

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF NORTHVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
February 22, 2022**

DATE: February 22, 2022
TIME: 7:00 PM
PLACE: Township Hall

APPROVED: March 22, 2022

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Wilk at 7:06 pm.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Milan Gandhi
Mindy Herrmann
Edward McCall
Jayne Watson
Matthew Wilk
Gary Yang
Tim Zawodny

Excused: None

Staff: Jennifer Frey, Township Planner

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Planning Commission – January 25, 2021

MOTION by McCall, support by Zawodny, to approve the January 25, 2021 Planning Commission meeting minutes as published.

Motion approved unanimously by voice vote.

CORRESPONDENCE: None.

BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENTS: None

OLD BUSINESS:

1. PSLU21-0004	Special Land Use
Representative:	Michael Rossen, General Manager
Owner:	Meadowbrook Country Club
Location:	40941 Eight Mile Road
Request:	Driving range improvements/expansion
Action:	Approve, Approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny

Township Planner Frey explained that action on this request for special land use approval was postponed at the January 25, 2022 meeting, to give the applicants time to address

concerns expressed during the public hearing and Commission discussion. The conditions from the last review letter had been met, with the exception of a condition to review landscape during final site plan review.

As the public hearing was held at the January 25 meeting, there would not be a formal public hearing tonight, although public comment could be taken.

Members of the development team present this evening included:

- Bryan Amann, PLLC, 1777 Stonebridge Way Court, Canton MI 48188
- Todd Callaway, Meadowbrook Country Club Board Member, 45426 Pebble Beach Court, Northville
- Mike Rossen, Meadowbrook General Manager

Mr. Callaway said that since the last meeting they had conversation with neighbors across 8 Mile Road, and had worked with a golf course landscape architect to provide solutions based on those neighbors' concerns.

Because the maintenance building that is currently on the south side of the golf range will be gone, the center point of the range will be shifted south by 120 feet. There were two basic design standards:

- 1) The average driving distance is 266 yards, and
- 2) The average dispersion is 200 feet to the right or left of the center point.

The center point of the golf range will be 280 feet (rather than the current 134 feet) from the 8 Mile Road right-of-way line, representing a 9 degree shift to the southwest, helping to keep balls from heading toward 8 Mile. The new driving range will be graded from north to south, which will also keep golf balls moving in a southerly direction.

The provided schematic showed existing and new pine trees, the berm extension, and the deciduous trees that will extend south of the berm to act as aiming cues. The design is centered around keeping everyone aiming toward the center line and keeping the 280-foot buffer between the center line and the 8 Mile right-of-way.

Existing plant material along 8 Mile will be supplemented to further define the edge of the hitting zone.

The main tee box area is 270' wide by 150' deep, 10' shallower and 15' wider than what was there today. The proposed range also has a training spot 70' wide by 100' deep, which will only be used with a teaching professional. The ball flight trajectories from the teaching areas were even further away from the 8 Mile right-of-way. The hitting zone was defined on the schematic.

The distance from the front of the range to the westernmost property line and the closest neighbor will be 350 yards, and will also be approximately 21 feet uphill from east to west.

The hours of operation will be 7am to 7pm. The maintenance building is pending site plan approval. The dead or damaged existing vegetation will be replaced.

Commission questions

In response to Commission questions, the applicants gave the following information:

- They were not adding any vegetation at the westernmost (350 yard) property line where there was already thick vegetation.
- While the range itself had shifted about 50' to the west, they were comfortable that the 350 yards to the westernmost property line was more than adequate.
- A net along 8 Mile road was not permitted.
- Even with the proposed changes, lower flight golf balls would be used.
- Meadowbrook would commit to keep the turf farm growing area out of the 50 foot setback next to the residential zoning district.
- At the 266 yard driving distance, a 200 foot dispersion could be expected in either direction; the shorter the shot, the less dispersion.

In response to Commission questions to staff, Township Planner Frey gave the following information:

- There is no driving range setback in the ordinance, but there was the criteria that the applicants show the trajectory, the hitting zone, and methods to mitigate or make improvements over the shortcomings of the previous range.

Commission discussion

- Commissioner Watson agreed that the 350 yard distance, the uphill slope, and the existing vegetation at the westernmost property line was sufficient to screen the residential property there.

MOTION by Watson, support by Ghandi, in the matter of PSU21-0004, Meadowbrook Country Club, that the Planning Commission approve the Special Land Use with the six conditions specified in the Township Planner's January 11 review letter, and including the criteria and findings of the meeting held on January 25, 2022.

