

GENOA TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
February 24, 2003
6:30 P.M.
MINUTES

The work session of the Planning Commission was called to order by Vice-Chairman John Cahill at 6:30 p.m. The following commission members were present constituting a quorum for transaction of business: Barbara Figurski, James Mortensen, Ken Burchfield, and John Cahill. Also present was Michael Archinal, Township Manager, Ron Nesbitt from Langworthy, Strader, LeBlanc & Associates, Inc., Debra Huntley from Tetra Tech MPS, and Kelly Kolakowski, Township Planner. By the end of the work session, there were a few persons in the audience.

Items scheduled for action during the regular session of the commission were discussed.

There was a brief discussion regarding the procedure for Open Public Hearing #3. Commissioner Mortensen questioned if the property needs to be rezoned to PRD-MDR from PUD-OSD in order to approve this proposal. Also, there was no revised PUD agreement in the packet. Mike Archinal will review the file before the regular meeting begins this evening.

GENOA TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
PUBLIC HEARING
7:00 P.M.
MINUTES

The regular session of the Planning Commission was called to order by Vice-Chairman Cahill at 7:05 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited and a moment of silence was observed.

Moved by Mortensen, seconded by Figurski, to approve the Agenda with the following changes:

1. Open Public Hearing #3 shall have the following actions listed
 - A. Consideration of PUD Rezoning
 - B. Recommendation of Conceptual PUD Plan
 - C. Recommendation of PUD Agreement
 - D. Recommendation regarding Impact Assessment
 - E. Recommendation regarding Site Plan

The motion carried unanimously.

The call to the public was made to discuss items not on the agenda. There was no response and the call to the public was closed at 7:07 p.m. Vice-Chairman Cahill noted that the Board will not begin any new business after 10:00 p.m.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 1...Review of site plan application, site plan, and environmental impact assessment for proposed 7,200 sq. ft. commercial retail building in Section 4, 4030 W. Grand River, at the southeast corner of Grand River Ave., petitioned by Anthony Patric Inc./Hicks Family Limited Partnership. (PC 02-24)

- **Planning Commission disposition of petition**
 - A. Recommendation regarding impact assessment.**
 - B. Disposition of site plan.**

Mr. Jay Newman from Anthony Patric, Inc. and Mr. John Hicks, the property owner, were present to represent the petitioner.

Mr. Newman gave a presentation of their proposal. He showed colored renderings as well as building material samples. They have addressed most of the concerns from the engineer and planner. They have been in contact with Country Corners with regard to the access agreement. This is currently in the process of being approved. They have revisited the drainage issue. They are proposing to provide catch basins for the Stormwater and then connect to the existing sewer and water service.

Commissioner Mortensen likes this building; however, he does not like flat roofs. He added that the south elevation should have an accent strip along the middle of the building. The petitioner will comply with this request.

There was a brief discussion regarding a rear access road to alleviate traffic along Latson and Grand River. The petitioner shows it on the plan and they will develop it in the future when the Township feels it is necessary.

Commissioner Figurski asked if there will be only one dumpster to service the entire site. Yes, there will be only one dumpster.

Vice-Chairman Cahill asked if the rooftop utilities will be screened. Mr. Newman advised they have created a parapet to screen the rooftop units. Those walls are 4 ½ to 5 feet high and will screen the utilities from all sides of the building. Vice Chairman Cahill agrees that it is a beautiful building.

Mr. Nesbitt reviewed his letter of February 19, 2003.

The proposed parking quantity meets the requirement for retail uses only. The petitioner is aware of this.

He reiterated the need for the shared access easements with the property to the east and advised that they be recorded and provided to the Township.

The decorative light fixtures should be provided along the Grand River road frontage and be consistent with the existing lighting. The petitioner will comply.

Manufacturer's sheets should be provided for the proposed parking lot lighting fixtures. The petitioner will comply. Mr. Newman advised that a photometric grid will be provided.

The pylon sign needs to be located outside the 25-foot clear vision triangle at the road intersection. The petitioner will comply. Vice-Chairman Cahill would prefer a monument sign and not a pylon sign. Mr. Nesbitt agrees, however, pylon signs are permitted in the ordinance. There was a brief discussion and Mr. Hicks stated he will change the pylon sign to a monument and the materials will match that of the building.

Curb ramps where the sidewalk meets the drives need to be shown on the plan. The petitioner will comply.

Ms. Huntley reviewed her letter of February 24, 2003.

The width of the dumpster does not scale properly on the site plan. Mr. Newman advised the scale is not correct, but the dimensions are. They will make the change.

Storm sewer calculations should be provided for the proposed storm sewer system to ensure adequate sizing. The petitioner will comply.

There was a discussion regarding the path that the garbage truck would take when accessing the property. Ms. Huntley feels a parking space should be eliminated so there is somewhere for the truck to turn around. Mr. Hicks does not feel a parking space should be lost because of an activity that will take place once a week. Commissioner Mortensen suggested adding language to the Impact Assessment that the trash pick up needs to be done before 7:30 a.m. so the truck can utilize the parking space to turn around. All commissioners and the petitioner agree.

