

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF NORTHVILLE  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
April 26, 2022**

**DATE:** April 26, 2022  
**TIME:** 7:00 PM  
**PLACE:** Township Hall

**APPROVED:** May 31, 2022

**CALL TO ORDER:** The meeting was called to order by Chair Wilk at 7:04pm.

**ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Mindy Herrmann  
Edward McCall  
Gary Yang  
Mathew Wilk  
Tim Zawodny

**Excused:** Milan Gandhi  
Jayne Watson

**Staff:** Jennifer Frey, Township Planner  
Township Attorney Ernest Essad

Chair Wilk explained that a minimum of four affirmative votes are needed to approve an application.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** Planning Commission – March 22, 2022

**MOTION by McCall, support by Zawodny,** to approve the March 22, 2022 Planning Commission meeting minutes as published.

**Motion approved unanimously.**

**CORRESPONDENCE:**

None

**BRIEF PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

None

1. Public Hearing:

**PPUDA21-0001**

Representative:

Owner:

Location:

Request:

**PUD Amendment**

John Fallone, Cantoro Market

Cantoro Market – Fallone, LLC

15550 Haggerty Rd.

To substitute the approved office/medical building for apartments

Action: Recommend to Board of Trustees

Referencing her April 19, 2022 review letter, Township Planner Frey gave the background and review for this application for PUD amendment, to substitute the approved office/medical building for apartments at 15550 Haggerty Road.

The Planning Commission reviewed the project at their 7-27-2021 meeting and recommended approval to change the office use to 60 apartments with a number of ordinance waivers. The Planning Commission motion to approve had four votes in favor and two votes against.

At their 10-22-2021 meeting, the Board of Trustees referred the proposed PUD amendment back to the Planning Commission for further review and consideration. In referring the project back to the Planning Commission, the Board was specifically concerned about the number of units which equated to the number of ordinance waivers that collectively impacted the appearance/mass of the building close up to Haggerty Road. Tonight the Planning Commission is being asked to review the revised PUD amendment, and make a recommendation to the Township Board to approve, approve with conditions or deny the request.

The original amendment for 60 apartments included the following wavier requests:

- To approve 183' length for the east (back) elevation, where 180' maximum building length is permitted for multiple family residential (Article 7, Multiple Family Residential - Required Conditions).
- To allow average building height of 42' – 11 3/4", where maximum 40' is permitted for multiple family residential (Article 18, Schedule of Regulations).
- To allow a minimum 30.05' wide greenbelt along the Haggerty frontage, where a minimum 35' and average 50' width is required for PUD's (Article 20.4(B) Development Options).
- To allow a 15'-17.65' building setback to the residential use to the north, where 50' is required when abutting a residential district or the proposed building is taller than 15' (Article 7, Multiple Family Residential - Required Conditions).
- To allow a 13.75' parking setback to the residential use to the north, where 50' is required when abutting a residential district (Article 7, Multiple Family Residential - Required Conditions).
- To allow .63 acres (10%) open space, where 20% is required for PUD's (Article 20.4(J), Development Options).
- To allow 319 shared surface parking spaces for the market and the residential component in totality, where 355 parking spaces are required for the market alone (Article 26, Parking Standards).
- To allow less than 15' building setback from a sidewalk or parking lot, where a minimum 15' is required for multiple family zoning (Article 7, Multiple Family Residential - Required Conditions).
- To allow a single multiple family/unit building to be constructed, where the mixed use PUD permits up to 20% of the units to be attached and up to four units per building (Article 20.7(B)/20.6(B), Development Options - Supplemental Standards for Mixed Use PUD's).

### Revised PUD amendment Proposal:

The number of units has been reduced to 48 but the building footprint remains the same as the previous version and as a result, the number and extent of the ordinance waivers has not changed. The primary concerns from the Township Board were the impact the waivers had on the appearance of the project along Haggerty Road, such as setbacks, building mass, building height and the resulting reduction of area to provide landscape to help mitigate the collective magnitude of the waivers.

In referring the project back to the Planning Commission to reduce the density, the implied outcome was that by reducing the number of units, the number and/or amount of waivers associated with the project would also be reduced proportionately. The expectation of the Board was that reducing the number of units would result in a smaller building footprint and the smaller building footprint would address the scale of the requested project waivers. The building footprint, setbacks and amount of landscape area around the base of the building remains the same as provided on the previous plan with 60 units. The number of surface parking spaces remains the same as the previous 60 unit building. The number of covered parking spaces has been reduced by four.

### REVIEW COMMENTS

#### General

- Any conditions shall be reflected on revised plan and/or incorporated into the PUD amendment, prior to being forwarded to the Township Board again.
- For resubmittals, a transmittal detailing what is being submitted and a written response to each reviewer's comments is required.
- The PUD amendment shall only apply to the use and associated ordinance waivers. All other applicable PUD provisions shall remain in effect, including the requirement to relocate the southern site driveway to the south property line (as a shared driveway) when the property to the south is developed. The notation from the 2017 approval (shown below) shall be provided on the amended PUD plan to ensure consistency with the prior approval.

Architect Mark Abanatha, Alexander V. Bogaerts & Associates, P.C., was present on behalf of this application for a PUD amendment.

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Abanatha made the following points:

- Based on several meetings with the Township Supervisor following the Board meeting, tonight they were presenting a revised plan showing 48 units. Two key issues that influenced the revisions were density and parking.
- As expressed to the Planning Commission and the Board of Trustees, the building needs to be a certain amount of square footage in order to be successful. Originally this had translated into 60 units. The applicant had revised the density to 48 enlarged units, keeping the same square footage.
- Mr. Abanatha reviewed the site constraints regarding the building's proposed location and mass, including the existing curb cut, the utilities and infrastructure in

the parking area, the pinch point along the existing drive, and the lower level parking grid that sets up the overall massing of the building.

- The building frontage is broken up by a large courtyard at the second floor terrace along Haggerty Road. There was also a rooftop terrace.
- The lower level had been redesigned, with a relocated entrance, allowing more landscaped area along the east property line.
- All of the units on the second, third and fourth floors have been redesigned to be larger, reducing the number of units per floor from 20 to 16. The new units will be 1174 sf – 1400 sf, with target rents of \$2.32 per square foot for two bedroom/dens and \$2.33 per square foot for two bedrooms. Rent will be \$2800-\$3000 per unit. There are 42 two bedroom/dens and 6 two bedrooms.
- The amenity area on the rooftop had been modified to reduce the mass and density of the building. The leasing area is now outside the elevator on the first floor. Social and amenity areas are on the second floor, with an exercise area on the third floor. Seasonal storage was added in the building corners. There was still an outdoor rooftop terrace.
- The units will be state of the art, luxury, boutique type residences.
- The applicants had responded to Planning Commission requests for trees instead of bushes on the second floor and rooftop terraces, for more landscaping along the southern and east side of the building, and reduced parking to add landscape islands.
- As requested, the applicant's parking and traffic consultant met with the Township's traffic consultant, and the Township consultant stated that they agreed with the parking analysis.
- This project was a good fit for a PUD, with walkability around the site, including between the Cantoro Market and the apartment building. The building was podium-style to accommodate the unique shape and topography of the parcel. They had taken advantage of the grade change to put parking under the building.
- With the reduction in units, there are 1.7 garage spaces per unit under the building. They have 23 excess spaces, and could remove some of those to add more landscaping, if the Planning Commission so directed; the Commission had previously expressed concern about having enough parking at this location.
- Regarding the requested waivers, a certain amount of mass was required, which dictated building size and parking. The location was locked by the existing drive. The front yard was virtually in the same position as the original office building, for which waivers were also granted. The closest senior living building to the north was about 125 feet away.
- With the park, the two rooftop terraces, and the amount of green throughout the project, there was more usable green space than the original PUD office development.
- Tonight's submission included a revised market study, along with a financial analysis and absorption review. There was no market for an office building at this location, and they felt the proposed apartment building will bring value to the community.