Roll call vote: Ayes: Ghandi, Herrmann, McCall, Watson, Wilk, Yang, Zawodny

Nays: None

Motion approved 7-0.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. PSKPR22-0001

Representative:

Owner:

Location:

Request:

Action:

Sketch Plan Review

Eddie Jarrard

Village at Northville Retail, LLC

15311 Beck Rd.

2nd sign based on having two elevations facing a street

Approve, Approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny

Referencing her February 10, 2022 memorandum, Township Planner Frey explained that First Watch restaurant at 5 Mile and Beck was requesting a 2nd wall sign. Per the sign ordinance, an additional wall sign may be permitted at the discretion of the Planning Commission, where a non-residential building is orientated such that more than one side of the building can be seen from the road, providing the sign is less than 60% of the maximum sign area allowed or each sign is no greater than 80% of the size permitted for the sign district in which it is located. In this case, the 2nd sign had not been reviewed for ordinance compliance.

Eddie Jarrard, Image Manufacturing Group, LLC, 5405 Buford Highway, Suite 270, Norcross GA offered to answer questions regarding this request.

Commissioner Zawodny said that while the ordinance allowed for a second sign, the request usually was based on the location having a unique circumstance. Given the location of this restaurant at this primary, visible corner, why was the applicant asking for a second sign?

Mr. Jarrard said they were requesting a 2nd sign to increase visibility from both streets.

Commissioner Zawodny explained that the Township was trying to create a village atmosphere at this location, staying away from the appearance of retail strip centers. While acknowledging that compromises had been made over time, Commissioner Zawodny said there was concern about adding more to the retail appearance. This high visibility corner was seen from northbound Beck road, southbound Beck road, and westbound 5 Mile, and even without a second sign the restaurant use would be obvious.

Mr. Jarrard said there were entrances on both sides of the building, and the signs would help identify the locations of those entrances. The sign on the south side was the larger of the two signs.

In response to a question from Commissioner Watson, Mr. Jarrard said the lines on the south side of the building represented awnings that had been previously approved. The awning would help provide for outdoor dining.

In response to a question from Commissioner Ghandi, Commission Zawodny said second signs were not favored in the Township. For instance, CVS was located on a corner and only had one sign, but was a very busy use. The goal was to keep the commercial areas from being too busy visually.

In this case, the Northville Township sign fell immediately behind this site. As someone approached this corner from any direction other than 5 Mile Road heading east, two signs would always be visible. One of the unique conditions for granting a second sign that was typically applied was that the sign was not visible from 50% of the directions approaching the building.

Mr. Jarrad pointed out that First Watch did not have the market recognition of a CVS drugstore. This was a new market for First Watch and they needed to make as much an impact as possible.

Commissioner Zawodny pointed out there was another First Watch restaurant on Haggerty Road.

Commissioner Watson said that the Panera across the street from this location had two signs. The sign facing 5 Mile was lit, and the sign on the side parallel to Beck Road was not. Perhaps having only one lit sign could be a condition of approval, especially as this was a daytime restaurant.

In response to a question, Mr. Jarrad said the individual sign letters were internally lit. Township Planner Frey added that this was an ordinance requirement.

Board Discussion

Vice Chair Wilk asked if the Township had previously conditioned a sign approval on the sign not being lit.

Commissioner Zawodny said that he remembered discussion regarding applying a condition that a sign not be lit, but in that instance the condition was not attached, and he didn't know if any signs in the Township were so limited. He was not supportive of a second sign in general, due to the history of this development and the goals that were trying to be achieved here. Other second signs that had been approved, such as Belle Tire near Meijer and 8 Mile, had real visibility issues. In all instances that he could remember a second sign was granted because the first sign could only be seen by travelers in one direction. In the present instance, the second sign would be the largest sign.

Vice Chair Wilk said First Watch was trying to catch the attention of northbound traffic. While not an unsubstantial chain, First Watch did not have a lot of advertising, and depended on their signage.

Commissioner Herrmann said she did not mind the second sign. It was good to see a business that was doing well.

Commissioner Yang also supported granting the second sign, which would be beneficial to this business as it attracted attention from traffic on Beck Road and Five Mile. This business did not have the name recognition of businesses such as CVS or other national chains, and having the second sign would be important to the restaurant.

