

GENOA TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
WORK SESSION  
July 31, 2000  
6:30 P.M.  
**MINUTES**

The work session of the Planning Commission was called to order by Chairman Don Pobuda at 6:30 p.m. The following commission members were present constituting a quorum for transaction of business: Don Pobuda, Barbara Figurski, Jerrold Joseph, John Cahill, Gary McCririe, and Ken Burchfield. Also present was Michael Archinal, Township Manager; Jeff Purdy from Langworthy, Strader, LeBlance & Associates, Inc.; and Melissa Talley 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 Chairman Don Pobuda at 7:10 p.m.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

**Moved** by McCririe, seconded by Figurski to approve the Agenda with the following change:

1. Open Public Hearing #2 add:
  - C: Recommendation regarding concept plan
  - D: Recommendation regarding PUD Agreement

**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. Chairman Pobuda noted that the Board will not begin any new business after 10:00 p.m.

**OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #1...Review of a site plan and environmental impact assessment for site improvements to the Genoa-Oceola wastewater treatment plant, located off Chilson Road, petitioned by the Genoa-Oceola Sewer Authority. (PC 00-27) Tabled from 7-24-00 meeting.**

**Planning Commission disposition of Genoa-Oceola petition**

- A: Recommendation regarding impact assessment.
- B: Disposition of site plan.

Melissa Talley from Tetra Tech, MPS presented the proposed materials and colors for the Genoa-Oceola wastewater treatment plant. It will be split face block and will be tan in color. There will also be single score concrete block. There will be clay-colored vinyl siding on one building. The roof will be a standing seam roof with hemlock green metal shingles. The dumpster enclosure will be made out of the same material shown tonight.

The call to the public was made with no response.

**Moved** by Figurski, seconded by Cahill to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment dated June 9, 2000 for site improvements to the Genoa-Oceola wastewater treatment plant, located off Chilson Road, petitioned by the Genoa-Oceola Sewer Authority. **The motion carried unanimously.**

**Moved** by McCririe, seconded by Cahill to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Site Plan for site improvements to the Genoa-Oceola wastewater treatment plant, located off Chilson Road, petitioned by the Genoa-Oceola Sewer Authority with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as recommended by motion this evening.
2. Township Engineer review and approval of all plans.
3. All material and colors as presented this evening are acceptable and shall be presented at the time of submittal to the Township Board and become the property of the township.
4. Parking as proposed on the plan is satisfactory.
5. All lighting fixtures shall be a maximum of 15-feet tall and shall be a shoebox style
6. A ramp shall be installed from the parking lot to the service building.
7. All drawings will be signed and sealed by an architect.
8. The garbage enclosure shall be the same materials as the buildings.

**The motion carried unanimously.**

**OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #2.....Review of a site plan application, environmental impact assessment, and site plan for a proposed amendment to Planned Unit Development to allow mixed uses as allowed under mixed use Planned Unit Development for property located on the south side of Grand River at the I-96 Lake Chemung interchange, Section 09, petitioned by Weiss Properties. (PC 00-20) Tabled from 6-12-00, 6-24-00 meetings**

**Planning Commission disposition of Weiss petition**

- A. Recommendation regarding impact assessment.
- B. Recommendation regarding PUD amendment request.
- C: Recommendation regarding concept plan
- D: Recommendation regarding PUD Agreement

Chairman Pobuda excused Commissioner Burchfield based upon his comments made the last time this petitioner came before the Planning Commission regarding his position of professional responsibility to another client. Commissioner Burchfield feels this would be inappropriate for both the Township and the petitioner.

Commissioner Burchfield was excused at 7:20 p.m.

