

GENOA TOWNSHIP  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
SEPTEMBER 13, 1999  
WORK SESSION  
6:30 P.M.  
MINUTES

The work session of the Planning Commission was called to order by Vice 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, Jim Mortensen, Jerry Joseph, Gary McCririe and Bill Litogot. Also present was Michael Archinal, Township Manager; Jeff Purdy from The Strader Group; and Melissa Talley from McNamee, Porter, & Seeley. By the end of the work session, there were numerous persons in the audience.

Items scheduled for action during the regular session of the commission were discussed. No formal action was taken.

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 Pobuda at 7:00 p.m. **Moved** by Litogot, supported by Joseph to approve the Agenda with the deletion of letters "B" and "C" in Public Hearing #1. **Motion unanimously carried.**

A call to the public was made to discuss items not on the agenda with no response. (The Board will not begin any new business after 10:00 p.m.)

- 1) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #1..REVIEW OF SPECIAL USE APPLICATION, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT, SITE PLAN APPLICATION AND SITE PLAN FOR A PROPOSED FOR A PROPOSED 3,200 SQ. FT. KENTUCKY FRIED CHICKEN RESTAURANT AT 3768 EAST GRAND RIVER, 0.9 ACRES, SECTION 05, PETITIONED BY LAWRENCE RYBO/ASHOR ASSOCIATES. (Tabled from August 13, 1999)

A. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING SPECIAL USE APPLICATION.

Mr. Ed Ashor, architect, stated that since the last meeting, they have addressed several issues. However, they are only looking for special use approval tonight.

Mr. Purdy advised the Commissioners that if a special use approval is granted, it be done with the stipulation that the project be variance free. The site plan should meet all the ordinance requirements.

Mr. Ashor stated he believed he could accomplish a variance free site plan.

Ms. Talley stated that as far as her special use comments are concerned, they have been addressed.

Commissioner McCririe asked Mr. Purdy if the 10' greenbelt on the side is acceptable.

Mr. Purdy stated that the greenbelt would be one item that would have to be changed. A full 10' of greenbelt is required.

Mr. Ashor stated that he did encroach with the car overhang on the west. If this is not acceptable, he will revise it and he won't have any car overhang on the landscaping.

Mr. Purdy noted that this parcel is not part of the PUD, but is adjacent to it.

Vice Chairman Pobuda made a call to the public at 7:09 p.m. with no response.

**Moved by Mortensen, supported by McCririe to recommend to the Township Board approval of the special use application for Kentucky Fried Chicken for a drive-through restaurant; it is further subject to review, recommendation and approval of the Impact Assessment and site plan without any variances. Motion unanimously carried.**

2) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #2...REVIEW OF A SITE PLAN APPLICATION, ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT AND SITE PLAN FOR A PROPOSED 8,000 SQ. FT. GOLF CART STORAGE FACILITY AT 4500 GOLF CLUB, SECTION 27, PETITIONED BY OAK POINTE/BOB GARBUTT. (Tabled from August 13, 1999)

A. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING IMPACT ASSESSMENT.

B. DISPOSITION OF SITE PLAN.

Mr. Bob Garbutt of Garbutt Associates introduced Mr. Don Rucker of Oak Pointe. They stated they wish to build a cart barn and looked over all of the possibilities of where it should be located. There is a low spot near the driving range which appears to be the best place. Since the last meeting, the building materials have been enhanced and additional landscaping is proposed. They wish to make the building as neighborhood friendly as possible. Mr. Garbutt presented samples of the building materials and colors. Portions of the building will have stone at the bottom with a metal stucco panel above. This will make it more aesthetically pleasing for those driving from the south and west. It will look more like the clubhouse. The panels are seamed every 18" and they are 20 gauge.

The Commissioners discussed the location of the doors. It was agreed that both doors will be moved to the north elevation so that they would not be seen from the clubhouse. A fire door, however, will be placed on the south or east.

Commissioner Joseph noted that he had received many comments from Oak Pointe residents who are not pleased with the looks of the building. He asked Mr. Garbutt if the building could have a pitched, shingled roof to better match the clubhouse?

Mr. Purdy agreed. He stated he would like to see a shingled roof, too.

Mr. Rucker agreed to a shingled, pitched roof.

Ms. Talley noted that she still needs to review the calculations for the retention area; but this could be done administratively.

Vice-Chairman Pobuda noted that some minor changes needed to be made on the site plan. The golf course is not on the north, that is the marina. The putting green needs to be revised. And the wooded area (upper right-hand corner) is not as heavily wooded as it used to be.

Vice Chairman Pobuda made a call to the public at 7:27 p.m.

Mr. Bill Langhorst of the homeowners' association asked what the minimum requirement for the pitched roof would be? He suggested the minimum be the same as what is required on the homes per the PUD.

Mr. Purdy suggested the pitch and shingles be similar to the clubhouse.