Commissioner McCall said the second sign was well within the 80% regulation. He suggested that neither sign be lit in the evenings, but allowed to be lit in the morning.

Township Planner Frey reiterated that such a condition was difficult to enforce.

Commissioner Watson said she did not have a problem with the second sign. It was beneficial to bring traffic into this location, and First Watch was a great amenity for the community. The sign would add to the south elevation, which was otherwise plain.

Regarding whether the sign should be lit or not, the sign would be next to a hotel and not a residential area.

Commissioner Yang agreed that there were no residences that would be impacted by this sign; he didn't mind it being lit 24 hours, as compared to a dark strip mall, for instance.

Commissioner Ghandi said the hotel next door was very well lit, and an additional sign did not impact what that part of 5 Mile Road looked like aesthetically.

Commissioner Zawodny said that when this particular tenant claimed that a second sign would add success to their business, did that mean that other restaurant owners in the middle of the district who did not have a second sign were less successful? Would allowing a second sign at this visible corner set precedent and encourage other business owners to ask for the same consideration? The Planning Commission's role was to provide some oversight to the commercial development in the Township, including how such things as signs impact the image of the community. He believed First Watch would be just as successful with one sign as with two.

Vice Chair Wilk opened the meeting to public comment. Seeing that no public indicated they wished to speak, Vice Chair Wilk closed the public comment and brought the matter back to the Commission for further discussion and/or a motion.

Commissioner Herrmann was in favor of allowing the sign to be lit during the hours the restaurant was open. Enforcement could be complaint-driven. However, she did feel the Commission should be consistent in how it applied the standards.

Township Planner Frey pointed out that the ordinance did not limit signs to only be lit during operational hours, and no other retailers in that area had that limitation.

Commissioner Zawodny said that from the beginning, this corner and the Village at Northville Development had been discussed as the gateway to Northville. A gateway should call attention to the Township, and not to specific retail development. It was important to respect the ordinance, which granted the right to have one sign for one site, and while it gave the Commission discretion to vary from that, there needed to be some real reason to deviate from the ordinance's intent, which was for one sign only.

Commissioner Wilk said that as described in Township Planner Frey's memo, the criterion to grant a second sign was: *an additional wall sign may be permitted at the discretion of the planning commission, where a non-residential building is orientated such that more than one side of the building can be seen from the road.* This building met that

criterion. The choice seemed to be to have a brick wall with no sign, or a brick wall with a sign that was lit, partially lit, or not lit.

Vice Chair Wilk indicated he was ready to entertain a motion.

MOTION by Herrmann, support by McCall, in the matter of PSKPR22-0001, to approve the second sign as requested for First Watch restaurant, 15311 Beck Road, with the sign on Beck Road being lit and the sign facing 5 Mile not lit, subject to both signs meeting ordinance requirements per the Building Department's review.

Motion discussion:

Commissioner Watson was in support of the motion. Commissioner Yang agreed. Commission Ghandi was ambivalent regarding the lighting restriction, but would support the motion.

Vice Chair Wilk thought the motion offered a reasonable compromise.

Roll call vote: Ayes: Ghandi, Herrmann, McCall, Watson, Wilk, Yang

 Nays: Zawodny

Motion approved 6-1.

2. Public Hearing

PPUDA21-0003

Representative:

Owner:

Location:

Request:

Action:

Planned Unit Development Amendment

Steve Friedman, Northville Five, LLC

Northville Five, LLC

Northwest corner of Beck & Five Mile Rds.

Amendment to the commercial component of the Village at Northville PUD

Recommendation to Board of Trustees

Referencing her February 7, 2022 review letter, Township Planner Frey gave the background and review for this application for an amendment to the commercial component of the Village at Northville PUD.

The total square footage of the current commercial component was 87,191sf. The total square footage of the proposed commercial was 71,356 sf. The plan did not identify if there was an increase or decrease in the overall density for the townhome component.

The plan was approved in 2016 for the entire 52-acre parcel, and included the retail on the current corner (the subject of tonight's presentation), in addition to the single family homes, the townhomes and the loft apartments, supplying a mixed use component, with two restaurants approved for the corner. In 2018 the plan was amended to allow a revision to the location of the retail, elimination of the restaurants at the corner of 5/Beck and the addition of a hotel. As originally intended, the commercial component

was to serve as an anchor for the project and be designed to promote pedestrian access and use.