Harvey Weiss of Weiss Properties was there to represent this project. The following people were also present:

Jeannie Jones – Owner of Brighton Honda  
David Beschke of Equinox – Project Engineer  
Doug Hamborsky – Architecture

Mr. Weiss stated there have been four or five sub committee meetings to try and resolve all of the issues. They all worked very hard in an attempt to make it a win-win project. He is prepared to answer any questions and comments. He reviewed his response to Langworthy, Strader, LeBlance & Associates, Inc.'s letter of July 21, 2000. All of the modifications are included in the amended draft dated July 20, 2000 with the exception of three items:

#5. At this time, MDOT is not prepared to authorize a traffic signal at this location. They indicated after all users were in place then they would consider the traffic light. Mr. Weiss presented the letter from MDOT to the Planning Commission. It was agreed that if, at a later date, MDOT does approve the traffic light, they (petitioner) will pay for any necessary studies, data collection and installation of the traffic light.

#12. There was a discussion regarding the outdoor PA system. It was decided to add the following language to Section 2.7 of the PUD: "All exterior PA systems shall be prohibited and....."

#13. There was a detailed discussion regarding the signage. Commissioner McCririe stated the car dealerships want similar wall signs as opposed to monument signs. Mr. Weiss stated the signage would be different for the dealerships as opposed to other businesses on this site. Mr. Doug Hamborsky showed the proposed wall signs for I-96. There will be monument signs along Grand River for Mazda, Honda, and the car wash. Mr. Purdy is not comfortable with 20-foot freestanding signs along I-96. There was another detailed discussion. If the petitioner is allowed larger wall signs on the dealerships, they agreed to no monument signs along the I-96 freeway. Commissioner Joseph asked what the compromise is if we are letting them have larger signs. Chairman Pobuda stated the compromise is a wider greenbelt along I-96, and the applicant will pay for the installation of the traffic light if approved by MDOT. Mr.

Hamborsky asked since they are allowed 300 square feet total signage for the front and the back, can they distribute it as they wish? i.e. 100 feet in the front, and 200 feet in the back. Mr. Weiss stated Honda is very strict with what they allow for signage. This proposed sign has been approved by Honda. Mr. Weiss suggested the Honda dealership have a 180 square foot sign on the front and a 100 square foot sign on the back and the Mazda dealership to have a 100 square foot sign on the front and a 125 square foot sign on the back. Commissioner McCririe doesn't have a problem with the front of the Mazda or the Honda, but he does not like the large "Service Center" sign on the Honda dealership. Commissioner Figurski agrees. Mr. Weiss stated the "Service Center" sign is a standard sign that comes from Honda. Ms. Jones will try to get a smaller sign, but she is not sure if Honda makes a smaller sign. Chairman Pobuda stated he does not feel that Honda is not inclined to change the size of the "Service Center" sign. Mr. Weiss stated they are still under the 600 square foot total for both buildings. Commissioner Joseph stated he is not opposed to being flexible, but he feels we should look at all of the issues and then negotiate from there to see what is benefiting the Township. Commissioner Cahill agrees with Commissioner Joseph. Chairman Pobuda decided to put the signage issue on hold for now.

Mr. Purdy stated he has prepared a revised site plan review that incorporated the discussions at meetings with the applicant over the past several months since the Planning Commission has originally held a public hearing on this PUD. His review also contains concerns of final site plan issues. He will not be addressing those this evening because we are not reviewing the site plan tonight. Mr. Purdy reviewed his concerns with the revised PUD Agreement:

Page 3, Section 2.5 – Change the language of the second to last sentence to read "...to expand that limitation, which approval by the Township shall not be unreasonably withheld."

Page 4, Section 2.7 – Mr. Purdy suggested deleting "(and similar display-oriented businesses)". Mr. Weiss stated there is no way to determine who is going to move into this site. It was agreed at the meetings that there would be no outdoor storage at the "out lots". Chairman Pobuda stated the language will remain as it is.

Page 5, Section 6.2 – Add to the first sentence "...the ordinance and the Township zoning ordinance and the Grand River.....".

Page 7, Section 9.4 – Delete. The petitioner agreed.

Page 10, Paragraph "u" – Mr. Purdy feels this paragraph can be deleted and language can be added to Paragraph "a" stating "except as provided for in Section 2.5 of this agreement." There was a discussion regarding the 60,000 square foot building limit.