#### Commission questions and discussion:

Commissioner Hermann expressed reservations about the modified rooftop amenity. It seemed strange to have a walkway on the rooftop to the amenity, which was now

smaller than originally proposed. She noted that in the Chicago area, sometimes residents were given individual rooftop spaces to claim as their own.

Mr. Abanatha explained that they were required to have egress off the roof, which was why there were walkways to the stair towers. There was a large rooftop terrace on the second floor. In addition to the rooftop terrace, there will be mechanical equipment on the roof.

Mr. Abanatha further explained that each unit had a private terrace, access to the second floor terrace, the rooftop terrace, and the amenity spaces inside the building.

Chair Wilk addressed safety concerns regarding rooftop terraces.

In response to further questions from the Commission, Mr. Abanatha gave the following information:

- Previously there had been approximately 1.4 parking spaces per unit in the lower level parking area; now there were 1.7 parking spaces per unit. They would have “a couple” of EV charge stations, with the prep work/wiring done so more can be added.
- Details such as material for the railing will be provided at site plan review.
- The rooftop walkway was to get people off the roof safely, should the need arise. The aesthetic appearance of the walkway would match the building.
- The rooftop terrace was a little over 3000 sf. The second floor terrace was a little over 4600 sf.

The Commission discussed whether a certain percentage of parking spaces could be required to be EV stations.

Commissioner Zawodny pointed out that the Planner's review letter indicated that density was a concern, not just regarding the number of units and parking, but also the total deviations being requested. This would be a very different element along Haggerty Road, and would be a big increase from the original PUD approval for a medical/office building.

Chair Wilk said the original medical/office request had been for 36,000sf of office space; this request was for 80,000sf of apartments, plus parking, plus other amenity spaces. The project price per square foot would be the highest in the area, and was the highest among the comps listed in the submission. It was difficult to demonstrate support for \$3,200 per month 2-bedroom apartments at this location. Additionally, the Township was experiencing other apartment developments.

Mr. Abanatha said John Widmer's financial analysis and the market analysis showed that this type of luxury boutique, podium-style building can support those rents.

Chair Wilk asked the applicants to clarify why they needed the waivers as requested.

Mr. Abanatha said in order for the apartment building to be successful, they needed a certain density. They wanted to present a great project, and create something that did not exist currently in the Township or general area. They could not go from 60 units to 48 units and provide the kind of project they wanted to provide with a smaller building.

Commissioner McCall suggested reducing the size of the entire building as well as parking, potentially bringing the price down to \$1.85 per square foot, closer to competitive price points. Some parking spaces could be changed to surface spaces.

Mr. Abanatha said they did not want to reduce underground parking; parking had been a major issue at previous Planning Commission meetings. They needed the square footage that was shown on the plan for the project to be successful.

Commissioner Herrmann suggested the rooftop amenity be enlarged. Perhaps additional amenity space could be added between the egress walk and the current amenity space.

Mr. Abanatha explained that they had two rooftop terraces. The top terrace would be a fantastic amenity, but he doubted whether it would be expanded.

Seeing that discussion had ended. Chair Wilk opened the meeting to public comment at 7:57pm.

Ashley Pieper, 19450 Smock, Northville Township, thought the project would be beneficial to the Township but was also concerned that there were nine deviations. What precedent would this set? She suggested underground parking be utilized. Haggerty Road was busy, and having the building too close may be a safety issue.

Seeing that no other public indicated that they wanted to speak, Chair Wilk closed the public hearing at 8:00pm and brought the matter back to the Commission for discussion and/or a motion.

Commissioner Zawodny said his concerns remained the same as at the last Planning Commission meeting regarding this project. There were no significant changes to the footprint from what was originally planned. The originally approved office building was going to be two stories of office/medical use. The lowest level of this project would not activate the area. He was also concerned regarding setting precedent. He was still concerned regarding setbacks, how the building was sited on the property, and density.

Chair Wilk said he did not remember any project needing as many deviations as this one did. The 9 requested waivers all represented non-compliance with the ordinance, yet the only change made by the applicants was in the number of units. The building was still 120,000sf including the parking. The parking ratio was improving somewhat, but the building was still the same size. He was concerned with the magnitude of the change, as compared to the originally approved PUD. The building was 4x the originally approved size. The building was too large for this site.

Commissioner Herrmann spoke to the growth of apartments in the Township. Her primary responsibility was to the Township's current residents. \$3000 per month rent was a tough sell, especially for current residents who might want to downsize and move into an apartment. She did not think the building would look out of place on Haggerty Road, however.

In response to questions, Township Planner Frey said the Planning Commission would make a recommendation, and whether the Commission recommended approval or denial, the application could still go before the Board of Trustees.

Commissioner Zawodny said that in terms of its character and appearance, the building was a relatively handsome facility. However, he was concerned that the building did not fit at this location, and would impact people as they drove down Haggerty. He wondered who would spend \$3000 per month to look at the Cantoro parking lot or Haggerty Road.

**MOTION by McCall, support by Yang**, in the matter of PPUDA21-0001, 15550 Haggerty Rd., Cantoro Market, to recommend to the Board of Trustees approval of the revised request for PUD amendment as submitted, to allow for the substitution of the approved office/medical building for apartments, with the following conditions:

- That the waivers listed in the July 27, 2021 motion be included in this motion, noting that the waiver regarding shared parking had been addressed by the Township traffic consultant, and with the understanding that the waivers do not set precedents for future Northville Township developments;
- That the developers present a plan for electric charging parking spaces during site plan approval.

**Roll call vote:** Ayes: Herrmann, McCall, Yang

Nays: Wilk, Zawodny

**Motion failed 3-2 (4 affirmative votes required).**

2. Public Hearing

**PPUDA21-0003**

Representative:

Owner:

Location:

Request:

Action:

**PUD Amendment**

Steve Friedman, Northville Five, LLC

Northville Five, LLC

Northwest corner of 5 Mile & Beck Rds.

Amendment to the commercial component of the Village at Northville PUD

Recommend to Board of Trustees

Referencing her April 20, 2022 letter, Township Planner Frey gave the background and review for this application for amendment to the commercial component of the Village of Northville PUD.