The request tonight was to make the following modifications to the commercial component:

1. Reduce the size of the proposed specialty grocery store from 40,000sf to 15,103sf.
2. Relocate the proposed specialty grocery store to the east, fronting on Beck Rd.
3. Eliminate the proposed freestanding full service restaurant.
4. Add a two-story 20,800sf medical office building to the center of the site.
5. Add 28 additional townhomes on the east side of the existing ones, where the 40,000 sf specialty grocery store is currently approved.
6. Add 8 additional townhomes on Village Blvd, where a single story office building is currently proposed.

The Planning Commission should look at this request in context, in terms of whether the proposed modifications reflect the original intent of the PUD to create a village with retail that produced a desirable mix of goods and services, and that integrates the uses with well-designed pedestrian connections. The Commission should also look carefully at the density of the townhomes, and the specialty grocery in terms of its use and its modified layout. At one time it was important that this development had a grocer component. In the context of the overall development, what was the Planning Commission trying to achieve, and will this modification achieve that?

Tonight's request was for a recommendation from the Planning Commission to the Township Board, who will approve or deny the request. The Planning Commission will hold a public hearing tonight before making its recommendation.

In response to questions from the Commission, Township Planner Frey gave the following information:

- In the multifamily zoning district, up to 8 units per acre were permitted by right, with up to 8-12 units per acre considered under a special land use request.
- With the exception of the Lofts, there was no project in the Township that met the 8 units per acre. Most developments were 4.5 – 6 units per acre at most.
- 283 units were planned right now for the Lofts.
- The 8 units per acre would apply to the townhome portion of the development. The Commission needs to understand the density of the townhome portion with the proposed additional townhomes.
- The Commission needs to determine if it is comfortable increasing the residential component.

Vice Chair Wilk invited the applicants to give their presentation.

John Ackerman, Atwell, 2 Town Square, Southfield, was present on behalf of this application. Tom Herbst, Northville Five LLC, 6400 Telegraph, Bloomfield Township, was also present, as was Jason Harrison, Chief Operating Officer, IHA, 24 Frank Lloyd Wright Drive, Ann Arbor.

Mr. Ackerman gave some history of the development, and overviewed the site generally. He directed the Commission's attention to retail buildings E, F, and G directly on the southwest corner. First Watch had just signed a lease on the very southern end cap and there were still two remaining vacancies within those buildings.

Mr. Ackerman made the following points:

- The developer had been aggressively seeking tenants for the buildings for several years.
- The original PUD had a 51/49 percent mix between the restaurant and retail components. The applicants were requesting a 60/40 mix, for the restaurant side without a bar.
- The hotel will open in about 2 weeks.
- This evening they were asking for the addition of medical office building, the additional townhomes, and the relocation and a reduction in size for the overall grocer.
- 36 additional townhomes were proposed. While similar to what was on the site now, the new townhomes would not have steps, and the front grade and rear grade would be the same. The northern townhome on the south side of the Boulevard worked as a bookend for the loft building across the street, helping to encase the boulevard entrance.
- The remaining four buildings were all internalized to keep all the parking internal. The applicants would change the parking for building 14 to parallel parking, to match the rest of the townhome development facing the park, and move the angled parking to the south side of the quadrant, where it could be utilized as overflow parking for the hotel and for the medical office building.
- The townhome units will be two car rear entry garages, with 20 feet of apron parking behind the garages.
- The developers marketed the grocer space nationwide for 5 years, without success. Feedback stated there were not enough rooftops to support a grocer, especially to the west, where there was a landfill and then a very rural community. The developer no longer believed a grocer would work internal to the site.
- However, several smaller grocers had reached out regarding the possibility of fronting on Beck Road. While the applicants did not have a tenant yet and they didn't know when they would have one, based on conversations with interested grocers, they were requesting through a PUD amendment to have the ability to place a grocer on Beck Road. Once the lofts were complete and the additional townhomes were in, they felt they could fill that space, and would bring design plans in at that time.
- The uses before the Commission this evening were what the development professionals state are the most marketable and successful options for the build out of this overall development.

Vice Chair Wilk pointed out that the developers thought this was the most marketable use of the location but there was no tenant in mind. There was not a layout or design to be presented. He felt this was a confusing presentation.

Mr. Ackerman said the intent was to have a grocer, which everyone wanted, and he felt a small specialty grocer that had pre-packaged foods, deli sandwiches, seasonal products, and an outdoor patio could be very successful there, with the changes as proposed.

