs on either side of the building would not apply because this is new construction. Their sign would have to comply with the setback requirement for a sign, which is 15' off the front setback line, which is technically 75' off of the centerline of the right-of-way of Haggerty Road. Paula, didn't we look at that and we determined they have plenty of space to put in a sign within their grass area, between the sidewalk and the parking lot?

Paula Lankford – Yes.

Chairperson Parel – Was that the proposed sign we saw?

Mr. Horney – Yes.

Chairperson Parel – I like that sign and I like it better than what we approved for Gilden Woods.

Dave Campbell – Specifically the changeable message component of it?

Chairperson Parel – Yes, specifically, yes.

Dave Campbell – Mr. Parel is no fan of changeable message signs.

Chairperson Parel – I like the style of the Guidepost sign. We talked about the signage on the dormer.

I have a question about the outdoor play area. Some of that will be visible from Haggerty Road. Will there be any play structures, accessory buildings, et cetera, in that space that will be visible? Will we have bright, colorful play structures visible?

Discussion took place and renderings were reviewed. Weber noted Page 94 shows where the structures will be located.

Mr. Horney – The two main structures are in the rear. Those were the pictures you saw with the shade structures behind. This is a combination of what they call trike tracks, they're concrete, and the interior part is woodchips. This playground is all turfed, and these are seating areas in the front.

Chairperson Parel – On the northwest corner, that is a play structure?

Mr. Horney – That is not. It's seating.

Weber – It says small, crooked log climber; a flat bridge, and an angled climber.

Mr. Horney – Those are up to 3-4'. It will be about as high as the fence.

Chairperson Parel – If there are going to be bright, colorful accessories for the property, I think it would be proper to somehow screen them with landscaping from Haggerty Road. That would be my preference.

Mr. Horney – Just to be clear, all of our stuff is traditionally cedar. We don't have bright red, yellow and green.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, can we leave that to administrative authority?

Dave Campbell – Do the colors of the structures have bearing on it?

Chairperson Parel – Yes, if we're allowed to make that comment. I think this will be done in a first-class manner. My preference is that I don't want to see multi-colored play structures and equipment from Haggerty Road.

Dave Campbell – You want to avoid what's called dissident colors. We can confirm that administratively.

Mr. Horney – We have a ton of space here, so if we need to move things around in the design, no big deal.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, when we conditionally approved Goddard, was it oriented in the same fashion?

Dave Campbell – It was. When you looked at Goddard, you were only at that time approving the waiver of the 1,500-foot rule. What you had at the time was a concept. Their concept was very comparable to this in terms of the size of the building and the orientation. The shape of the site kind of dictates how the building would layout to a large degree.

Chairperson Parel – Okay, and it sounds like you will consider breaking up the north end of the building?

Dave Campbell – That is within your authority to seek that. I've heard that comment come up a couple times. I think I've heard Mr. Horney say they're willing to work with that. If that's something you can entrust the Planning Department to administratively review and approve, rather than having them come back, it would probably give them all the more reason to want to do a good job with it.

Chairperson Parel – I'm comfortable with that. I think we've got to figure out the dormer on the east side. I think the north side of the property will be important as you're heading south on Haggerty.

Dave Campbell – The only comment or request that I have, if you utilize the recommended motion in our review letter, condition #5, *Revised site plan to be submitted for administrative review and approval with the following revisions: ...* Then we speak to building design and materials. One of the things we didn't discuss here, but I think I asked Chris about this, if there's any building mounted utilities, that they be screened from public view. They will probably end up on the west side of the building, which is the playground side. And it's too early to know where the gas meter will go. If they are publicly viewable, tall grasses or something should be included to better screen.

Chairperson Parel – Is that already labeled as “b.”?

Dave Campbell – Yes, and I brought it up because I didn't discuss it in my overview earlier. The future cross-access, and then if there could be a letter “d.” of a revised landscape plan addressing the comments of the landscape architect.