Commissioner Cahill feels the last sentence in Section 2.5 is a threat to the Township. Mr. Weiss stated there is no intent to threaten the Township. Mr. Purdy stated that language is in other PUD Agreements. Mr. Weiss agreed to delete "...which approval by the Township shall not be unreasonably withheld, delayed, or denied."

Page 10, Paragraph “bb” – Delete “drive in”.

Page 10, Paragraph “cc” – Change the language to read “Similar uses of the same nature or class as those listed herein as determined by the Planning Commission based on the standards of Section 3.05 of the Zoning Ordinance.” The petition will comply.

Commissioner Joseph feels “authorized” should be changed to “approved” on Page 5, Section 4.1. The petitioner will comply.

Page 5, Section 4.2 – Commissioner Joseph suggested taking out “with a commercial use”. Mr. Weiss stated his concern with that. Industrial is a much harder use. There is more wear and tear on their road, etc. After a discussion it was decided to use the language “commercial/office”. Commissioner Joseph asked if there is an agreement with Reuland Electric? Mr. Weiss explained if the light is installed, Reuland’s employees will be able to use it to enter and exit their facility.

Page 6, Section 7.1 - Commissioner Joseph asked what is the effect of the façade. Mr. Weiss stated the intent is for a high-level façade. He added this language was taken from other PUD’s approved by the Township. He feels when the Planning Commission sees the plans, they will be very pleased.

Page 6, Section 7.3 – Commissioner Joseph feels the entire parcel is going to be paved. He does not feel that this site is preserving any of the natural features. Commissioner Cahill agreed with this. Commissioner McCririe stated he has visited the site and does not feel that many of the trees are worthy of preservation. Commissioner Cahill asked Mr. Purdy if there are natural features worth preserving. Mr. Purdy stated there are some trees that appear to be in pretty good condition and some that were in poor condition.

Page 6, Section 8.1 – Commissioner Joseph suggested deleting “...commercial and residential..”.

Ms. Jones stated she is very excited about this project. They are very willing to work with the Planning Commission. They have spent a lot of time on the trees and the signage. She respects what the Planning Commission is trying to accomplish.

Mr. David Beschke gave a brief overview of the site.

1. It is on 24 acres.
2. There are no existing wetlands.
3. He does not feel that the existing trees are worth saving. He would prefer to grade the site and plant new greenery.
4. The primary access would be lined up with Lawson Road.
5. He reviewed the proposed car wash area and showed what they have done to meet the Township’s requirements as well as make the building aesthetically pleasing from Grand River.

6. He also reviewed the proposed auto dealership area. He pointed out that he would like the Planning Commission to consider the use of each site when considering the signage approval.
7. The detention area will provide a screen off of I-96.
8. They will plant one tree per 40 feet of frontage along Grand River and I-96.
9. They have provided additional landscaping around the stocked parked cars.
10. The dumpsters are on the back side of the site and screened.
11. Fire hydrants will be installed.
12. The roadway is 30-feet wide, curbed and contains a left turn lane.
13. They have added a 20-foot greenbelt along the service drive. This is not required for a service drive.
14. Twenty percent of open space is required; they have 22 percent. There is no more than 75 percent impervious surface allowed; they are at 72 percent.

Chairman Pobuda asked what compromises have been made by the petitioner. Mr. Beschke stated the following:

1. They are giving up access from Beck Boulevard.
2. The businesses have been moved back from Grand River.
3. They have installed the service drive to avoid numerous entrances.
4. They have provided more landscaping.
5. They have enhanced the detention pond.
6. They will grant access to their neighbor to their site if the traffic light is installed.

Commissioner Cahill asked what is considered open space. Mr. Beschke stated the exterior boundary and one-half of the detention area is allowed to be considered for open space. Mr. Purdy stated they have met the requirements for the concept plan. It will be confirmed when the final site plan is reviewed.

Commissioner Figurski asked what is the distance from Grand River to the parking lot. Mr. Beschke stated it is 50 feet.