Township Planner Frey explained that the request is to modify the method used to calculate parking for the multi-tenant buildings located near the corner of 5 Mile & Beck (southeast corner of the PUD commercial component). The ordinance requires parking based on usable floor area (UFA), with UFA calculated at 85% of the total floor area. Additionally, for the two retail buildings, the PUD plan allocates up to 49% of the tenant space to be used as restaurant/food service and 51% retail. The restaurant/retail mix was capped based on parking.

The amendment request is to calculate UFA at 75% of the total floor area and increase the permitted amount of restaurant tenant space from 49% to 60%. Modifying the method for calculating UFA permits the amount of restaurant/food service uses to increase to 60% based on parking provided.

#### REVIEW COMMENTS:

Five hundred eighty (580) parking spaces are provided for the commercial component; 555 parking spaces are required based on the proposed amendment to use 75% UFA to calculate required parking. Floor plans for the existing tenants (First Watch, Five Guys, Sherwin Williams, Tropical Smoothie and Verizon) indicate UFA on average is considerably less than 75%. Calculating UFA at 75% ensures enough parking is available for the current tenant mix as well as provides flexibility going forward as tenants change over time. The required number of parking spaces would not change with the proposed amendment.

#### Condition of Approval

1. The PUD concept plan should be updated to reflect the parking required using 75% UFA and 60% restaurant for the multi-tenant buildings.

John Ackerman, Atwell, Southfield MI, was present on behalf of this application for amendment to the commercial component of the Village at Northville PUD.

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Ackerman presented the following:

- They were asking for a revision amendment to the PUD to revise the restaurant/retail ratio for buildings F and G. The applicant has another restaurant user for building G (southern building), but currently they cannot bring another restaurant in because of the ratio restriction.
- The parking was originally developed as shared parking, with unknown uses. There were currently 555 spaces required in the overall commercial parking area, and the requested change would still require 555 spaces, allow the new tenant to locate in building G, and also give future flexibility for change in tenant use.

In response to questions from the Commission, Township Planner Frey reviewed current uses and parking requirements, and explained that the Building Department tracks use as tenants change over time, so that a situation did not develop where there was not adequate parking.

The change would allow the applicant to increase from 49% restaurant to 60% restaurant use in buildings F and G.

The Commission discussed the original ratio and agreement, what changing the ratio meant in terms of allowed square footage in restaurants and retail spaces, the changed market place, other restrictions that were in place, and concerns that enough parking and good circulation be provided during peak times.

Chair Wilk opened the public hearing at 8:42pm. Seeing that no public indicated they wished to speak, Chair Wilk closed the public hearing at 8:43pm and brought the matter back to the Commission for discussion and/or a motion.

**MOTION by Zawodny, support by Herrmann**, in the matter of PPUDA21-0004, Northville Five, LLC, Northwest corner of 5 Mile & Beck Rds., to recommend to the Board of Trustees approval of the request for PUD amendment to the commercial component of the Village at Northville PUD as submitted, with the following condition:

- The PUD concept plan shall be updated to reflect the parking required using 75% UFA and 60% restaurant for the multi-tenant buildings.

**Roll call vote:** Ayes: Herrmann, McCall, Wilk, Yang, Zawodny

Nays: None

**Motion carried 5-0.**

3. Public Hearing

**PSLU22-0002**

Representative:

Owner:

Location:

Request:

Action:

**Special Land Use**

Michael Rossen, General Manager

Meadowbrook Country Club

40941 Eight Mile Rd.

Clubhouse Addition

Approve, Approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny

Referencing her April 12, 2022 review letter, Township Planner Frey gave the background and review for this application for special land use at 40941 Eight Mile Road, Meadowbrook Country Club, in order to construct a 2,360 square foot addition on the southeast corner of the Clubhouse and 3,555 square feet of covered outdoor space abutting the building addition. The functions included a new dining room with a covered outdoor terrace and expanded banquet floor area with an outdoor covered balcony. The golf course and its ancillary functions required special land use approval, including additions to existing facilities.

SPECIAL LAND USE REVIEW

Compatibility with adjacent uses. The proposed special land use shall be designed and constructed in a manner that is harmonious with the character of the adjacent property and the surrounding area. The special land use shall not create a significant detrimental impact, as compared to the impacts of permitted uses.

The proposed addition is located on the interior of the site. It does not impact adjacent properties. The uses associated with the addition already take place within the building.

Compatibility with the master plan. The proposed special land use shall be compatible with and in accordance to the goals and objectives of the Township Master Plan and any associated sub-area and corridor plans.

The Master Plan does not specifically address building additions associated with the existing golf course and country club use.

Traffic Impact. The proposed special land use shall be located and designed in a manner that will minimize the impact on traffic, taking into consideration pedestrian access and safety, vehicle trip generation, types of traffic, access location and design, circulation and parking design, street capacity and traffic operations at nearby intersections and access points.

The functions associated with the clubhouse expansion already take place on the site. The addition to the banquet space is intended to improve the function of events. The addition to the dining room is intended to serve families. The improvements do not add significantly greater usage or traffic coming to the Club.

Impact on Public Services. The proposed special land use shall be adequately served by essential public facilities and services such as streets, pedestrian or bicycle facilities, police and fire protection, drainage systems, refuse disposal, water and sewerage facilities and schools.

The proposed improvements do not have an additional impact on public services. The building and fire departments will review the plans for their respective requirements. The addition and building improvements must satisfy building and fire department requirements.

Compliance with Zoning Ordinance Standards. The proposed special land use shall be designed, constructed, operated and maintained to meet the intent of the zoning districts and the site shall be able to comply with all applicable ordinance requirements.

The proposed addition complies with setback requirements. Compliance with other applicable requirements will be confirmed during site plan review.

Impact on the Environment. The proposed special land use shall not unreasonably impact the quality of the natural features and the environment in comparison to the impacts associated with typical permitted uses.

The proposed addition does not impact natural features.

Specific Special Land Use Requirements. The proposed special land use shall comply with any specific requirements relating to a particular use.

The use specific requirements for golf courses and country clubs are met. These specific requirements include:

- Buildings and structures must be setback at least 100' from adjacent residential zoning districts/uses and 50' from nonresidential zoning districts/uses.
- Parking must be set back at least 30' from the road R.O.W and 50' from all other property lines.
- Ingress and egress shall be directly onto a major road.
- The ball trajectory must be identified along all fairways and driving ranges and shall not infringe on adjacent properties.
- Netting is not permitted. The facility shall be designed to minimize errant balls.
- Driving ranges are permitted as an accessory use, provided it is not illuminated.

The Planning Commission shall also consider the following factors when reviewing a special land use.

- The nature and character of the activities, processes, materials, equipment or conditions of operation typically associated with the use.
- Vehicular circulation and parking areas.
- Outdoor activity, storage and work areas.
- Hours of operation.
- Production of traffic, noise, vibration, smoke, fumes, dust, glare and light.

Conditions. Given the location and nature of the proposed clubhouse addition on the interior of the site, the project does not create adverse impact on adjoining or nearby properties. The only condition required is to change the name of the drawing from Site Plan to Special Land Use Concept Plan - Clubhouse Addition.

Fire Department comments will be addressed at site plan and building plan review.