Chairperson Parel – Okay, so Item d. will be a revised landscape plan.

Discussion took place regarding condition #6, but that is directly related to the sign.

Chairperson Parel – Where do we include administrative authority regarding the north side of the building?

Dave Campbell – In #5. a. if you wanted to expand on that language.

MOTION by Weber, supported by Loskill, to approve, **with conditions**, Item PSP22-01, Guidepost Montessori, the request by Murphy Development Group, LLC/NVS Properties 19 LLC of Chicago IL for site plan approval for a new daycare facility located at 2855 Haggerty Road, between Oakley Park Road and Pontiac Trail.

Sidwell No.: 17-24-200-052

Move to approve PSP#22-01, a site plan by Murphy Development Group and NVS Properties 19 LLC for Guidepost Montessori, an 11,470 square foot daycare center on a vacant parcel on the west side of Haggerty Road at 2855 Haggerty Road.

Site plan approval is based on the following findings:

1. The location of the proposed daycare from other daycares less than 1,500 feet from the subject site is acceptable to the Planning Commission on the basis that a new daycare facility on Haggerty Road will not result in an excessive concentration of such facilities in the vicinity, consistent with Sec. 26.202 of the Zoning Ordinance;

2. A dedicated loading zone is not necessary based on a finding that the use does not generate regular deliveries from large vehicles;

Site plan approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. The facility to be licensed by the appropriate agencies of the State of Michigan and to operate in compliance with all applicable local, County, and State regulations;
2. Review and approval of engineered construction plans by the Township Engineer, Fire Marshal, and Building Department;
3. Road Commission for Oakland County (RCOC) review and approval of the location and design of the driveway approach onto Haggerty Road and any road improvements necessary;
4. Wall sign(s) and ground sign to be reviewed by the Building Department under separate permit subject to Article 30 of the Zoning Ordinance, with the understanding that a wall sign is permissible only on the Haggerty Road side of the building;
5. Revised site plan to be submitted for administrative review and approval with the following revisions:
 - a. Building design and materials to be revised as discussed, including improvements on the north elevation, to include 3-4 vertical stone elements and substantial gable or dormers, to be administratively approved by the Planning Director;
 - b. Utility and ground-mounted mechanical equipment to be screened from public view;
 - c. A note indicating allowance for future cross-access to adjacent commercial properties to the north and south if deemed appropriate by the Commerce Township Planning Commission, if and when those properties redevelop with uses compatible to a daycare;
 - d. Submission of a revised landscape plan, addressing the comments of the Township Landscape Architect in his review letter, to be administratively approved by the Township Planning Director;
6. Site landscaping, street trees, and ground sign design to be coordinated to avoid landscaping obscuring the ground sign;
7. Coordination with the Commerce DDA on removal of the existing paved pathway spur terminating at the site's west property line;
8. Any play structures are to avoid dissident colors and appropriate screening to be approved by the Township Planning Director.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM 12. PSP22-02 – EDGEWOOD COUNTRY CLUB SUPPORT BUILDINGS

Wayne Dutton with Thomas Roberts Architect LLC of Wyandotte MI representing Edgewood Country Club is requesting site plan approval to construct two new support buildings in the southwest corner of the property at 8399 Commerce Road.

Sidwell No.: 17-12-401-008

David Campbell, Planning Director, gave a review. Wayne Dutton with Thomas Roberts Architects have submitted a site plan for two new connected support buildings totaling approximately 10,600 square feet on the west side of the existing Edgewood Country

