

GENOA TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION
WORK SESSION
March 11, 2002
6:30 P.M.
MINUTES

The work session of the Planning Commission was called to order by Vice-chairman Jack 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, Curt Brown, John Cahill, and Bill Litogot. Also present was Michael Archinal, Township Manager; Jeff Purdy from Langworthy, Strader, LeBlanc & Associates, Inc. and Deb Huntley from Tetra Tech, MPS. 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.

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 Jack Cahill at 7:10 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

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

1. Open Public Hearing #3 should show **264** units, not **248**.
2. Open Public Hearing #4, Letter B shall read "Recommendation regarding Amendment to the PUD Concept Plan".
3. Open Public Hearing #5, Letters A and B shall read "Disposition regarding impact assessment" and "Disposition regarding site plan", respectively.

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 7:12 p.m. Vice-chairman Cahill noted there is a heavy agenda this evening so it would be best to move through each item quickly. He also 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, special use, and environmental impact assessment, for proposed 3,300-sq. ft. bank facility with drive-through operations, located in Section 5, on the West Side of Latson Rd. in the Livingston Commons PUD consisting of 1.87 acres, petitioned by Comerica Bank. (PC 01-33)

- **Planning Commission disposition of petition**
 - A. Recommendation regarding special use application.
 - B. Recommendation regarding impact assessment.
 - C. Recommendation regarding site plan.

Commissioner Brown asked to be excused from this public hearing due to the fact that he works for Comerica Bank. **Moved** by Litogot, seconded by Figurski, to excuse Commissioner Brown from Public Hearing #1 due to a conflict of interest. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Mr. Tom Chubb representing Comerica Bank and Mr. Scott Cannard, the architect for the project, were present to represent the petitioner.

Mr. Chubb noted they have made the changes and additions based on the planner's and commissioners' comments.

Mr. Cannard reviewed the changes / additions that were made.

1. They will have three drive thru lanes with an ATM on the outer lane.
2. They have added a considerable amount of landscaping to shield the drive thru from the businesses to the south as well as Latson Road to the east.
3. They have supplied a photometric grid and the lighting has been revised to meet the requirements of the Township. He noted that some of the light may spill out onto Grand River Avenue. Mr. Purdy noted that this is acceptable. The ordinance allows for this.
4. It was requested that more glass be added to the building but due to the energy code as well as this being a bank and the need for security, they have not been able to add more windows. They will use a green tinted glass.

Mr. Cannard showed building material samples.

Commissioner Litogot asked about the traffic flow. Mr. Cannard explained the traffic flow design. It will be a "natural" traffic flow.

Commissioner Litogot stated it is a very nice building and he likes the proposed plan.

Commissioner Figurski noted that dust control measures need to be added to the Impact Assessment. Also, the additional sheet noting the number of employees and the hours of operation should be incorporated into the Impact Assessment.

Commissioner Mortensen stated this is a nice project.

Mr. Purdy stated the petitioner has addressed all of their concerns.

There was a brief discussion regarding ornamental lighting being added to the Grand River and Latson Road property lines. The petitioner noted it would not be a problem to add this. All commissioners would prefer the ornamental lights.

Ms. Huntley stated the petitioner has addressed all of their previous comments.

The call to the public was made at 7:35 with no response.

Moved by Litogot, seconded by Figurski, to recommend to the Township Board approval of a Special Use Application for a three-lane drive-thru bank and ATM noting the requirements of Article 12.2514 have been met, specifically for drive thru banks. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Moved by Litogot, seconded by Figurski, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment dated December 5, 2001 for a 3,300-sq. ft. bank facility with drive-through operations, located in Section 5, on the West Side of Latson Rd. in the Livingston Commons PUD consisting of 1.87 acres, petitioned by Comerica Bank. (PC 01-33) with the following changes:

1. Dust control measures shall be added.
2. The single sheet insert noting the hours of operation and the number of employees shall be added.

The motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Burchfield, seconded by Figurski, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Site Plan with a revision date of February 6, 2002 for a 3,300-sq. ft. bank facility with drive-through operations, located in Section 5, on the West Side of Latson Rd. in the Livingston Commons PUD consisting of 1.87 acres, petitioned by Comerica Bank. (PC 01-33) with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as recommended by motion this evening.
2. Building material samples, including the glass, as presented this evening, are satisfactory and shall be presented to the Township Board.
3. All signs shall be subject to permit requirements of the Township.
4. As demonstrated on the Site Plan, this site will not be accessed directly from Latson Road.
5. The external design and building materials shall be as set forth on the revised site plan.
6. Lighting shall be limited to 1.0 footcandles at all boundaries, except to the east, which shall be no greater than 2.4 footcandles.

7. The Planning Commission recommends the petitioner provide to Township staff for review the proposed ornamental lighting as well as the spacing for that light along the Latson Road property line.
8. Township Engineer review and approval of all plans.
9. The number of REU's shall be determined by the Township Engineer.

The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Litogot asked what the height of the building is. Mr. Cannard stated it is 20 feet high and the entry element is 27 feet high.

Vice Chairman Cahill told the petitioner that the Planning Commission appreciates them working out all of the planner's concerns prior to this evening, which allowed this hearing to move along smoothly. He appreciates the work that was done.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 2... Review of final site plan, and environmental impact assessment, for proposed 47 single-family units on 66.91 acres located on the north side of Cunningham Lake Road in Section 34 of Genoa Township, petitioned by The Terra Land Group, LLC. (PC01-25)

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

Ms. Kimberly Hiller and Mr. Thomas Dumond from Boss Engineering, Mr. David Holdwick, the developer, and Mr. Jeff Greeneisen from Terra Land Group were present to represent the petitioner.

Ms. Hiller gave a brief overview of the project. They have made the following changes / additions based on the planner's and Planning Commission's comments:

1. They have moved the Ciderbury cul-de-sac back 150 feet and added a 20-foot private drive to service Lot #'s 22, 23, 24, and 25.
2. They have removed the cul-de-sac for Lot #'s 16 – 19 and have added a private drive as well.
3. They will put \$20,000 in escrow for the development of Ciderbury Park
4. They have added a 50-foot easement to the south should this property ever be developed.
5. They have provided an asphalt sidewalk and landscaping as access to Ciderbury Park.

Ms. Hiller responded to Mr. Purdy's comments regarding the buffer along Cunningham Lake Road for Lot #'s 1, 45, and 46 as well as the accessibility of Lot #'s 30 and 31. They have not been able to accomplish the required buffer for Lot # 46 but their builder feels he can build on this site; they just need to be unique and creative. She added that they have received approval for Lot #1 and

Lot #45 with respect to the buffer. Also, they have a drainage easement as well as a 35-foot easement for driveways with respect to Lot #'s 30 and 31.

They do not have any building elevations or floor plans because these homes are going to be custom building. The builder is present this evening to address any concerns of the Planning Commission regarding this.

Regarding Mr. Purdy's request for landscape islands in the cul-de-sacs, they do not feel it is safe to have a landscape island in the Ciderbury cul-de-sac because of the 20-foot private drive on the opposite side and they wanted to be consistent, so they did not propose landscape islands in any of the cul-de-sacs.

Commissioner Brown asked the petitioner if they have reviewed the fire marshal's letter.

Commissioner Mortensen had a concern regarding the parks usability and stated the master plan should reflect the \$20,000 that is being put in escrow for the park.

Commissioner Figurski asked the petitioner when they received approval for Lot #'s 1 and 45. Ms. Hiller stated it was agreed upon at a staff meeting in June. Mr. Purdy noted that although it was discussed at a staff meeting, it does not mean it was approved.

Commissioner Litogot does not like the proposed layout. He does not like all of the easements that are going to be needed to accomplish this plan.

Mr. Purdy reviewed his letter of March 6, 2002.

He noted the setbacks from the buffers along Cunningham Lake Road for Lot #'s 1, 45 and 46. He stated the modified setbacks were not specifically approved at the last Planning Commission meeting. They should be 50 feet, but they are approximately 10 feet. He added that the Planning Commission can grant these modifications if they feel it is a hardship to the petitioner. He would prefer that the setbacks be met.

Commissioner Mortensen stated this is a nice project, but there are issues with some of the lots that need to be addressed.

Commissioner Figurski stated that when these homes are going to be built, they are going to require variances.

Mr. Greeneisen stated they are making modification to their detention ponds to provide the building with what he needs in terms of building envelopes so they will not have to receive variances for certain lots.