Ross Hoekstra, McIntosh Poris Associates, 36801 Woodward Avenue, Ste 200, Birmingham, was present on behalf of this application for special land use.

Mr. Hoekstra made the following points:

- A big component of both the current driving range work and the construction of the new maintenance building is to introduce parking along the west side of the Club. During special events the Club currently has to park cars on the driving range. Having the majority of the parking near the north entry forces everyone to enter far from the event space.
- The addition will re-orient where guests arrive, and will allow removal of some of the existing walls in the banquet space in order to create a more cohesive banquet experience.
- There will also be an addition to the family dining room.
- The 2400 square foot addition represents a 4.2% addition to the approximately 50,000 square foot clubhouse. They were also adding covered balcony space that will accommodate dining for the new family dining room as well as the event space itself.

Chair Wilk opened the public hearing at 8:52pm.

Mary Lou Posa, 20560 Wintergreen Circle, had no objections to the proposed special land use.

Seeing that no other public indicated they wished to speak, Chair Wilk closed the public hearing at 8:43pm and brought the matter back to the Commission.

Commissioner Zawodny was concerned that the parking on the site be addressed during final site plan approval, to ensure that the parking was adequate for the special land use.

Commissioner Yang had visited the site and had no concerns with this request.

Chair Wilk noted that this was a relatively small addition to a 50,000 square foot building, located at the back of the building.

**MOTION by Yang, support by Herrmann**, in the matter of PSLU22-0002, 40941 Eight Mile Rd., Meadowbrook Country Club, to approve the request for a Special Land Use to construct a clubhouse addition as submitted, with the following condition:

- Change the name of the drawing from Site Plan to Special Land Use Concept Plan - Clubhouse Addition.

**Roll call vote:** Ayes: Herrmann, McCall, Wilk, Yang, Zawodny

Nays: None

**Motion carried 5-0.**

The Chair called a short break at 8:56pm and recalled the meeting at 9:05pm.

<b>4. PSPR21-0006</b>	<b>Site Plan Review</b>
Representative:	Michael Rossen, General Manager
Owner:	Meadowbrook Country Club
Location:	40941 Eight Mile Rd.
Request:	New Maintenance Facility
Action:	Approve, Approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny

Referencing her March 21, 2022 review letter, Township Planner Frey gave the background and review for this application for site plan approval for a new maintenance facility for Meadowbrook Country Club, 40941 Eight Mile Road.

The revised site plan submission had been reviewed for compliance with zoning ordinance requirements, special land use conditions and the administrative review comments from the Planner's January 25, 2022 review letter. Review comments from the Fire Department, Lighting Engineer and Traffic Engineer were provided separately.

At the discretion of the Planning Commission, completion of the outstanding comments may be subject to an administrative staff review.

#### Background.

At the September 28, 2022 Planning Commission meeting, the Commission approved the special land use request for a new maintenance facility with the following conditions:

1. Move the building off the former residential parcel on Wintergreen.
2. Landscape plan shall be designed with the intent to preserve as much existing vegetation as possible, while at the same time achieving the desired buffer treatment for the residents on Wintergreen Circle.
3. Maintenance vehicles shall exit the building and the maintenance area, at the northeast corner of the building site and travel along 8 Mile Road before entering the golf course. This shall be clearly noted on the plan.
4. Remove pavement for fire access on the west side of the building, subject to Fire Department approval.
5. Representatives from Meadowbrook shall meet with all the residents on Wintergreen Circle prior to site plan submission to work out agreeable details for the buffer treatment along the west and south sides of the maintenance facility. A report summarizing the outcome of the meeting(s) shall be provided by Meadowbrook and the residents; or a combined report representing both parties.
6. Site plan shall comply with all site plan requirements.

The report provided from Meadowbrook regarding communication with the neighbors on Wintergreen and the landscape treatment within the buffer area was provided. The Township did not receive a report from the residents. With the exception of the outstanding site plan review comments, all of the special land use conditions have been met and/or are reflected on the site plan.

#### Review Comments General

1. All site plan conditions must be completed prior to the Township accepting engineering and building plan submittals.
2. A transmittal detailing what is being submitted and a written response to each reviewer's comments is required.

Landscape/Woodland Replacement. The existing vegetation within the 8 Mile Road R.O.W, and approximately 20' into the site is identified as being preserved (except for access to the site). On the south and west sides of the building, grading is limited which allows most of the existing trees to be preserved. Additional new plant material provides additional buffer.

1. A portion of the required tree replacement is proposed to be planted near the project area, 114" (38 3" deciduous trees/8' tall evergreens) are noted as being planted elsewhere on the Meadowbrook property. If the homeowners on Wintergreen desire additional trees along their property lines, this could be a location for some of the replacement trees. The other option is to use them for the buffer along 8 Mile, as part of the driving range improvement plan. The note

on sheet L-1 shall be updated to reflect planting the trees along the residential property lines or along 8 Mile.

2. The height of the evergreen replacement trees could be increased from 8' to 10'-12' in order to satisfy a greater amount of the outstanding 114" replacement value.
3. A detail of the landscape wall, and identifying the wall material, is required.

Building elevations. An 18' tall brick building with a flat roof is proposed. There are no doors or access on the west side of the building.

1. The ordinance requires building walls over 80' in length to be broken up by varying roof lines, recesses, projections, windows, architectural features, use of complementary building colors and materials, trees or other means approved by the Planning Commission. The architect responded by adding brick corbels and raised piers on the north and south elevations. In addition, the existing vegetation will buffer views of the building from 8 Mile. The Planning Commission shall review this design detail and confirm it meets the objective to break up the north and south elevations.
2. The ordinance does not allow overhead doors to face a main road, in this case 8 Mile. Additionally, visibility of overhead doors shall be minimized from public view. If due to site constraints no other feasible location exists, or overhead doors are visible to the public, the design shall include architectural elements to reduce the visual appearance of the doors. The architect is requesting the doors to be on the north side of the building to direct operations away from the residential on the west side. The existing vegetation that is being preserved along 8 Mile, and corbel details identified in #1 above, will help to minimize views of the overhead doors from 8 Mile.
3. The building height is 18', the measurement of 16' on the elevation sheet is just below the top of the roof.
4. Full dimensional brick is required, this shall be noted for the screen wall detail and on the building elevation sheets.

### Lighting

It appears that there is building lighting on the west side of the building, but there is no parking or anything on that side. The Planning Commission might want to consider a condition that the lighting is confirmed as not required by Code, and then eliminated.

The Fire Department has reviewed the plan and approved it with conditions. Lighting has been approved. The Traffic Engineer reviewed the plan a second time and has no remaining traffic related issues.

In response to questions from Chair Wilk, Township Planner Frey provided the following:

- It was strongly recommended to increase the height of the evergreen trees in order to draw down the deficit in replacement trees on the site.
- Eliminating the lighting on the west side of the building should be a condition, as long as the lighting was not required by the Building Code.
- The ordinance does not have an hours of operation lighting requirement. Parking lot lighting would be limited to along 8 Mile Road and the east of the building.

- Lighting could be further limited in the winter.

Chair Wilk summarized that a special land use had been approved for construction of this facility. Tonight the Planning Commission was reviewing the site plan.