Mr. Ackerman continued that the healthcare industry had expressed interest in the site and the proposed plan reflected the addition of a two-story medical office building. The PUD restricted some medical/healthcare options but the Agreement was drafted before Covid, and the market had changed dramatically since that time. In the past 3 years it had become clear that medical/healthcare was a complementary use that was needed in the region.

Mr. Harrison said that IHA was part of Trinity Health, and operated about 120 outpatient practices across Southeast Michigan. They were proposing a 2-story building, with first floor adult primary care, urgent care, lab services and X ray. The second floor would house physical therapy, pediatrics and OB GYN.

Mr. Ackerman said the medical building would have an approximately 10,400 sf footprint, with approximately 20,000 sf of useable space. They would address the original site plan by providing minimum 15 foot wide sidewalks, raised planters, decorative stamped concrete, street trees, etc., with that same kind of element proposed for the eastern front edge of the townhomes. and around the facade of the grocer.

Changes in footprints, use sizes, townhome units, parking, and layout were provided in the submitted documents. More parking was provided than needed. They would work with the traffic consultant to widen the boulevard to help reduce traffic conflicts, as noted in the traffic consultant's review.

Commission questions:

The applicants responded to Commission questions as follows:

- They did not have a before and after comparison (reflecting the proposed changes) of townhome square footage. A rough calculation would be 36 x 1800sf.
- Mr. Ackerman described the townhome parking and traffic circulation.
- Townhomes were approved in 2018; the 64 townhomes sold out in about 1.5 years. There was interest in additional townhomes on the site.
- Single family homes are almost sold out; final closings will be in June 2022.
- Mr. Harrison indicated that IHA was prepared to move forward with the medical office building, if the PUD amendment is approved.
- The applicants were asking for the ratio for buildings F and G to be 60% restaurant/40% retail.
- No builder was under contract for the additional townhomes, but if the townhomes were approved, the applicants felt they would move ahead quickly.
- The new townhomes would eliminate the front steps, and the door would be at grade, with a single level first floor going to the back garage.

Commissioner Watson said the biggest unknown was the grocer, and there were significant doubts as to whether that use would ever be filled.

Commissioner Herman's biggest concern was the residential component. She did not like the new townhomes and the density being added to the site. Her concern was for the existing residents, and she felt the proposed changes did not benefit them. She believed that the baseline should be "where we are right now" and whatever goes in now should not increase density, and should be an amenity to the community, that a percentage of the residents could be expected to use with regularity in a measurable way. The health care could be an amenity, although she was not sure she liked the location.

Vice Chair Wilk called a short break at 9:19 pm and reconvened the meeting at 9:24 pm.

Vice Chair Wilk made some comments regarding the fundamental nature of zoning, and opened the public hearing at 9:26pm.

Carol Seneker, 47893 Fieldstone Drive, moved to a single family home in the Village at Northville in 2019. She made the following points:

- The developers were unresponsive, would not attend HOA meetings.
- Townhome residents park in front of their homes. Placing townhomes at the entrance drive would result in nothing but cars parked along the street.
- During soccer games people come into the subdivision to park.
- They moved to the Village for the promised amenities, the ability to walk to get coffee, or to a grocery store. Now things are changing, those amenities are being taken out, and a medical building is being proposed. She would have a view of the medical building from her windows.
- When they moved to the Village, there was supposed to be retail and residential, and nothing commercial. This was being changed without talking with the existing residents.

Viola Gowen, 47975 Leland Drive, said she was a new resident of the community. She had moved from Plymouth which had great walkability, and thought she would be getting that in the Village. But not having the ability to walk to amenities or having to walk around an office building was not what she had bought into. She had liked the community because it had children, but with the increased congestion and lack of walkability, the community would not be safe for children.

Cameron MacKellar, 48004 Fieldstone, said they had moved to the Village from West Bloomfield because they had been sold on the idea of the Village. They saw a vacant lot, a building plan and a site map, and were presented with a walkable community with retail. They invested in that community. Now the developers were asking for changes to benefit the developers, not the people who believed in the idea of the Village. Also, he did not find out about this meeting until last night.

Victoria Evans, 48004 Fieldstone, agreed with comments already made. They were willing to wait to get the right amenities for the neighborhood and their families.

Marcela Migliori, 47861 Fieldstone Drive, agreed with comments already made. She asked if the urgent care portion of the medical building would be staffed with mid-levels or physicians. Will there be narcotics dispensed? Even with the best of intentions, an urgent care will bring a different type of use and clientele to the community.