The call to the public was made at 7:50 p.m. with no response.

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Mortensen, to recommend approval of the Impact Assessment received by the Township on February 6, 2003 for a proposed 7,200 sq. ft. commercial retail building in Section 4, 4030 W. Grand River, at the southeast corner of Grand River Ave., petitioned by Anthony Patric Inc./Hicks Family Limited Partnership subject to all of the following conditions:

1. Dust control measures shall be added.
2. At the end of the paragraph "Impact on surrounding land use", the following shall be added: "Trash hauling will occur prior to 7:30 a.m. as existing parking spaces may be used by the truck to turn around."

The motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Burchfield, seconded by Figurski, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Site Plan for a proposed 7,200 sq. ft. commercial retail building in Section 4, 4030 W. Grand River, at the southeast corner of Grand River Ave., petitioned by Anthony Patric Inc./Hicks Family Limited Partnership subject to all of the following conditions:

1. Approval by the Township Board of the Impact Assessment as amended and prepared by Anthony Patric, Inc. and received on February 6, 2003 and as recommended by the Planning Commission this evening
2. The petitioner will obtain an easement with the adjoining property owners to the south and east for shared access with the site, which will be submitted to the Township Attorney for review and approval.
3. The petitioner will provide for a future service drive connection as currently indicated on the site plan with the property to the south.
4. Building elevations, materials and colors of those materials are to be as presented to the Planning Commission this evening, with the south elevation to be modified to provide an accent band for relief and color variation.
5. All rooftop equipment shall be screened.
6. Traditional Genoa decorative lighting as is currently in place within the Township along Grand River shall be added to the site plan and manufacturer's specification shall be provided to the Township.
7. All parking lot lighting fixtures shall be downward directed and manufacturer cut sheets and a photometric grid shall be provided and submitted prior to review by the Township Board.
8. Curb ramps are to be provided where the sidewalks intersect with the streets.
9. The sign location for the site must be outside the 25-foot clear vision triangle and a monument structure with the same brick material as the building shall be substituted for the current pylon sign.
10. The dumpster enclosed is to be located at a minimum of 10 feet from the side and rear lot lines and shall be constructed of the same material as the building. The petitioner will rescale the dumpster on the site plan.
11. Stormwater connections shall be presented for adequate sizing with hydraulic grade elevations for each structure being shown on the site plan.
12. The petitioner shall comply with all of the Township Engineer issues, including the calculation of REU's for sewer and water.
13. Dust control measures shall be added to the site plan.

The motion carried unanimously.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 2...Review of special use application, site plan, and environmental impact assessment for proposed 9,000 sq. ft. warehouse addition to match existing 26,887 sq. ft. building (Highland Engineering) in Section 8, south of Grand River Ave., on the east side of Grand Oaks Dr., petitioned by Contracting Management Corp. (PC 03-06)

- **Planning Commission disposition of petition**
 - A. **Recommendation regarding special use application**

B. Recommendation regarding impact assessment.

C. Recommendation regarding site plan.

Mr. Andrew Balow from Lindhout Associates Architects, Ralph Beebe, Vice President of Highland Engineering, and Neil Plante of Boss Engineering were present to represent the petitioner.

Mr. Balow advised they are proposing to add an additional 9,000 square feet to the existing 26,000 square foot building that is a warehouse and manufacturing facility. The addition will only be used for warehouse purposes.

Mr. Beebe advised their business has grown and they have run out of storage. They currently have two trailers at the rear of the building that are used for storage and these will be removed once the addition is complete. They will not be hiring any additional employees.

Mr. Balow advised the addition will be to the south of the building and will match the existing building's materials and colors. They will also be incorporating a detention pond on the east side of the property, which will require a small amount of earth movement. They will be adding landscaping to the front of the building as requested by the Township Planner.

Commissioner Figurski advised that dust control measures need to be added to the site plan.

Mr. Nesbitt and Ms. Huntley advised that the petitioner has addressed all of their concerns.

Mr. Nesbitt noted that the proposal meets all of the requirements of Section 12.08 of the Ordinance with regard to the special land use.

The call to the public was made at 8:08 with no response.

Moved by Mortensen, seconded by Figurski, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the special land use application for Highland Engineering noting that this recommendation is made because all of the following elements of Section 12.08 of the Township Ordinance have been met.

1. Be compatible and in accordance with the goals, objectives and policies of the Genoa Township Comprehensive Plan and promote the Statement of Purpose of the zoning district in which the use is proposed.
2. Be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to be compatible with and not significantly alter the existing or intended character of the general vicinity.
3. Be served adequately by essential public facilities and services such as: highways, streets, police and fire protection, drainage structures, water and sewage facilities, refuse disposal, and schools
4. Not involve uses, activities, processes, or materials detrimental to the natural environment, public health, safety or welfare by reason of

excessive production of traffic, noise, vibration, smoke, fumes, odors, glare or other such nuisance.