Ross Hoekstra, McIntosh Paris Associates, 36801 Woodward Avenue, Ste 200, Birmingham, was present on behalf of this request for site plan review and approval. Meadowbrook Board member Todd Calloway, 45426 Pebble Beach Ct., Northville Township, was also present.

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Hoekstra presented the following:

- The revised landscape plan (L-1) showed the preservation of existing vegetation to the extent possible, with new landscaping being added to meet buffering requirements, especially along the west and south sides, to screen the building as much as possible from the neighbors on Wintergreen, and to screen the views from Eight Mile Road.
- The west drive had been eliminated. All doors along the western façade had also been eliminated.
- All maintenance traffic will leave across the north side of the driving range before going on to the rest of the course.
- Todd Calloway, Meadowbrook Board member, has met with the residential neighbors. The plan provided this evening represented the best consensus they had, which was to provide as much landscaping as possible while maintaining the existing vegetation.
- There were approximately six locations where trees could be added to fill in.
- Regarding obscuring the building as much as possible from both public and private neighbor views, the building had been reduced to 18'3" at the parapet, which was consistent with the height of houses on Wintergreen Circle, including the house to be demolished on Meadowbrook property.
- They had introduced corbelled brick and raised piers on all 4 elevations to provide more architectural visual interest.
- The overhead doors were eliminated from the west side. In the spirit of meeting ordinance requirements, the existing vegetation as well as the proposed parking screen wall along the north will obscure the doors from being visible to the public.
- From the view of Wintergreen Circle, deciduous trees were in front, with evergreens behind.
- They would be happy to eliminate the lights on the west wall.

#### Commission questions and discussion

In response to Commission questions, Mr. Hoekstra gave the following information:

- The views from 8 Mile and Wintergreen showed the area in summer; the views will be relatively bare in winter, although the brush was thick in those locations.
- Regarding whether the renderings were showing mature growth, Meadowbrook's goal was to maintain all the existing landscaping on the north side, with additional trees planted along the edge of the parking lot. The rendering was modeling existing conditions.

- The residents did not want a wall or berm. The west elevation was broken up with raised piers and corbels. There was an intake grill in the middle of the wall.
- Mature deciduous trees (4032, 4033) north of the home to be demolished will remain, as shown on the tree protection plan.
- A 10'-12' tall evergreen is close to the limit that a tree can be transported and planted. 4"-5" caliper deciduous trees were considered large trees.

Commission comments:

- The west elevation presented as a brick wall. The 8' evergreens might be close together, but the building height will be 18'.
- The rendering presented mature growth, at least 10 years out.
- How did the residents feel this view could be improved?
- Perhaps a mural or faux windows could be added to the west side.
- The corbels provided a very small relief to the expanse of the wall.
- More effort should be made toward year-round screening of the west wall, including but not limited to climbing ivy.
- A variety of tree heights – 8', 10', 12', or even taller – would mitigate the look of a tall hedge. Different sizes strategically placed provide a more natural setting.
- The Commission discussed potential solutions to break up the west wall visually; this should be researched further and incorporated into the final site plan review.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Calloway said that he and Mr. Hoestra had met with the Wintergreen Circle residents, and received good feedback. The residents asked for fast-growing vegetation, which they will provide, as well as putting in some taller trees as mentioned in the Planner's report, and filling in gaps in the landscape plan. They would try to create interest on the west side, although Meadowbrook believed the primary driver was reducing building height, and they didn't want to do anything that would make the building grow. They had focused on removing access to the west side and keeping that view as pastoral as possible, and planting as many trees on the west side as possible. Evergreens would be planted close to the building, with the distance from Wintergreen to the building cut in half by a series of 12 foot trees. Taller trees placed toward Wintergreen as opposed to flat against the building would help the imagery remain as true as possible.

Chair Wilk opened the meeting to public comment, specifically to get resident feedback regarding the appearance of the west wall.

In response to questions, Township Attorney Essad explained that originally the Planning Commission approved the special land use permit with conditions. Tonight the Planning Commission needed to find whether the conditions of the special land use approval had been met. If the conditions had been met, the next step was to review the site plan for outstanding issues as called out by the Planner.

Mary Lou Posa, 20560 Wintergreen Circle, said that from the residents' perspective, they understood that the special land use had been approved in September. The residents had appealed the decision before the Zoning Board of Appeals (December), and were denied, and then appealed the decision to Wayne County Circuit Court, where the

parties put forth some stipulations for purposes of an order related to the appeal. It was her understanding that at the present time, there was no final special land use in place. The special land use was dependent upon final site plan approval, at which point if the residents believed that the special land use failed to comply with the zoning ordinance, they could go through the appeals process again. This was the history of the application from the residents' perspective.

The residents still believed that there were problems with the project. The size of the building at 16,000 square feet with ancillary activities was too impactful in the R-1 zoning district. While golf courses fall within a special land use within the R-1 district, this was a maintenance facility, with more than 4X the square footage of homes on Wintergreen, and with hours of operation starting at 5:30 am, with employees arriving earlier than that. The facility did not belong in their neighborhood.

The residents had unanswered questions regarding drawings obtained through FOIA Freedom of Information Act). For instance, they needed clarity regarding the retention pond shown on the plans. They had met with Mr. Calloway 3 times; the meetings were lengthy, cordial, and professional, but at no time was the retention pond brought up. The residents did not understand the drainage and sewer infrastructure associated with this project. Was there potential impact to the Wintergreen Circle residents?

Ms. Posa was hopeful the Commission could hear their concerns and help them reach a resolution that everyone could live with; they were not there yet.

Ms. Posa said she felt there was no way to make the west façade look anything like a 140-foot long brick wall. The tree line was pretty much gone. A berm would act like a "mountain" in front of the homes. New trees would not mature for 20 years.

Ms. Posa asked that the Commission not rush this application through, but postpone action this evening. There were still outstanding issues.

Ms. Posa distributed a letter to the Commission.

Linda Malec, 20557 Wintergreen Circle, said that most of what the Planning Commission was looking at could not be found online. From what she could piece together, the building would be 140'x115', for a size of 16,146.7 square feet. In their most recent meeting with Meadowbrook last Friday, they did see one drawing, and they talked at length about the landscaping. It seemed the information regarding this project was constantly changing. The retention pond was new on the drawings. And while screening was very important, issues of odor, chemicals, etc., had not been addressed, and all of those issues related to the placement of the building, as well as the building being industrial and commercial in nature.

Ms. Malec appreciated the Commission's conversation about trees and screening, and how long it would take the trees to mature. She noted that two of the residents backed up to the golf course. When green #14 was changed, Meadowbrook put in small evergreens which had barely grown. The changed contour of the green resulted in

more water coming into their yards. This was one reason they didn't want a berm on Wintergreen – changing contours often meant changing drainage patterns. The renderings and photos shown tonight did not look like what she saw from her yard.

Ms. Malec said the biggest issue remained the nature of the building, where tires were changed and other maintenance performed. This did not belong next to residences. She wondered if the Commissioners would want this facility next to their house.