Mr. Purdy stated detention ponds are required to be general common areas and cannot be part of individual lots. Also, the draining easements creates difficult buildable lot sizes for Lot #'s 17 and 26. He feels they are unbuildable unless a variance is granted. He does not feel this is a good practice for the Township. Mr. Dumond stated that the builder feels these sites are building without variances. Commissioner Mortensen would like to see some proof in the form of a footprint of a home that these sites are actually buildable. Mr. Purdy added that if the lots are not buildable as proposed, then it is a self-created hardship and it is the Planning Commission's responsibility to make sure these lots are buildable.

Commissioner Mortensen stated he feels this is going to be a first-rate subdivision and he would like to work with the petitioner to have this project approved.

Mr. Dumond stated they can provide floor plans of proposed homes. They would prefer to come back in 2 weeks to provide this information.

Mr. Purdy stated a tree survey and the preservation of trees detail needs to be provided. Commissioner Brown stated he has seen some of Gordon Builder's subdivisions and he trusts them to preserve as many trees as possible. Commissioner Mortensen agrees. Mr. Archinal stated that the proposed roads are going to be built where they are shown on the plan due to the topography of this site. He feels that not much would be accomplished by requiring a tree survey. All the Township would receive would be a list of trees that will be cut down. He suggests having snow fencing be put in to show tree preservation and limits of grading. Mr. Purdy as well as all of the Commissioners agree with this suggestion.

Mr. Purdy stated a split rail fence should be used to delineate the park entry. The petitioner stated they have provided landscaping for this purpose and would prefer this to fencing. All Commissioners agree.

There was a discussion regarding the cul-de-sac on Ciderbury Road. Mr. Purdy prefers to have the landscape island. Ms. Hiller reiterated their concern for safety. Mr. Purdy stated only one canopy tree is required. There was a brief discussion regarding the landscape island and Commissioners Cahill, Burchfield, Litogot, and Figurski would prefer the island be installed. Commissioners Mortensen and Brown do not feel it is needed.

Commissioner Burchfield stated he does not feel the Planning Commission should get involved in the issue of the \$20,000 bond for the park. Mr. Purdy suggested that it be put in an account for the homeowners association. Commissioner Cahill asked if the Planning Commission should put requirements on what is to be installed in the park. Mr. Purdy stated this is in the master deed and by-laws of the subdivision.

Commissioner Figurski questioned the buildability of Lot #45. The petitioner stated they would like to keep the variance on this one so as not to have to provide a building envelope and floor plan for this site.

Commissioner Burchfield suggested trying to approve this site plan this evening and have the petitioner work with Township staff to handle the problem sites. Commissioner Cahill agreed, however, he feels after working with staff, the petitioner should then return to the Planning Commission so they can make a proper recommendation to the Township Board.

Commissioner Litogot stated the Planning Commission already told the petitioner what is required during the preliminary site plan approval and they were supposed to come back meeting these requirements and they have not. He does not like this plan at all.

Commissioner Figurski would like to see proof, in writing, of the buildability of Lot #'s 17, 26, and 45.

Commissioner Brown feels the petitioner is within the requirements of the Township except for three lots and he would like to see proof that these three lots can be built.

Commissioner Cahill feels that with some creativity and working with staff, these issues can be resolved.

The call to the public was made at 8:48 p.m.

Ms. Rona S_____ of Eggert Place asked if there is some way that the access road to this subdivision could not be Eggert Place. She suggested it being Cunningham Lake Road.

Ms. Elaine Serroca's property abuts the Ciderbury cul-de-sac. She asked if this has been moved because previously it was proposed to be 20 feet from her tennis courts. Ms. Hiller stated it has been moved.

Mr. Dan Nerwitz of Eggert Place asked if the proposed drawings will be available to the public. Mr. Archinal replied affirmatively.

Mr. John Brock stated that his lot abuts Lot #11 and the Township never notified him of this proposed subdivision. He also noted this is going to increase the traffic on the surrounding roads and these roads are already in need of repair and maintenance.

The call to the public was closed at 8:54.