Seeing that there was no other public that indicated they wished to speak, Vice Chair Wilk closed the public hearing at 9:45 pm and brought the matter back to the Commission for discussion.

Commissioner Zawodny expressed appreciation for the residents who spoke this evening. He especially appreciated the comment that the residents were willing to wait for the right amenities. His thoughts and considerations were summed up by the speakers. He spoke to the importance of planning, of listening to the residents, and the fact that over time the original concept of the Village at Northville had been weakened. Plans and visions approved at the onset and believed by the residents needed to be honored. While it was important for a development to be successful, decisions that would last decades should not be based on a 2 year pandemic. It was important not to reach for a quick fix, but for a right fix.

The comments about marketing aggressively nationwide were confusing. Buddy's was originally going to come to this development, and while eventually they didn't, they did locate close by and a new restaurant pad was going in next door. Hearing that things will never work, but then seeing that they will work in close proximity, was confusing.

Commissioner Zawodny was not entirely opposed to the clinic, if it was located and planned correctly, in the private sector. Tonight's proposal would increase the land usage for residential to nearly 83% of the land of the development being residential. The original vision was for a village. One of the greatest concerns was that the development was going to become a residential subdivision. There was a balance that had been lost. Planning should not be done by lease negotiations.

Vice Chair Wilk said that land use and zoning was about expectations and meeting those expectations. When someone buys a piece of land that is zoned PUD for a particular use, the expectation of the people involved is that is the use they will get, even if they have to wait. There were residents who made purchases predicated on a site plan, but it did not appear that those residents have been given the type of site plan that they were sold.

Vice Chair Wilk agreed with the comment about not being able to build a restaurant, when restaurants were being built close by. First Watch was moving in. The idea of the 15,000 sf grocer brought to mind examples where popular small grocers used up all the available parking, so that no other business wanted to locate close by.

Vice Chair Wilk explained the noticing process for public hearings, and stated that all Planning Commission meetings were open to the public. He encouraged the public to sign up for the Township's listserv for receiving notices of agendas and meetings.

Commissioner Herrmann encouraged residents to attend Board of Trustee meetings, which were always the 3rd Thursday of the month. She was a Trustee, and was the Board of Trustee's liaison on the Commission.

Vice Chair Wilk invited the applicants to respond to the public comment.

Mr. Ackerman said the developers present this evening were not MIHomes, which was a separate entity. However, he would relay the information presented this evening to MIHomes. In terms of the current proposal, the applicants had heard the concerns called out this evening.

Mr. Harrison said IHA was a group of approximately 70/30 physicians/mid-levels. In terms of controlled substances, their facility would prescribe a much lower level than an ER. The urgent care would cater to pediatric needs, common health concerns, with some acute care needs. Their demographics were more or less the residents that live around where their centers were located. The urgent care would be open 7am to 9pm, Monday through Friday, and 8am to 6pm on Saturday. Hours for medical offices would be 8am to 5pm. There would be some ambulance service, although that was infrequent.

Vice Chair Wilk said that it did not appear the Commission was inclined to give a favorable recommendation to this proposal.

Mr. Ackerman said they would like to request that their application be tabled. The development team needed to absorb and talk about the feedback they had received. He asked how the Commission felt about the request for a medical office facility as part of the PUD development.

Vice Chair Wilk summarized Commission concerns so far:

- Adding 36 townhomes, bringing the number of townhomes to 100: If the original request had been for 100 townhomes, the request would have been denied. That amount of residential was not what the Commission wanted.
- Loss of the 5,000sf office building, in return for a 22,000sf medical building.
- Inability to find a grocer. Putting a grocer by Beck Road would further limit walkability, and the grocer would no longer be an anchor.

Commissioner Herrmann reiterated her comments of 1) no increased density, and 2) whatever was added needed to be an amenity – something that will be a bonus to the community. As a 3rd point, and as chair of the Pathways Committee, Commissioner Herrmann strongly prioritized walkability, both internal to the site and with connections to the greater community.

Commissioner Yang expressed appreciation to the residents who had spoken. He was also concerned about density on this site. He understood the resident's concern regarding traffic and safety, including safety for the children. He thought that having a medical building with potential ambulance activity was not appropriate in the middle of a residential area.