Tanya Pado, 20631 Wintergreen Circle, said that one of the conditions of special land use approval was to keep as much of the vegetation as possible. However, it now appeared that not one tree was preserved out of the 40 years of growth. Could the building be moved further east in order to preserve trees? She had asked Meadowbrook to continue the wall on the north side of the building, to block vehicle lights and workers parking on site, and they had seemed receptive to this suggestion. All the residents were concerned with safety. Would a security fence be installed so that people could not just drive in and park? She would like to see more detail, including the building dimensions. It was hard to imagine living next door to this building. This was not expected when one decided to live on a golf course.

Linda Malec, speaking again, said that today she had seen and heard three large pieces of construction machinery behind her home, along with a 20' box truck. This was happening and the construction was not yet in operational mode.

Seeing that no other public indicated they wished to speak, Chair Wilk closed the public hearing.

Chair Wilk asked Township Attorney Essad to comment on Ms. Posa' claim that the residents would have another opportunity to appeal this decision.

Mr. Essad explained that under the ordinance, anyone who deems themselves an aggrieved party can appeal a decision of the Planning Commission. However, being considered by the court to be an aggrieved party was not easy. Olson vs. Jude & Reed, LLC was a seminal case regarding this issue. In particular, the court noted near ownership of an adjoining parcel of land, incidental inconveniences such as increased traffic congestion, general anesthetics, economic loss, population increases, or common environmental changes are all deemed inadequate to establish that a party is aggrieved.

The history of the case being heard this evening is that the Planning Commission approved the Meadowbrook maintenance facility with conditions of special land use. The neighbors through their counsel filed an appeal to the Zoning Board of Appeals, which found: 1) Everything the Planning Commission did was proper. 2) This wasn't a final decision because there were conditions that needed to be satisfied before the special land use was finalized. 3) The zoning ordinance uses the same language as the court to define an aggrieved person. The claims met by the residents don't meet the requirements for an aggrieved person in the State of Michigan. The Michigan Court of Appeals and the Michigan Supreme Court have set an extremely high bar for people to

challenge Planning Commission and Zoning Board decisions as an aggrieved person. The consequences of a decision need to be unique to you and your property, not something suffered by the general public, or nearby residents in general.

In terms of the case, the Planning Commission needs to determine whether the conditions for the special land use have been satisfied. If the Commission finds they are satisfied, then the Commission would move on to the standard site plan approval process. If the residents are not happy with the decision, and feel they are aggrieved, they can return to the ZBA, and the ZBA will then determine whether or not they are aggrieved. If the ZBA denies the petition, the residents can go to Circuit Court, and ask the Court to look at the entire record again. One word of caution is that the appellants in the original case strongly urged the plaintiffs to look at the definition of an aggrieved party in Michigan, and the actions of the courts in this regard.

Chair Wilk indicated the Commission would take two votes, one regarding whether the conditions of the special land use approval were met, and one to act on the site plan review. He asked for Board discussion.

Commissioner Herrmann said she would like more information regarding what trees were going to be removed, and whether a small adjustment to the building's location could save some of those trees. She agreed with Ms. Pado's request for a screening wall for the parking area, and thought such a wall should be constructed on the north and south ends of the building.

Mr. Calloway said they had one of their professionals draw up a proposal as to where a north wall was envisioned; they could do the same for a south wall also. They would need to bring the Club into this conversation for approvals, but he was open to this discussion, and had shared the drawing with Ms. Posa.

Commissioner Herrmann summarized that if the neighbors were in favor of such a screen wall or fence, running north to south adjacent to the northern parking and access area and also to the south, Meadowbrook would potentially be amendable to that.

Mr. Calloway agreed.

Mr. Hoekstra addressed the issue of moving the building in order to save trees. If the building was moved east, it would place the building in the driving range and would negatively impact the changes that had been made to increase the safety of the range.

Commissioner Zawodny spoke to the 5<sup>th</sup> condition of approval: *Representatives from Meadowbrook shall meet with all the residents on Wintergreen Circle prior to site plan submission to work out agreeable details for the buffer treatment along the west and south sides of the maintenance facility. A report summarizing the outcome of the meeting(s) shall be provided by Meadowbrook and the residents; or a combined report representing both parties.*

One of the Commission's key intents and one of the verbal directives was that the Commission did not want to be in the position they found themselves in this evening. The intent was that the two groups would be able to talk to each other and come to a result so that the Commission didn't become arbiters. For him, one of the key features of the conditions was making sure that the Commission had a better resolution relative to working this out.

Township Planner Frey asked the Township Attorney to address this issue.

Township Attorney Essad said that one of the conditions for special land use approval was that Meadowbrook and the neighbors meet, and that each side file a summary of the meeting. Meadowbrook filed a report with the Township, but in spite of a couple of prompts, the neighbors did not.

Chair Wilk said there was no dispute that the meetings took place. The issue seemed to be that the parties entered the meeting with vastly different understandings of where the process stood, and what was on the table. Chair Wilk's understanding was that a 16,000 square foot golf course maintenance facility was approved to be constructed in a certain location; that question had been resolved. But the court filing shows that was not a shared understanding. Tonight's discussion was not focused on whether there will be a building or not. It appeared that the parties in their meeting had conversations past each other, because tonight that same issue is being discussed.

Township Attorney Essad said the Planning Commission had already decided that issue, subject to the conditions being met. The people opposing that decision did not agree the decision has already been made. A quick perusal of the letter handed out this evening seemed to indicate that it represented a repeat of arguments already made, and did not offer anything new. If the neighbors wanted to go through the process again, that was their right, but tonight the Commission needed to focus on whether the conditions of special land use approval were satisfied. He noted that the maintenance building was now being located on property previously owned by Meadowbrook, and not on their residential lot facing Wintergreen.

After making the determination regarding whether the special land use conditions were met, the Commission could then look at site plan review, including the landscape plan, adding a screening wall to the north and south, etc.

Commissioner Herrmann said that her understanding after the last meeting concurred with Chair Wilk's.

Commissioner Zawodny said that he had previously stated that the location of the building needed to be based on an evaluation of tree protection, to provide the best resolution possible. He had not agreed that the building should be moved only one or two feet inside the original parcel. As a design professional, if he had done those evaluations, he would have shown various options, presented the pros and cons as part

of the discussion, instead of locking in to one position and saying nothing else would work.

Chair Wilk thought the location of the building could be discussed at site plan review. Meadowbrook needed to understand they would have to make the case for the building location at that time.

Township Attorney Essad advised that the Commission needed to make a determination regarding conditions 1-5 of the special land use approval. The building had been moved off the former residential parcel on Wintergreen, as stated in Condition 1. That condition was approved essentially with the agreement of the residents present at that meeting, and the issue should not be re-discussed. If the Commission determined the conditions were met, site plan issues such as putting some kind of design on the west façade, adding trees, placing trees next to the building or closer to Wintergreen, could be discussed at site plan review.

Commissioner McCall said he was surprised to see the retention pond, when he remembered the discussion being detention would be submerged.