With no other comments, the call to the public was closed at 7:29 p.m.

Vice-Chairman Pobuda noted for the record receipt of a letter from 37 people of Oak Pointe stating their objection to the building materials and metal roof. He asked why this building did not go before the architectural committee at Oak Pointe?

Mr. Rucker stated that the Oak Pointe development committee was of the opinion that it was not under the jurisdiction of the architectural committee.

Mr. Langhorst stated that there is a difference in interpretation and opinions as to the responsibilities of the architectural committee.

**Moved** by Litogot, supported by Mortensen to recommend to the Township Board the approval of the Impact Assessment for Oak Pointe, dated 8/6/99. **Motion unanimously carried.**

**Moved** by McCririe, supported by Litogot to approve the site plan for Oak Pointe with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment as recommended.
2. Township engineer review and approval of all plans and specifications.
3. Materials as presented this evening are acceptable, except that the roof to the building shall be of a pitch matching the current clubhouse and have the same shingle color as on the clubhouse. Modified materials shall be available at the time of presentation to the Township Board and become the property of the township.
4. Four feet of the lower portion of the north, south and west walls shall be of stone material as shown in the drawings presented this evening and the remainder of those walls shall be of a stucco-type material on these same sides.
5. The color of the stucco-type material shall be light stone as depicted on the Morton color board as presented this evening and shall be available at the time of presentation to the Township Board.
6. The building shall only have security-type lighting with no additional site lighting.
7. There shall be, at no time, a public address system on the exterior of the building.
8. The garage doors on the west wall shall be relocated to the north side of the building.
9. All changes made by motion this evening shall be shown on revised plans prior to submission to the Township Board.

**Motion unanimously carried.**

Vice-Chairman Pobuda reminded the applicant that nothing should be done to the site until Township Board approval.

3) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #3...REVIEW OF A REQUEST BY ALAN UMSTEAD FOR A 6 FOOT HIGH FENCE PER SECTION 3.3406 OF THE GENOA TOWNSHIP ZONING ORDINANCE.

A. DISPOSITION OF UMSTEAD REQUEST.

Mr. Alan Umstead presented photographs of a fence he has constructed. He wishes to have a six-foot fence for privacy. The fence would drop to four feet as it reaches ten feet from the rear property line. He also presented a landscape plan he had drawn up by Leppek Nursery to enhance the fence. He noted that he has planted some evergreens which have been destroyed by his disgruntled neighbor.

Mr. Archinal explained that section 3.3406 states no fence within a required side or rear yard shall exceed a height of four feet, except the Planning Commission may approve "a

privacy wall up to six (6) feet high within the required side yard provided the wall does not extend beyond the front building line or more than ten (10) feet beyond the rear building line, and a minimum side yard setback of three (3) feet is provided." He believes it does not meet the 3' side yard setback.

Mr. Umstead admitted that he has not had the property surveyed, but he presented drawings showing the property lines and fence location which he believed to be accurate.

Commissioner Figurski asked if the fence would block anybody's view?

Mr. Umstead answered that any fence will block some vision. He wants the fence to allow for privacy from an antagonistic neighbor.

It was noted that Mr. Umstead came before the ZBA once for the fence. And the plans for his garage have been cancelled.

Commissioner Litogot asked when the home was going to be completed and debris cleaned up. He stated he was just out there this past weekend and he was not pleased with what he saw. He stated he would vote against this petition until the homeowner cleans up his property. He did not want to give him permission to erect anything on his property before that is accomplished.

Vice Chairman Pobuda made a call to the public at 7:52 p.m. with no response.

**Moved** by Litogot, supported by Joseph to deny the request by Alan Umstead for a six foot fence. **Motion unanimously carried.**

Mr. Archinal noted to the petitioner that they will keep the same dates for their court proceedings.

- 4) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #4...REVIEW OF A REZONING APPLICATION TO REZONE 10 ACRES FROM CE (COUNTRY ESTATES) TO RR (RURAL RESIDENTIAL) AT 4859 CROOKED LAKE ROAD, SECTION 16, PETITIONED BY KEELING/JARVIS/BOSS ENGINEERING.
  - A. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING IMPACT ASSESSMENT.
  - B. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING REZONING REQUEST.

Mr. Mike Boss of Boss Engineering introduced Mr. Ed Jarvis, son-in-law of the owner of the property, Mrs. Linda Keeling. Mr. Boss explained that Mrs. Keeling had come before the Planning Commission during a call to the public at a previous meeting and asked for their input for some type of relief from the financial burden of her property. Her husband recently passed away and her circumstances require her to go back to school. She is currently out of state. She wishes to rezone the property (two parcels, five acres each), from CE to RR. The requested district has a smaller minimum lot size of two acres/unit

creating the potential for each lot to obtain two land divisions. However, they haven't requested any lot splits at this point. She wishes to sell her house (on parcel 2A) but not the entire property as she hopes to move back. The Jarvis's own 2B. The RR rezoning is consistent with the Master Plan.