Club clubhouse at 8399 Commerce Road. Edgewood is comprised of three properties totaling over 100 acres, with the new buildings proposed on the 17.4-acre property that houses the clubhouse, fitness center, pool and parking lot. They are also proposing a 611 square foot addition on the northeast side of the existing clubhouse building for a covered drop-off area at the existing main entrance, with reconfiguration of the drop-off driveway. The two new buildings will house a pro shop, golf simulator rooms, a new bag room, and golf cart storage and will be connected by a covered breezeway, and will include a new circular driveway. Three existing support buildings would be demolished. The entire Edgewood site has two zonings on it. The property where they want to build the new buildings is zoned R-1C, and golf courses are a Special Land Use in the R-1C zoning district. They are demolishing existing buildings and replacing them with buildings that will house a use that already exists. Procedurally, the Planning Department did not consider this to be an amendment to the Special Land Use, as it is not expanding upon the intensity, traffic generation or demand on public services. However, the Planning Commission could perceive it differently and could make a determination that this is an expansion of a Special Land Use, and could direct the Planning Department to schedule a public hearing. If the Planning Commission agrees that this requires site plan approval only, then action can be taken this evening. Elevations were provided. The building materials are intended to be consistent with the clubhouse and other amenities. The landscape plan was also submitted, which indicates their plan to reestablish a significant buffer along the west and south sides of the new buildings to provide ample screening from the residential land uses next door. It is also notable that when they had this property surveyed, they recognized that the neighboring property owner's driveway actually encroaches onto Edgewood's property, but it appears they will allow that to remain in place and landscape around it. To the extent possible, they are proposing to retain the existing vegetation to minimize the impact with screening.

The plans were reviewed by the Township Engineer, the Township Landscape Architect, and the Fire Marshal. Approval is recommended with some modest revisions to the proposed plan. Recommended motion language has been provided by the Planning Department.

Wayne Dutton, Project Manager, Thomas Roberts Architect, LLC, 2927 4th Street, Wyandotte, MI, was present, along with Brian Bach, Manager, Edgewood Country Club, 3181 Edgewood Park, Commerce Township, and JR Watkins, PE, PEA Group, 45 W. Grand River Ave, Ste 501, Detroit.

Mr. Dutton – The Planning Director does a fantastic job describing projects. Essentially we are visually improving the site by creating new structures. The functions are the same functions that happen there today. The buildings that we are demolishing, those house the golf carts currently. They're old, small and tight. The baggage storage room is connected to the cart storage. That occurs in the facility today, but it's cumbersome as it's in a basement. It's hard to get to, navigating stairs with golf bags. It's a nice experience for members to have carts and bags next to each other. Staff can put them together much easier and get them out to the course.

Then we have the pro shop as well. It will be a little bigger and a little nicer, but again, it's the same use we have today. The perk for members will be the indoor golf simulators. We're not adding to the membership at all, simply making it a nicer feature for the members.

With the residents, there is a landscaping buffer there today. It's a wild buffer and a lot of it is scrub growth. There are some decent trees in there. We are going to save as many as possible. We just saw the landscaping plan. We're going to heavily landscape that with evergreen trees and a variety of birch, et cetera. It will be a really dense screening.

The club and the residents were aware of the driveway conflict with the property line. It will stay there as it is so they don't cause any hardship on the neighbor. The parking doesn't really change. We are improving the front entrance of the clubhouse, but that is a means of making a nicer canopy and getting better ADA accessibility.

Dave Campbell – If I could mention one point, on the reconfigured parking spaces. There's 9 or 10 here, with ADA spaces up here. The Township requires 10x20' parking spaces. They are proposing 9x18.5'. The Planning Commission does have it within their authority to allow for those dimensions. When the Planning Commission allows these spaces, they are conditional upon the curb being a low-profile 4" curb to allow for a 2' overhang.

Commission Comments:

Karim – Can you elaborate more about the functionality of the two spaces. I know one is for carts. What is the other?

Mr. Dutton – You have that breezeway that separates the two buildings. The bottom building, the larger rectangle, that is cart storage.

Karim – Would there be any noise coming from those, with the golf simulator?

Mr. Dutton – In the very center of the building is the golf simulator room. You're indoors with insulated walls, and the ball is hitting a net before the wall. They don't create a tremendous amount of noise.

Karim – I'm asking because I live in an area where there's a lot of gun practicing.