Commissioner McCall was also concerned about the increased density. Based on the public comments, residents were sold on a certain site plan, which transaction was then based on a common contract between the developers and the residents. Agreeing to the proposed changes was helping break that contract. He agreed with the residents that were willing to wait for the right amenities for this site. He encouraged the developers to think about a profitable way to move forward in a manner that also helped the residents.

Commissioner Watson addressed the ratio of restaurant to retail. She did not oppose changing the ratio which she felt would encourage more restaurants to come in, and bring more amenities to the residents and larger community.

Township Planner Frey explained that the proposal would remove a full service restaurant pad. Buildings F and G had a limitation on the retail to restaurant mix because of parking requirements; restaurants required more parking. This would have to be addressed if the ratio was changed. The applicants would like the two remaining vacant spaces in F and G to be restaurant spaces.

Regarding the medical building, Commissioner Herrmann said that she thought ambulance activity was very rare at an urgent care.

Commissioner Zawodny said that while he agreed ambulances were used rarely at urgent care facilities, ambulance activity did happen, because people did not always understand that an urgent care was not a full service hospital. For him the issue still remained as to whether a medical building was part of the vision people bought into when they purchased their homes. Was there a real effort being made in the planning of this facility to address ideas of continuity, walkability, and cohesiveness of the community?

Mr. Ackerman asked that PPUDA21-0003, application for a PUD amendment, be withdrawn this evening.

Township Planner Frey advised that any new plan submitted would be publicly noticed. However, residents should still be on the listserv and pay attention to the agendas on the Township website, because the applicant could come in for a study session, for instance, which would be a public meeting, but would not be noticed as a public hearing.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Resolution – Capital Improvements Program

Township Planner Frey explained that the Board of Trustees passed a resolution at their January meeting to not have the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) come to the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission was being asked to approve a similar resolution, as provided in tonight's packets. The State Act states that the CIP come to the Planning Commission unless the governing body waves that process. The CIP was a Board of Trustees document, developed by the Board to prioritize capital improvement goals, and which the Planning Commission was then asked to approve.

Commissioner Herrmann further explained that the CIP was a lengthy budget planning document, most of which was not related to the Planning Commission.

Vice Chair Wilk agreed with this action, as the Planning Commission was not engaged with the CIP process.

MOTION by Yang, support by Herrmann, to approve Resolution to Exempt Planning Commission from the Capital Improvements Process and delegate that authority to the Township Board of Trustees.

Roll call vote: Ayes: Ghandi, Herrmann, McCall, Watson, Wilk, Yang, Zawodny

Nays: None

Motion approved 7-0.

2. Election of officers – Chair and Vice Chair

Vice Chair Wilk thanked Eric Lark for his service on the Commission, and welcomed new Commissioner Ghandi.

After discussion, the following motion was offered:

MOTION by McCall, support by Zawodny, to nominate and elect Commissioner Matt Wilk as Chair, and Commissioner Gary Yang as Vice Chair, of the Planning Commission.

Roll call vote: Ayes: Ghandi, Herrmann, McCall, Watson, Wilk, Yang, Zawodny

Nays: None

Motion approved 7-0.

3. Appoint ZBA Liaison

Township Planner Frey explained the role of the Zoning Board of Appeals liaison, which was to represent the Planning Commission as a ZBA member. Commissioner Ghandi said he would serve as the ZBA liaison.

MOTION by Herrmann, support by McCall, to appoint Commissioner Ghandi as ZBA liaison.

Motion carried unanimously by voice vote.

DEPARTMENT REPORTS:

Township Planner Frey:

- Master Plan RFQ Update
- No February ZBA meeting

The Commission discussed ways to organize meeting materials for ease of use.

EXTENDED PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Linda Malec, 20557 Wintergreen Circle, addressed issues of public process, and asked that public notices go beyond the 300' legal requirement. She asked that more documentation regarding the applications be posted online – site plans, etc. She noticed that Mr. Lark was not thanked nor was new Commissioner Ghandi welcomed until the end of the meeting. Could the Planning Commission meetings be video recorded or streamed live?

Ms. Malec addressed the issue of the proposed medical building in the Village at Northville; she felt there were several such facilities close by and wondered whether concentration of similar businesses was something that should be discussed. Last, she thanked Commissioner Zawodny for his thoughtful presentation this evening.

Commissioner Herrmann said that she would like the question of how many/location of urgent cares be discussed should the issue arise again.

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by McCall, support by Herrmann, to adjourn the meeting at 10:46 pm.

Motion approved unanimously by voice vote.