Township Planner Frey said the special land use plan did not have all the site plan details. The purpose of the special land use application was to evaluate the appropriateness of this particular element of the Country Club in this particular location. Condition #6 was that the *site plan shall comply with all other site plan requirements*, which includes the detention pond, grading, and so on. It was never anticipated that there wouldn't be a detention pond, which was a normal part of site development.

Commissioner McCall said he was ready to move to the next step, and Chair Wilk indicated he was ready to entertain a motion.

**MOTION by Herrmann, support by Yang**, that Conditions 1 through 5 as listed in the Township Planner's letter dated March 21, 2022 have been satisfied for the special land use, relative to the Meadowbrook Country Club maintenance facility site plan review.

Commissioner Zawodny indicated he would support this motion, with the understanding that per legal counsel items just discussed are addressable as part of site plan review, and are not locked in stone for the special land use approval.

**Roll call vote:** Ayes: Herrmann, McCall, Wilk, Yang, Zawodny

Nays: None

**Motion carried 5-0.**

Chair Wilk asked for Board discussion regarding site plan review. Pursuant to Commissioner Zawodny's comments, as for any site plan review, the Commission could move a building around on the site, address how the building looks, and whether the landscape plan should be approved.

Commissioner Herrmann said that she still did not have a sense of what the residents as a collective group would like relative to the site plan. While the residents should have provided that at this point, she hated to overlook an opportunity for them to state what they would like. She also sensed from Mr. Calloway that Meadowbrook was open to working with the residents. While it may not be normal to give the residents another opportunity, she would like to hear their ideas for the west façade, for instance, and what kind of screen wall they wanted on the north and south sides. The site plan was largely acceptable to her, with the exception of the west façade needing improvements. However, she did not want to give the applicants direction without knowing that was what the residents also wanted.

Commissioner Herrmann summarized her concerns as: 1) Improving the west façade, perhaps with such elements as faux windows. 2) Provide a screening wall or fence to the north and south of the building. 3) Research how far the building would need to be moved to the east to save some of the trees there.

Commissioner Zawodny supported Commissioner Herrmann's comments. The Commission needed the information she listed in order to make a decision. From the perspective of the special land use approval, which determined that this is an appropriate use for the Country Club, the question of how to address the use with the residents was not yet resolved. Not enough information had been presented to understand what other options were possible. He was concerned with building position, landscaping including other landscape site elements, and so on.

The Commission reviewed the issues of the site, and discussed how best to move forward. The Commission could approve with conditions subject to administrative review, subject to further Planning Commission review of certain conditions, or postpone.

Chair Wilk summarized outstanding issues as follows:

- Landscape plan on western portion of the property, which could reflect a determination to move the building to save more trees.
- Eliminate lighting on the western façade if not required by ordinance.
- Present options for "dressing up" the western façade.
- Screen wall or fence or other measure to block views of parking from the residential neighbors on the north and south sides.

Commissioner Zawodny said there was enough gray area in the outstanding issues that action should be postponed. The Commission should be clear on what it is approving.

Commissioner Yang agreed. Otherwise the Commission would actually be providing two site plan approvals. Regarding the west façade and vegetation, when the special land use approval was last discussed there was a pledge to preserve the tree line as much as possible. Tonight it looked like a majority of the trees will be removed. Mr. Calloway had commented that installing larger trees could be expensive, yet doing so

did offer a compromise. He felt that this plan was not ready for approval with conditions.

Chair Wilk asked the Commission how they wanted to proceed. He did not support requiring Meadowbrook to shift the building.

Commissioner Herrmann pointed out that regardless of whether the Commission postponed, or approved with conditions, the applicants would need to return to the Commission. The Commission had voted that the 5 conditions of special land use approval had been met, and the maintenance building could be constructed. The Commission should identify the things the applicants should come back with, that would be different than what was presented this evening.

Commissioner Herrmann said her 3 primary issues included providing the screen wall or fence to block headlights and parking, presenting options for the west façade, and eliminating the lighting on the west façade, if allowed by ordinance/code.

Using a standard of what was allowed, and because the lot abutting Wintergreen could, per ordinance, be developed with a house that was larger than 16,000 square feet and the lot could also be clear cut by a residential developer, at this time Commissioner Herrmann also did not support requiring the applicants to move the building.

Chair Wilk said that before they asked the applicants to shift the building, there needed to be a sense that this was possible and important to the Commission.

Commissioner Herrmann suggested that taller trees – perhaps 15' – could be required to replace any landmark trees that were removed.

Commissioner Zawodny said that the Commission had a responsibility to perform due diligence regarding the site plan, in light of the special land use approval. Part of the reason this application came before the Commission was to give the residents an opportunity to speak and have someone hear their concerns.

Commissioner Zawodny said he would like to think that a resolution could be reached with the location of the building as proposed or close to the proposed location, with other creative features to mitigate the height and appearance of the building and to screen the parking lot, and so on. But such a resolution would take care and due process to make sure that all parties involved have reached a good conclusion. This effort warranted a postponement, to make sure that everyone had the opportunity to have the best resolution possible for this overall design, including issues regarding site plan review.

Chair Wilk said it was important to understand that the Commission was no longer in the special land use approval process, and re-litigating special land use issues did not facilitate a collective solution, and provided false hope that the residents can prevent

the building from being constructed. The site plan needed to be reviewed against site plan review criteria, which included landscape requirements, for instance.

Mr. Hoekstra said that they would likely have to shift the building 40' to the east in order to save the tree line, because of the equipment that would need to be driven in that area.

Commissioner Zawodny noted that the Township had projects where, with due care, construction equipment had come very close – 15' – to the drip line of trees to be saved. However, the greater point was that it was important to take time to come up with the best resolution.

Commissioner Herrmann summarized that at a minimum the building would need to be shifted 15', in order to preserve some of the trees; she did not support this requirement. Leaving the building as shown made the most sense to her.

Allen Greene, Meadowbrook attorney, said they had spent time and effort meeting the requirements of the Planning Commission with the landscape plan and working with the neighbors. If the landscape plan could be improved, they were willing to look at that. However, with respect to the building, the building was located where it needs to be. They might be able to preserve a few more trees by construction methods, and they would work with the Township on that effort. They were already preserving 87 trees. They requested a conditional approval this evening, so that the project could move forward. They were concerned about losing the construction season. They would reduce or eliminate the lighting, if allowed by code. They would produce a plan and work with staff on providing screen walls to the north and south. They would look at the landscape plan and see where they could add more landscaping, bigger trees, and provide mixed planting. They would look at the west wall and see what could be done architecturally. They could return to the Commission with these changes, but they needed to move the project forward and have clarity regarding what the Commission wanted them to do. However, they could not move the building, which would change the entire site plan and engineering.

In response to a question from Chair Wilk, Township Attorney Essad advised that the Commission could approve the site plan, subject to outstanding items being addressed by modification, or with the directive that final approval won't be given until the outstanding items are addressed, or the matter could be postponed with directions to the applicant to come back after addressing the outstanding issues.

**MOTION by Herrmann, support by Yang**, in the matter of PSPR21-0006, Meadowbrook Country Club, 40941 Eight Mile Road, to approve the site plan for a new maintenance facility as presented, subject to the following four items being brought back to the Commission for further review and approval at the next Planning Commission meeting.