Mr. Dutton – There's very little sound coming out of those rooms.

Winkler – No comments.

Loskill – The two barrier-free spaces on the south side; right now, I'm assuming you have people coming out of those cars and have to traverse through the driveway to get to the entrance. Is there anywhere to locate those somewhere that we could get people off the road? It makes it awfully tough for people to traverse through the street to get through the cul-de-sac. You'd be better off putting your barrier-free spaces on the south side in front of the cart barn where you could put a walkway in front of the parking spaces. There's no sidewalk in front of the spaces.

Discussion continued regarding adding a sidewalk for convenient access to the barrier-free spaces for safety. Mr. Dutton was amenable to the suggestion.

Loskill – The park and share on the north side, is that new or existing?

Mr. Dutton – There's one there now. We're going to replace it with a more attractive one.

Loskill – Are you going to meet the fire requirements for height on that?

Mr. Dutton – Yes. Our intention is to meet all of that and we would work with the Building Department.

Loskill – On the west side of the cart barn, you have a cart prep area. Is there going to be noise generated from that, because you have a house right next to that? I know you're going to put up a couple evergreens, but it might be obnoxious.

Mr. Dutton – The intention would be a quick hose off if there's a lot of mud on the cart. That's it, just a quick wash in that area. Procedurally, they would have to keep an eye on the noise level.

Weber – I would pile onto Joe's comments regarding the cart barn. I'm familiar with Edgewood and the property. Has the neighbor been shown these plans? Any review or discussion with them?

Mr. Dutton – Yes, and there was no pushback from the neighbor.

Weber – Okay, because having the cart barn there will generate significantly more cart traffic / noise closer to their property than where the existing one is. If the neighbors are okay with it, then I'm okay. That's my biggest concern.

Dave Campbell – Mr. Bach, Brian, can you speak to how it will operate? The cart barn, hosing off carts and so-forth?

Mr. Bach – The wash area is actually really close to the existing wash area. It's moved south just a little bit. It's a one-person job. A cart comes in, they hose it off and park it in the building. All the member traffic is going to go up here, on this side of the building, and all the carts will park up there. The gathering area for the carts will be in the same place it is now.

Weber – So toward the south, where you're going to house the carts, the entrance to that is where?

Mr. Bach – There's an entrance here. Carts will come in and out both doors.

Weber – It's just closer to the front of the home. That's my only concern, and it's hard for me to determine the landscaping and what that really means. I have no idea what half of those trees are or what they're going to look like, but some level of noise screening so we don't have somebody coming to us. If they have seen this plan and they know what's going on, and they're fine, and you tell us you've had a review with them, that's good enough for me.

Mr. Bach – Thank you.

McKeever – No comments.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, is there anything else before we call for a motion?

Dave Campbell – I have not heard anyone suggest that we should treat this as a Special Land Use. That's the one question I wanted to have confirmation on. If that is the determination, it is written into the recommended motion language.

MOTION by Winkler, supported by Loskill, to approve, **with conditions**, Item PSP22-02, Edgewood Country Club Support Buildings, the request by Wayne Dutton with Thomas Roberts Architect LLC of Wyandotte MI, representing Edgewood Country Club, for site plan approval to construct two new support buildings in the southwest corner of the property at 8399 Commerce Road. Sidwell No.: 17-12-401-008

Move to approve PSP#22-02, a site plan which includes two new connected support buildings totaling 10,600 square feet, an addition of 611 square feet to the existing building, the demolition of three existing support buildings, and modifications to the existing parking lot and circulation lanes, within a 1.4-acre portion of the Edgewood Country Club located at 8399 Commerce Road.

The Planning Commission's approval is based upon a finding that the proposed improvements are not an expansion of the existing special land use (a golf course in the R-1B & R-1C zoning districts) and therefore special land use approval consistent with the procedures of Article 34 of the Zoning Ordinance is not required.