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Mortensen, to table Public Hearing #2 until the Planning Commission's next meeting in two weeks. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Commissioner Mortensen asked for a five-minute break. The meeting resumed at 9:00 p.m. Ms. Hiller stated they have reviewed his letter and the 20-foot requirement has been met.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 3... Review of final site plan, and environmental impact assessment, for proposed 264-unit apartment complex located on the north side of Grand River Ave. in the Lorentzen PUD, Section 4 & 9, petitioned by Singh Development Co. (PC 00-48)

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

Mr. David Z_____ from Singh Development and Mr. Madhurkar Mahajam from Boss Engineering were present to represent the petitioner.

Mr. Z stated they have made all of the changes addressed by the planner and the Planning Commission and are requesting a final site plan approval recommendation this evening.

Mr. Purdy reviewed his letter of February 19, 2002. He stated they have more detailed requirements for the final site plan approval process.

The building setbacks need to be dimensioned on the site plan. The petitioner will comply with this request.

A performance guarantee needs to be provided to ensure construction of the service road and pathway through the Detroit Edison/Consumers Power easement. Commissioner Mortensen has concerns regarding this. Mr. Archinal noted the concerns of Commissioner Mortensen regarding the last part of this road being installed. He stated each developer has built their section of road at the time of development and now there would be just one piece left, which will be the responsibility of the last developer to this site. Commissioner Mortensen would like the Township Attorney to review this and assure the Township Board that this road will get built as well as advising the Township of our options.

Mr. Purdy stated the shared private road access agreements will need to be recorded between all of the interconnected developments. Mr. Archinal stated he would like to discuss with the petitioner the continuation of this road to the east to meet Lawson Drive.

The details on the parking areas need to be submitted as well as all parking areas to have curbs. The petitioner stated they have submitted the detailed plan for the parking and there are curbs proposed.

One street tree per 50 feet of roadway length should be provided on each side of the road. The petitioner will comply with this request.

Mr. Purdy stated the two-foot wide greenbelt between the parking areas and the sidewalk along the north side of White Horse Drive needs to be increased to accommodate the required landscaping. He would like it to be at least three to four feet wide. There was a discussion as to how this can be accomplished. Mr. Purdy suggested moving the sidewalk, moving the building, and/or moving the parking area. Mr. Mahajam feels this might be difficult to accomplish due to the utilities already being laid out. He will work on this request and determine if it can be accomplished.

Detention Basin #2 should be provided with a more natural shape. Clusters of shrubs should be planted around the rim. The petitioner will comply with this request. Mr. Purdy noted this can be handled administratively by township staff.

Samples of colors and building materials need to be submitted to the Planning Commission for review. The petitioner does not have samples of the building materials present this evening. All commissioners elected to table this request this evening due to the fact that the building materials are not present. As well as other items discussed needing finalization.

Mr. Purdy continued with review of his letter.

Detailed plans for all buildings, including the united and the clubhouse need to be submitted. The clubhouse plans are shown on Sheet #3.

A grading plan must be submitted to show limits of trees being cleared. The petitioner will comply with this request.

Ms. Huntley stated the petitioner has met all of their previous requirements.

Commissioner Burchfield noted the February 6, 2002 letter from Tetra Tech regarding the Latson Road pump station capacity.

The call to the public was made at 9:42 with no response.

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Mortensen, to table Public Hearing #3 until the conditions of the February 6, 2002 Tetra Tech and February 19, 2002 LSL letters have been met. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Mr. Archinal stated that due to the late hour, it is apparent that Public Hearing #6, Mr. Orlandini, is not going to be heard this evening. He noted that Mr. Orlandini has been before the Planning Commission a few times and is hoping to receive a recommendation this evening because he is scheduled to be heard at the ZBA tomorrow evening.

Commissioner Litogot suggested we hear Public Hearing #4 and having Public Hearings #5 and #6 come back in two weeks.

Commissioner Burchfield stated that the two applicants that will not be heard this evening should be put first and second on the agenda for the next meeting.

There was a brief discussion and it was decided that the Planning Commission would stay and hear all of the remaining petitioners.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 4... Review of site plan application, site plan, and environmental impact assessment, for proposal to amend the Oak Point PUD for proposed 7,040 sq. ft. office building located on the west side of Chilson Road, approximately 400 feet north of Brighton Road, in Section 28, petitioned by Doyle Homes. (PC 02-04)

- **Planning Commission disposition of petition**
 - A. Recommendation regarding impact assessment.
 - B. Recommendation regarding amendment to the PUD concept plan.
 - C. Recommendation regarding revised PUD agreement.