5. Provide mitigation necessary to minimize or prevent negative impacts.

The motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Mortensen, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment with a revision date of February 19, 2003 for a proposed 9,000 sq. ft. warehouse addition to match existing 26,887 sq. ft. building (Highland Engineering) in Section 8, south of Grand River Ave., on the east side of Grand Oaks Dr., petitioned by Contracting Management Corp.

The motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Burchfield, seconded by Mortensen, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Site Plan for a proposed 9,000 sq. ft. warehouse addition to match existing 26,887 sq. ft. building (Highland Engineering) in Section 8, south of Grand River Ave., on the east side of Grand Oaks Dr., petitioned by Contracting Management Corp. subject to all of the following conditions:

1. Approval by the Township Board of the petitioner's special land use application as recommended by the Planning Commission this evening.
2. Approval by the Township Board of the Impact Assessment with a revised date of February 19, 2003 as recommended by the Planning Commission this evening.
3. The 9,000 square foot addition is to be used for warehouse purposes only.
4. The building materials are to be the same as to texture and color as the existing building and consistent with the color renderings provided this evening.
5. Dust control measures shall be added to the site plan as well as any construction plans.
6. All additional lighting as noted on the site plan shall be fully shielded and downward directed.
7. The petitioner shall submit the PIPP plan to the Township Board for review prior to their appearance before the Board.
8. The petitioner shall satisfactorily meet the requirements of the Township Engineer.

The motion carried unanimously.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 3...Review of site plan application, site plan, and environmental impact assessment for proposed condominium development, (Chemung Highlands) on a 49 acre undeveloped parcel, in Section 10, located on the south side of Grand River Ave., between Grand River and I-96, petitioned by B/K/G Development L.L.C. (PC 03-04)

- **Planning Commission disposition of petition**
 - A. Consideration of PUD Rezoning**
 - B. Recommendation of Conceptual PUD Plan**
 - C. Recommendation of PUD Agreement**
 - D. Recommendation regarding Impact Assessment**
 - E. Recommendation regarding Site Plan**

Mr. Archinal reviewed the action that has been taken on this property in the past. The petitioner was denied by the Planning Commission the recommendation for multiple family. They proceeded to the Township Board anyway, and the Board stated they would consider MDR zoning, but the proposal was too dense. That developer did not proceed.

On August 6, 2001, the petitioner received direction from the board and it was sent back to the Planning Commission. At the August 27, 2001 Planning Commission meeting, the request was tabled because the applicant was not present.

He stated that the Township Staff has worked with the applicant with regard to MDR zoning, which they felt was welcomed by the Board, however, the density was too high.

All of the public hearings have been held and the applicant has not applied for a rezoning so a notice does not have to be done, but given the time lapse, Mike feels we should hold another public hearing. He added that the zoning district of PUD-OSD no longer exists in the Township Ordinance. He questioned if the site will need to be rezoned or can the PUD be amended with an overlay.

Commissioner Mortensen does not feel the Planning Commission can hear this petitioner this evening because there is no PUD agreement or conceptual site plan. All commissioners agree. They would like to see those documents first.

Mike suggested tabling this item until the March 10, 2003 Planning Commission meeting in order to give notice of the rezoning to the public.

Mr. Chris Burton and Mr. Larry Goss of Burton-Katzman, Mr. Mike Polmear of Giffels-Webster Engineers, and Marshall Smith, the previous property owner, were present and asked if they could present their proposal and receive some feedback from the commissioners.

Commissioner Mortensen would agree to this request. Commissioners Figurski and Cahill do not feel comfortable with the proposed project. Commissioner Burchfield does not want to go forward if this needs to be noticed. He feels the issues should not be addressed at this time.

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Mortensen, to table Open Public Hearing #3 so the Township can notify the neighbors of the rezoning request. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Mr. Archinal advised they will be on the March 10, 2003 Planning Commission meeting agenda.

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Burchfield, to approve the minutes of February 10, 2003 as corrected. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Member Discussion

Commissioner Burchfield hopes that the members of the Township staff are taking into consideration the land that is being subject to rezoning. The Planning Commission struggled with Summerfield Point and the Singh Property and he felt all commissioners agreed after these two project that the density of 4.63 was a stretch. The impact of the proposed density of the property in Public Hearing #3 being 4.63 is not comparable to these projects. He does not feel that every piece of property needs to be developed. He empathizes with the landowner, but does not feel it is the Township's responsibility for him to make the most of his investment.

Vice-Chairman Cahill agrees with Commissioner Burchfield and does not accept 4.63 as the new "benchmark" for density in the Township. Each piece of property is different. With regard to the Singh property, a lot of the natural features were preserved and the adjacent uses were considered. He does not feel there is a benefit to having a PUD on this site.

Commissioner Mortensen's concerns are with the widths and lengths of the roads.

Commissioner Figurski feels the proposal is too dense and it will generate too much traffic.

Commissioner Mortensen noted that the MDR Ordinance states the density as 4-8 units per acre. He feels this should be limited to just 4. Mr. Nesbitt stated there is a reason for the range of density because of the way the property would be developed as a PUD.

The meeting adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

Submitted by: Patty Thomas, Recording Secretary

Approved by: Barbara Figurski, Secretary