The Planning Commission further finds that the reconfigured parking spaces can be nine feet in width, where ten feet is typically required, under their discretion provided with Sec. 28.09.

Site plan approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Review and approval of engineered construction plans by the Township Engineer, Fire Marshal, and Building Department;
2. Curb adjacent to reconfigured parking spaces of 18.5 feet in length to be 4 inches in height to allow for a 2-foot vehicle overhang;
3. Signs to be reviewed and approved under a separate Sign Permit by the Building Department subject to the requirements of Article 30 of the Zoning Ordinance.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

ITEM I3. MASTER PLAN DISCUSSION

Dave Campbell – Jill Bahm let us know that she would not be able to attend tonight as she is at a conference. She provided a revised scope last week that is intended to incorporate some of the discussions we had at the April meeting. Jill and I did not have a great opportunity to discuss that revised scope to help me get a handle on what she is describing. I did provide it to you.

At first glance, it appears to be going in the direction as discussed in terms of grouping development areas. My hope is that we can have an opportunity to discuss it further with Jill as she can explain it better than I can. I want to avoid waiting a month to have these discussions. I had discussed with a few of you having a subcommittee with 3 members of the Planning Commission, so not a quorum. The subcommittee could maybe meet more regularly than the full Planning Commission could, and have discussions to try to move this forward more efficiently.

I want to get a scope in front of the Township Board and get it funded. At one time I was hoping the May meeting, now it may be the June meeting. Mr. Parel and Mr. Weber, I

think I discussed it with you and I was recruiting volunteers. Mr. Parel, I think you were willing and able to serve on a Master Plan update subcommittee.

Chairperson Parel – I am willing to do it, and I'd be happy to. I'd also like to open it up to others. Has George committed?

Weber – I'm committed if you are.

Chairperson Parel – It might be me and George.

Dave Campbell – Tradition is to appoint the person who is not here.

Loskill – I'd be up to joining.

Dave Campbell – Legally, it can't be more than 3 or it becomes a quorum with a full meeting that has to be noticed, et cetera.

Discussions continued regarding a rotation between Parel, Weber, Loskill and Winkler. Meetings are envisioned to be held during Township business hours, late afternoons. Zoom was also considered as an option for the subcommittee. The first tentative subcommittee meeting would be on Thursday, May 12th at 3:00pm.

J: OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION:

None.

K: PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- **NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: MONDAY, JUNE 6, 2022**
- Parcel C:
 - Parcel C is the northwest corner of Pontiac Trail and Haggerty, next to Walmart.
 - The Planning Commission is aware of the conceptual proposal brought before you in March by Lafontaine. Lafontaine would like to purchase that property from the DDA for the purpose of developing a dual-branded dealership.
 - The property is within Commerce Towne Place, CTP, both the master deed and the condominium. This and the other CTP properties are units in a large condominium.
 - Parcel C is governed by the CTP master deed and PUD.
 - Both of those agreements have language that will likely have to be amended to allow for a car dealership. That process will involve the DDA, the Township Planning Commission, the Township Board, and the CTP unit owners. The attorneys are looking into what the procedure would be to get to the point where a dealership would be a permitted use on that corner. It's still a work in progress. You'll be hearing more about that as we get closer to what the game plan will be.
 - As Mr. Winkler mentioned earlier, Lafontaine and the DDA have agreed on a price tag for the property and have an LOI.

Discussion took place regarding the LOI, the potential use of a dealership at the flagship property, screening vehicle inventory, and connection of the pathway through Parcel C. Other matters were also addressed related to car buying experiences, changes in the auto industry, the transition to electric cars, and anticipated changes to the future needs for vehicle services.