1. Lighting plan be revised to reduce lighting on the west wall as much as possible, consistent with the ordinance,

2. Enhance parking lot screening beyond landscaping, to include but not be limited to, a wall or fence or other appropriate means to screen the north and south parking areas of the building,
3. Western wall enhancement: Provide a presentation of an option or options for Commission consideration of a variation of the view of the western wall, to improve the wall's appearance specifically until the trees reach maturity,
4. Landscaping enhancement: Provide a representation of the landscape plan, which would include greater variation in height at maturity, including larger trees than 10'-12' in some portions, and modified placement in an east to west direction to be half the distance to the western wall, as described by Meadowbrook representatives, and to provide appropriate visualization for the seasons of growth and screening during the different seasons.

Discussion

Commissioner Yang said the motion was clear that these conditions should be met. It was also important that once these conditions are satisfied, no additional items will be added.

Commissioner McCall asked that the motion state the items should be brought to the Planning Commission by the May meeting, and the phrase was added: *at the next Planning Commission meeting.*

**Roll call vote:** Ayes: Herrmann, McCall, Wilk, Yang

Nays: Zawodny

**Motion carried 4-1.**

<b>5. PSPR21-0001</b>	<b>Site Plan Review</b>
Representative:	Isam Yaldo, Yaldo Construction
Owner:	Northville Ford Gauge, LLC
Location:	42975 Mill St.
Request:	Building renovations and site improvements
Action:	Approve, Approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny

Referencing her April 19, 2022 review letter, Township Planner Frey gave the review and background for this application for site plan review for building renovations and site improvements at 42975 Mill Street. The project is called Waterford Mill, and is located on the east side of Northville Road, south of Six Mile, at Mill Street.

The building has been vacant for several years. The proposed plan is to clean the site up with the hope that a better looking site will attract a tenant. At this time, the plan identifies the use as self-storage, which is a permitted use in the existing industrial zoning district.

REVIEW COMMENTS

### General

1. All site plan conditions must be completed prior to the Township accepting engineering and building plan submittals.
2. For resubmittals, a transmittal detailing what is being submitted and a written response to each reviewer's comments is required.
3. Signs are not part of the site plan. The reference to the monument sign on the site plan and the sign detail shall be removed from the plan set. The sign will be reviewed for compliance with the sign permit application.
4. The development plan objectives narrative on sheet SP-1 must be updated to remove the reference to a warehouse use. Warehouse is a special land use and not part of this plan.

### Layout

1. Loading is not permitted in the front yard (along Mill Street). The paving and driveway access from Mill Street shall be removed.

### Landscape

1. A number of trees are proposed on the east side of the building. To provide greater visual impact, as many trees as possible should be changed to redbud or dogwood and planted as understory plant material in the front yards along Mill and Northville Road and at the edge of the existing vegetation on the south property line.
2. "ASG" is specified on the north side of the building but is not identified in the plant list.
3. A note must be added to provide 4" of topsoil in all planting beds and lawn areas.
4. Note #7 (Sheet LP-2, Materials) references cobblestone mulch. Mulch must be a natural product; cobblestone is not permitted. The note shall be revised.

### Building elevations

1. A small material sample board is required and shall be provided at the meeting.

This project had been through 3 rounds of administrative review; only outstanding items were listed. Review comments from the Fire Department and Lighting Engineer were provided separately, with some outstanding issues still listed in the lighting review. Review comments from the Township Engineer have been addressed.

At the discretion of the Planning Commission, completion of the outstanding comments may be subject to an administrative staff review.

Brian Devlin, Nagy Devlin Landscape Design, 31736 West Chicago, Livonia, was present on behalf of this application. Isam Yaldo, Yaldo Construction, Northville Ford Gauge, LLC, was also present.

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Devlin showed a rendering of the landscape plan. To the east of the property there were railroad tracks at approximately 763'

elevation, which was just about at the top of their building, creating a steep slope 20'-25' wide from the railroad tracks to the building.

Mill Street was on the north with parking across the street. The cell phone tower to the west is on Northville Road, Hines Park was to the south, as well as some industrial type uses. The Rouge River meandered through the parcel.

The site was 4.15 acres; total building area is 75,800 square feet. This was one of Henry Ford's village industries, originally a mill that was turned into a small factory, and which had been added to over the years. They were proposing a mini self-storage facility.

The site was currently zoned Industrial; future land use designation is Northville Road Mixed Use District.

Mr. Nagy gave the following information:

- The single story addition at the northwest corner will be removed.
- The existing drive that meets at the intersection of Northville Road and Mill Street and runs diagonally into their site will be removed.
- Debris and dead trees will be removed, along with a large sycamore and a Tree of Heaven.
- The site will be accessed with a new driveway off of Mill Street, with new pavement installed for the circulation and parking areas on the lower level.
- Pavement repair on the upper level is proposed.
- The building will be renovated with new paint and window replacement.
- Fire suppression and alarm systems will be installed.
- The driveway on the east of the upper level parking will be removed.
- They will seek a variance from the Zoning Board of Appeals to maintain the asphalt area on the upper level.
- New landscaping will be installed to conform to Township standards.
- They did not provide a sample board. They did get a study from a preservation architect, who concluded that buildings of this time were concrete. Per the preservation architect, since the building has been painted several times, after paint removal the building should be repainted in colors that most likely matched the original: Anew Gray (SW 7030) for the concrete and Saguaro (SW 6419) for windows, doors, and frames. Paint samples were available this evening.

Commissioner McCall asked about strategy for window replacement. Mr. Nagy said they would replace the broken glazing and finish the trim around the windows.

Commissioner McCall said it was important to re-create the grid pattern. He applauded the applicants for taking on this project, and encouraged them to review the project to the south of this one (Phoenix Mill).

Chair Wilk summarized that this would be converted to an air-conditioned, two-story self-storage facility.

In response to a question from Chair Wilk, Mr. Nagy said a significant portion of the property was in a flood plain, but the flood plain did not rise above the lower level floor elevation.

Commissioner Zawodny also complimented the applicants for doing this project and cleaning up the property.

Commissioner Herrmann expressed appreciation for the proposed appearance of the building. Self-storage appeared to meet the needs of people who are working from home; this project will provide a nice amenity to the community.

**MOTION by McCall, support by Herrmann**, in the matter of PSPR21-0001, 42975 Mill Street, to approve the site plan for building renovations and site improvements as presented, with the following condition:

- Resolution of outstanding items in the April 19, 2022 Planners review letter and the April 19, 2022 Lighting Consultant's review, per administrative review and approval.

**Roll call vote:** Ayes: Herrmann, McCall, Wilk, Yang, Zawodny

Nays: None

**Motion carried 5-0.**

### **OTHER BUSINESS**

None

### **DEPARTMENT REPORTS:**

Township Planner Frey:

- Master Plan project update

Mindy Herrmann, Board of Trustees

- Board of Trustees Update
- New play equipment at Fish Hatchery Park
- Pathway Committee Update – Presentation to Township Board

### **EXTENDED PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

None

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION by McCall, support by Yang**, to adjourn the meeting at 12:06 am.

**Motion approved unanimously.**