Commissioner Joseph asked how far back the self-serve car wash is from Grand River. Mr. Beschke stated it is 300 feet from the center of Grand River.

Commissioner McCririe stated the Township's experience with Mr. Weiss in the past has been nothing but outstanding. He has compromised with uses on the site. They have given up gas stations and fast food restaurants, which are the best ways to maximize your profit. In the sub committee meetings, the negotiation process was very pleasant and positive. He feels that this is going to be something that the Township can be proud of.

Mr. Hamborsky gave an overview of the three proposed structures. The two auto dealerships and the car wash. He showed samples of the proposed brick and metal materials. He handed out artistic color renditions of the proposed buildings. He stated the design is very contemporary and the materials are state-of-the-art.

Chairman Pobuda asked if this is a new design for Honda. Ms. Jones stated Honda has a corporate image that she must follow. They are building new dealerships with this new corporate image. She added that the Mazda/Daewoo building was designed by them. They do not have a corporate image.

The signage under "Service Center" that reads "breaks repair, oil, gears, engine, tune ups" as reflected on the artists rendition will not be on the building.

Commissioner Joseph does not feel that these are earthen tones. Mr. Purdy stated the architecture is approved at the final site plan state. It will not be addressed tonight but he would like to see something more of an earthen tone than just off white. Ms. Jones does not feel the beiges and browns will not compliment the blue on the Honda building. Commissioner Cahill stated he is thinking of the surrounding buildings. How does this blend in with them? He agrees with Commissioner Joseph. Mr. Weiss reiterated they do not have much flexibility with Honda, but they do have some flexibility with Mazda/Daewoo.

Mr. Purdy reviewed his outstanding issues with regard to the conceptual PUD:

1. He feels the one access point and the installation of the traffic light is safe and convenient.
2. The site is being served by sewer and water.
3. He feels the Planning Commission will like the detention pond and the landscaping.
4. He feels there are significant natural features that are not being preserved. Commissioner Joseph asked Mr. Purdy what has changed since he stated in January that he does not feel this is a good use for this site. Mr. Purdy stated he wanted to make sure this area wasn't going to be used for big box retailers, gas stations, or drive thru restaurants. The Township wants to keep those types of uses west of Latson Road. Commissioner Joseph stated Mr. Purdy stated in his corridor plan from January, he felt the best use of this site would be for office. There was a discussion regarding the changes that were made to that document in January. Commissioner McCririe stated he disagreed with Mr. Purdy when he made that statement in January. The ZBA, Township Board, and Planning Commission agreed on a mixed use PUD for this parcel and agreed to rezone the master plan for this site.

Commissioner Joseph asked what the site was going to look like in 20 years. Mr. Weiss stated he will maintain his property. It will look as it does today with natural wear and tear. He suggested the Planning Commission look at his property on the corner of Old US23 and Grand River in Brighton. This developed site is over ten years old.

Mr. Purdy stated the petitioner meets the 20 percent open space requirement.

Mr. Purdy stated the Planning Commission must make a determination on the requested reduction to the parking lot setback and greenbelt requirement along I-96 and

the service drive. The petitioner asked for the 10-foot setback because the greenbelt has an average of 20 feet and where it is 10 feet, they have added 50 percent more greenery. Mr. Weiss feels that site circulation is the most important, but he does agree with Mr. Purdy. He suggests planting a tree that grows up and not out. Mr. Beschke stated he can get the correct landscaping that will not encroach the view. Commissioner McCririe agrees with Mr. Beschke. There was a discussion on how the petitioner could meet the setback. Mr. Purdy suggested tightening the lot of the car wash site. Mr. Beschke stated there is no requirement for a 20-foot greenbelt on this service drive. They have only gone below 20 feet on that one small curve. He does not feel that adding five feet of green space outweighs making the parking area smaller.

Mr. Purdy stated drives off the service road need to be separated at least 150 feet from Grand River. The petitioner will comply.