Chairperson Parel referenced high-end dealerships in Novi where the beautiful buildings are close to the street, and only a few select models are right on the road. He does not want to see a bunch of multi-colored cars parked on the road, similar to his conversation with Guidepost about their play structures. Dave Campbell stated that in the earliest conversations with Lafontaine, those dealerships were discussed, the Cadillac dealership, and a Jaguar/Land Rover dealer nearby. City of Novi had them push their buildings to the corner, with inventory in the back. That is the direction that was given to Lafontaine, and that is what they came back with. Discussion continued regarding buffers, screening and frontage features. Dave Campbell explained that PUD's are great for managing site design details.

Dave Campbell –

- The next topic is the construction along Union Lake Road. There are a lot of unknowns. The Road Commission had hoped they would be replacing the culvert under Union Lake Road, south of Wise Road. AT&T is attempting to relocate their fiber optic cables and they have encountered many water-related issues. It has turned into quite an ordeal. The best-case scenario from the RCOC is that AT&T will be out of their way within 6 weeks from now, and the project may start in mid-June. However, the contractor for the RCOC might no longer be available to do the job. I don't know what the outcome will be.
- The Township Board approved the expenditure to repair the color-changing bridge lights on the M-5 bridge. The contractor, Shaw Electric, is waiting on the parts needed to do the work. It will involve some intermittent lane closures along M-5.
- At the June Planning Commission meeting, you are likely to see a proposed addition to 2121 Easy Street, on the west side of Welch Road, at Options Furniture.
- Also in June, you will see a text amendment with respect to utility trailers. This is an amendment that our Code Enforcement staff is looking for to clarify what you can and cannot do with respect to storing utility trailers on your residential property. Code Enforcement is working with the Township Attorneys on drafting the language.

Supervisor Gray – Right now, with boats and trailers, it's May 1st to October 31st that they can have them parked in the driveway. After that, they have to put them in storage. There's nothing really in the ordinance regarding large utility trailers.

I want to add that, with the Union Lake construction, if it goes as planned to start construction in June, White Lake also has construction that will start in June at Elizabeth Lake Road, Teggerdine and Oxbow, they're putting roundabouts there.

Chairperson Parel – Thanks for the warning.

Dave Campbell – It's going to be painful. The RCOC will say that the culvert under Union Lake Road is in poor shape. That's why they wanted to get it replaced last year, but they had to delay it until this year. It's not something that can safely be delayed much longer.

Chairperson Parel initiated discussion on the Union Lake Road expansion. Dave Campbell explained that environmental assessments have to be completed, and a PEL study has to be completed prior to those. The RCOC has a scope and price for the PEL; it's \$1.92 million for the preliminary study. Environmental assessments have to be done if you want to seek State and/or Federal funding for a project of this scale. Discussions continued regarding smart signals, related costs and RCOC scheduling.

Dave Campbell gave an update on the M-5 bridge blue wave panels. Some progress was made on the re-installation of the M-5 bridge's blue wave panels, as MDOT is prepared to approve the zinc-aluminum metallization of the panels that will keep them from rusting. The metallization – essentially a protective zinc-aluminum coating fused to the steel panels - had to pass an adhesion test to insure a strong bond. On April 22nd, the Township and MDOT witnessed a successful adhesion test at Midwest Thermal Spray in Farmington Hills. The contractor responsible for the panels, Action Traffic Maintenance, will deliver the panels to Midwest for metallization. Then the panels will be taken to CA Hull in Commerce Twp, where the blue powder-coat will be applied over the metalized panels. Once powder coated, Action Traffic will reinstall the panels. MDOT and Action Traffic are in the process of generating a schedule for when all of the above will happen. At one time, MDOT and Action Traffic estimated the process would take 22 weeks, which led the Township to urge all involved to target Labor Day 2022 as the date to have the panels completely re-installed.

Karim and Dave Campbell discussed the status of Five & Main. Bruce Aikens provided an update to the Township in March and he seemed optimistic. As Mr. Winkler mentioned, Bruce feels that he will know more after the ICSC convention at the end of May in Vegas.

L: ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Loskill, supported by Karim, to adjourn the meeting at 9:42pm.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Chelsea Rebeck, Secretary