Bob and Jeff Doyle from Doyle Homes were present to represent the petitioner. This site is currently zoned residential, but it is zoned NSD in the Master Plan. They feel their proposed use is a good transition from commercial to residential.

Bob Doyle explained what they have done to be sensitive to their residential neighbors.

1. They have put the parking lot in the rear.
2. There will be a one-way traffic flow
3. They have added substantial landscaping for the parking area.
4. They have designed the building to fit in with the character of the area. They have used gabled roof and residential-type windows, all entrances are in the rear, and it is an all brick building.

Bob noted they have presented their plan to the Oak Point subdivision and the Fairways at Oak Point and neither have any objects to their project.

Mr. Purdy reviewed his letter of February 19, 2002.

The Planning Commission must make a recommendation regarding an amendment to the PUD Concept Plan as this site is currently zoned multiple family residential.

He stated the 35-foot front yard setback is not being met. He feels the setback should be increased enough to allow landscaping outside the right-of-way. Mr. Doyle stated they have met with the Livingston County Road Commission and they are satisfied with their proposed setback and landscaping. Mr. Purdy would prefer the 35-foot setback be met and in order to accomplish this, the building would have to be made smaller. There was a brief discussion regarding reducing the rear setback to five feet in order to accomplish the 35-foot front yard setback. The rear of this site abuts against the railroad tracks so all commissioners and Mr. Purdy agree to allow this. Mr. Purdy noted this must be noted in the PUD Agreement.

Mr. Purdy stated the storm water detention pond should be redesigned so as not to require fencing. It should be more of a landscape feature. There was a brief discussion and it was decided that if fencing is required, it will be made of green-colored material and will be heavily landscaped.

Ms. Huntley stated the petitioner has met all of their concerns.

The call to the public was made at 10:18 p.m. Ms. Catherine _____, president of the Fairways at Oak Point stated they have reviewed the Doyle's proposed plan and they are in favor of it. They like the parking in the rear, the proposed lighting, as well as the business entrances being at the rear of the building. They would like to show their support for this plan.

The call to the public was closed at 10:19 p.m.

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Mortensen to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment dated February 6, 2002 for a proposal to amend the Oak Point PUD for proposed 7,040 sq. ft. office building located on the west side of Chilson Road, approximately 400 feet north of Brighton Road, in Section 28, petitioned by Doyle Homes. (PC 02-04). **The motion carried unanimously.**

Moved by Burchfield, seconded by Mortensen, to recommend to the Township Board to amend the PUD concept plan to permit the site on the west side of Chilson Road (PC 02-04) be zoned NSD with a rear yard setback reduced to five feet conditioned upon:

1. The petitioner shall provide to Township staff an amended PUD agreement.

Commissioner Mortensen asked if this should be zoned OSD and not NSD. There was a brief discussion regarding the uses that are permitted in each of these districts. Mr. Doyle presented the amendments they made to Section 8.202 Neighborhood Service Permitted Uses showing what they are hoping to include as permitted uses. All commissioners agreed with the petitioner's

suggested permitted uses. Mr. Purdy noted this should be included in the PUD Agreement.

2. The attachment regarding permitted uses in the Neighborhood Service District as amended by Doyle Homes shall be added to the PUD Agreement.

The motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Mortensen, seconded by Litogot, to recommend approval to the Township Board for a revised PUD Agreement to permit a modified NSD usage on this particular site, which is shown on the attached, as well as a five-foot rear yard setback, and a 35-foot front yard setback from the existing right-of-way subject to the Township Attorney's approval. **The motion carried unanimously.**

It was agreed by all commissioners to continue with the meeting.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 5...Review of site plan application, site plan, and environmental impact assessment, for proposed 6,225 sq. ft. EMS facility, located in Section 8, on the north side of Grand Oaks Drive, just east of the existing Livingston County Road Commission Building, petitioned by the Livingston County Road Commission. (PC 02-03)

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

Mr. Michael Kennedy from Lindhout Associates Architect and Jeff Boyd from the Livingston County EMS were present to represent the petitioner.

Mr. Kennedy gave a brief overview of their proposal. He displayed the proposed floor plan colored elevations, and submitted material samples.