There was a discussion regarding Section 3.4 of the PUD. Who should petition MDOT for the traffic signal? It was decided that the petitioner will work on this in time for the Township Board meeting. Mr. Weiss reiterated that they do want the traffic signal there and suggested the Township send a letter to MDOT.

Ms. Talley reviewed her letter of June 6, 2000. She stated most of her details will come at the final site plan portion of this petition.

1. There are adequate utilities in the area for this site.
2. They will need a cross section for the bike path, access drive, curbing, etc. The petitioner will comply.
3. An offsite easement will be needed for the retention center. The petitioner will comply.
4. The water from the car wash should not discharge into the sanitary sewer system. As stated in Section 8.3 of the PUD, the car wash will recycle its rinse water to limit the sodium released to meet Township and State standards.
5. When each site plan comes before the Planning Commission, each REU will be determined and assessed at that time.

Chairman Pobuda stated the following issues in regards to signage still need to be discussed:

1. Monument signs along Grand River.
2. Monument signs along I-96.
3. 20-foot pole signs on the underdeveloped part of the property.

Commissioner Cahill feels there should be more landscaping with regards to trees.

Commissioner Cahill asked if fencing has been addressed. Mr. Weiss stated there is no fencing proposed. Commissioner Cahill would like to see a provision stating fencing is not being proposed. The petitioner will comply.

Commissioner Cahill stated he would like to see more landscaping throughout the parking lot. This will be addressed at the final site plan approval.

Commissioner Joseph asked about run off. The site is not proposed with curbs at this time. Ms. Talley stated this will be addressed at the final site plan approval.

The call to the public was made at 10:20 p.m.

Mr. Bill Walsh of Reuland Electric stated he appreciates what the Planning Commission and the petitioner are doing to try to satisfy his needs. Safety is very key to Reuland Electric. He reiterated his request for an access drive to the traffic light. He is pleased that the manual car wash will be closed at the same time as the automatic car wash. He asked that the petitioner watch for the run off along the property line so as not to pollute the area. He asked about the lighting for the car wash. Chairman Pobuda stated this will be discussed at the final site plan approval. He asked the Planning Commission to approve the access road between the two sites to allow his employees to get onto Grand River at the traffic light. Chairman Pobuda stated this has been addressed in the PUD, but this needs to be addressed between Weiss Properties and Reuland Electric.

The call to the public was closed at 10:33.

The petitioner and the Commissioners returned to the subject of signage. Ms. Jones reiterated she will do everything in her power to work with Honda on the signage. Mr. Purdy would prefer additional signs on the backs of the buildings as opposed to 20-foot signs along I-96. Commissioner McCrie disagrees. He feels that a tasteful monument sign is appropriate for the I-96 side. He is opposed to the lit up signs on the backs of buildings. Mr. Weiss stated they have provided for either/or type of signage in the PUD not knowing who the users are going to be in that part of the site. Commissioner Cahill asked if every user is going to have a sign along I-96. Mr. Weiss stated signs will be reserved for larger users with highway frontage. Commissioner Cahill stated he would not be opposed to users with highway frontage having a sign. He would like the Planning Commission to have the discretion. He suggested adding language such as "The petitioner may request signing along I-96 at the time of final site plan approval at the discretion of the Planning Commission". Mr. Weiss asked for some sign parameters for the petitioners to work with. There was a discussion as to what size and number of signs will be allowed for I-96. Commissioner Joseph feels the signs should be on the buildings only. It was decided there would be no more than two building signs of no more than 100 square feet of channel letters and no more than two monument signs not more than 20-feet tall and 200 square feet. Mr. Weiss asked if the monument sign for the entire site along Grand River is acceptable. Mr. Purdy stated it should be 15 feet. The petitioner will comply.

Commissioner Cahill is in favor of this project.

Commissioner Joseph is not in favor of this project. He does not feel it is the proper use of the site. He feels it will appear to be a sea of cars and asphalt paving. He does not feel the buildings are in compliance with the Township ordinance. He does not like this use for this site as an entrance into the Township. He feels it will cause many traffic problems. He does not feel it meets Section 10.602 of the ordinance, specifically B, F, and G.