Mr. Purdy stated the petitioner has met all of their previous requirements.

Ms. Huntley stated the petitioner has met all of their previous requirements.

The call to the public was made at 10:40 p.m. with no response.

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Mortensen, to approve the Impact Assessment for a 6,225 sq. ft. EMS facility, located in Section 8, on the north side of Grand Oaks Drive, just east of the existing Livingston County Road Commission Building, petitioned by the Livingston County Road Commission. (PC 02-03). **The motion carried unanimously.**

Moved by Burchfield, seconded by Mortensen, to approve the Site Plan dated February 27, 2002 submitted by Lindhout Associations for a 6,225 sq. ft. EMS facility, located in Section 8, on the north side of Grand Oaks Drive, just east of

the existing Livingston County Road Commission Building, petitioned by the Livingston County Road Commission. (PC 02-03) with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as recommended by motion this evening.
2. Building materials, as presented this evening, are satisfactory and shall be presented to the Township Board.
3. REU's will be determined by Township Engineer.
4. Township Engineer review and approval of all plans.
5. Dust control measures will be added to the Site Plan and all construction plans.

The motion carried unanimously.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #6...Review of site plan application, site plan, and environmental impact assessment for a proposed 3,200 sq. ft. convenience store and office suite located on the northwest corner of Grand River and Boulevard Park, Section 9, petitioned by Joe Orlandini, Jr. (PC 01-24)

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

Joe Orlandini, Jr. of Midway Party Store was present to represent the petitioner. He has made the following changes to meet the requests and concerns of the Planning Commission and the planner.

1. The building has been reduced to 2,800 square feet.
2. There will be a three-foot rear greenbelt.
3. They have increased the greenbelt on the east to 10 feet.
4. They have added a greenbelt between the sidewalk and the parking lot in the front of the building

Commissioner Brown stated that he appreciates the petitioner's willingness to work with the Planning Commission on meeting their requests.

Mr. Purdy stated they have met all of their previous concerns, however, he suggested curbing the east entrance to the parking lot.

Ms. Huntley stated the petitioner has met all of their previous concerns.

The call to the public was made at 10:52 with no response.

Moved by Litogot, seconded by Figurski, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment dated January 2, 2002 for a proposed 3,200 sq. ft. convenience store and office suite located on the northwest corner of Grand River and Boulevard Park, Section 9, petitioned by Joe Orlandini, Jr. (PC 01-24). **The motion carried unanimously.**

Moved by Burchfield, seconded by Figurski, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Site Plan with a revision date of March 7, 2002 for a proposed 3,200 sq. ft. convenience store and office suite located on the northwest corner of Grand River and Boulevard Park, Section 9, petitioned by Joe Orlandini, Jr. (PC 01-24) with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as recommended by motion this evening.
2. Building materials as previously provided, including beige and orange brick with brown asphalt shingled roof, green framing, and colored glass without tinting, are acceptable.
3. The petitioner is required to provide a shared service drive agreement to Boulevard Drive and shared waste receptacle agreement subject to the Township Engineer approval to be recorded prior to the issuance of any land use permit.
4. The waste receptacle gate shown on the site plan must be constructed of pressure treated wood
5. Signage shown on the site plan shall be affixed to the building as shown with letters in relief being outward from the building façade.
6. The sign shall be backlit
7. The petitioner shall provide decorative lighting on the southwest and southeast corners of the property as depicted on the landscape and lighting plans with a revision date of January 22, 2002.
8. All lighting fixtures and pole mountings shall be as provided to the Planning Commission on March 5, 2002.
9. The exterior wall mounted fixtures shall be shoebox type with downward directed lighting.
10. The three-foot greenbelt running parallel to Grand River shall be made of perennial grass.
11. ZBA approval of the currently requested setback variances.
12. Four-foot radius curves be provided on the outer driveways.
13. Township Engineer review and approval of all plans prior to submission to the Township Board.
14. The wattage of the outdoor lighting shall be added to the site plan.

The motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Figurski, seconded by Litogot, to approve the minutes of March 5, 2002. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Moved by Litogot, seconded by Brown, to adjourn the meeting at 11:04 p.m. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Submitted by: Patty Thomas, Recording Secretary

Approved by: Barbara Figurski, Secretary