Commissioner Figurski does not feel it is the proper use for this property. There is so much blacktop. She feels it will cause traffic problems and there is no guarantee that a traffic light will ever be installed.

**Moved** by McCririe, seconded by Cahill to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment dated July 26, 2000 by Equinox as presented for a proposed amendment to Planned Unit Development to allow mixed uses as allowed under mixed use Planned Unit Development for property located on the south side of Grand River at the I-96 Lake Chemung interchange, Section 09, petitioned by Weiss Properties. (PC 00-20) with the following condition:

1. The attachment needs to be presented before the Township Board.

**The motion carried (McCririe–Y; Joseph–N; Cahill–Y; Figurski–N; Pobuda–Y).**

**Moved** by McCririe, seconded by Cahill, to recommend to the Township Board approval to amend the PUD from OS to GC for the 24 acres as requested. **The motion carried (McCririe–Y; Joseph–N; Cahill–Y; Figurski–N; Pobuda–Y).**

**Moved** by McCririe, seconded by Cahill to recommend to the Township Board approval of the concept plan dated July 26, 2000 with the latest revision and attachments be presented to the Township Board with the following conditions:

1. Dust control measures shall be on Page 2.
2. Provided the final site plan complies with the PUD agreement and ordinance standards.

**The motion carried (McCririe–Y; Joseph–N; Cahill–Y; Figurski–N; Pobuda–Y).**

**Moved** by McCririe, seconded by Cahill to recommend to the Township Board approval of the revised PUD dated July 20, 2000 with the following conditions:

1. Page 3, Section 2.5 - Delete "...which approval by the Township shall not be unreasonably withheld, delayed, or denied."
2. Page 4, Section 2.7 – Add "All exterior PA systems shall be prohibited and....."
3. Page 5, Section 3.4 – Add "If, at a later date, MDOT does approve the traffic light, the petitioner will pay for any necessary studies, data collection and installation of the traffic light".
4. Section 6.2 – Add "...the ordinance and the Township ordinance and the Grand River Corridor.....".
5. Page 6, Section 8.1 – Delete "...commercial and residential..".
6. Section 9.4 shall be deleted.
7. Under **Permitted Uses** – Any portion that has "as amended" shall be stricken.

8. Section "u" shall be deleted.
9. Section "bb" shall be modified to take out "drive in"
10. Page 10, Paragraph "cc" – Change the language to read "Similar uses of the same nature or class as those listed herein as determined by the Planning Commission based on the standards of Section 3.05 of the Zoning Ordinance."
11. Paragraph "a" - "...except as provided for in Section 2.5 of this agreement."
12. A provision shall be added that states, "Driveways off of the service drive shall be a minimum of 15 feet from the Grand River right of way".
13. A provision shall be added that states, "There shall be no fencing within the PUD".
14. Signage – The following language shall be added "There would be no more than two building signs of no more than 100 square feet of channel letters and no more than two monument signs not more than 20-feet tall and 200 square feet".
15. The entry sign into the development shall be no higher than 15 feet below the peak by 16 feet wide as depicted on the plan.
16. Page 6, Section 7.2 – Add "Exterior banners or other temporary exterior advertising signs shall be prohibited except for occasional temporary promotions or events, as may be approved by the Township Manager subject to Section 8.0602S of the Township ordinance.
17. There shall be no pole signs within the development.
18. Subject to Township Attorney review and approval of the documentation.

**The motion carried (McCririe–Y; Joseph–N; Cahill–Y; Figurski–N; Pobuda–Y).**

#### Member Discussion

Commissioner McCririe stated he feels everyone showed a great level of cooperation tonight. He feels the Planning Commission accomplished a lot tonight and appreciates everyone's efforts.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:20 p.m.

Submitted by: Patty Thomas, Recording Secretary

Signed by: Barbara Figurski, Secretary