Commissioner Mortensen asked about the easement for the driveway. Is there room to put a driveway in to service 3-4 homes?

Mr. Archinal stated that in this instance (with the few homes), there is no requirement for the easement to be off the property line. "Yes," there is room for a drive.

Commissioner McCririe stated the question before the Planning Commission is whether or not the RR zoning is the proper zoning for this particular site. While the future land use map shows the township has contemplated this area to be RR, he is not in favor of looking at individual rezoning of this area. He would be in favor of looking at the entire, larger area for rezoning. He believed this to be spot zoning. If Mrs. Keeling could get some of her neighbors to join in with her, he would be in favor of looking at it. Although, they must realize that a change in zoning would change the number of livestock, horses, etc. allowed.

Mr. Boss agreed that it would be best to look at the whole area and believed it would be helpful to Mrs. Keeling if the township looked into that. However, Spring Hill has a number of parcels that are non-conforming. The rezoning is consistent with what is already developed there. This could be considered the first step in an overall rezoning.

Mr. Purdy stated the rezoning would be consistent with the Master Plan; however, he agreed with Commissioner McCririe's comments. The township may wish to consider evaluating an expanded area. The Planning Commission has the authority to initiate it. Residents would be notified and a public hearing would be held. It would be a recommendation to the Township Board.

Commissioner McCririe stated that is the direction he would like to see the Planning Commission go. This would make good planning sense.

Mr. Archinal stated the public hearing would be in October at the very earliest because of the notice requirements.

Commissioner Mortensen asked if residents in this area would be "grandfathered" for their livestock?

Mr. Purdy answered "Yes."

Ms. Talley stated the engineering meets the requirements for rezoning. They would need Health Department approval for the septic.

Vice Chairman Pobuda made a call to the public at 8:12 p.m.

Ms. Kim Mayes, 2745 Spring Hill, stated Mrs. Keeling was interested in rezoning this property a couple years ago and her husband was alive then. She doesn't want a subdivision in her back yard. She is a large parcel owner and she doesn't want the rezoning. She stated the property already has a for sale sign with two acres.

Mr. Dave Davis of Spring Hill stated that he has 10 acres and moved from Detroit two years ago in order to be in the country. This is not in his best interests. He chose the area because of the acreage. He would like to see it remain CE.

Ms. Julie Hunkle of Fishbeck Road stated she has 4 1/2 acres to the east. She, too, moved here to get into the country. She doesn't want to see two or three homes here. She also took issue with the applicant's answer on the application; specifically, section B number 3. The area does have five acre parcels.

Ms. Amanda Mickelitis stated she lives in this area and was not approached by anyone. She agreed with Ms. Hunkle's comments. She enjoys the larger parcels and doesn't want to see the houses from her yard.

With no other comments, the call to the public was closed at 8:15 p.m.

Mr. Jarvis noted that his house would be the most impacted by the rezoning. There is a patchwork of parcels in that area. Mrs. Keeling is not in a position where she can afford to have this process go on for a number of months. He hoped the Commissioners would take this into account.

Mr. Boss asked the Commissioners to keep this in perspective. The majority of the lots in that area are non-conforming. The applicant is asking to rezone to two acre lots which is consistent with the Master Plan. He didn't think they should hurt Mrs. Keeling because the township is not prepared or ready to rezone the greater whole. After approving this request, the Planning Commission could move on to the larger area.

Commissioner McCririe reiterated his position that the Planning Commission spent 18 months developing the Master Plan and this area was discussed. He believed the request should be tabled so that the Planning Commission could go forward with the rezoning process for the entire area, holding a public hearing and getting the residents' ideas.

**Moved** by Figurski, supported by Mortensen to table the Keeling rezoning request in order to have the Planning Commission proceed with a larger rezoning for the surrounding parcels, specifically the southern one-half of the southeast quarter of Section 16, at the earliest possible date, but no later than the second meeting in October, 1999.

**Motion unanimously carried.**

Mr. Boss asked if the Planning Commission would make a recommendation to consider refunding the \$2,500 application fee that Mrs. Keeling paid.

Mr. Archinal stated he felt that was an inappropriate recommendation for the Planning Commission to make.

- 5) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #5...REVIEW OF A REZONING APPLICATION TO REZONE 60 ACRES FROM RR (RURAL RESIDENTIAL) TO RPUD (RESIDENTIAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT) AT THE END OF LAWSON DRIVE, NORTH OF GRAND RIVER AVENUE, SECTION 4, PETITIONED BY ADLER ENTERPRISES COMPANY/BOSS ENGINEERING
  - A. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING IMPACT ASSESSMENT.
  - B. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING REZONING REQUEST.
  - C. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING PUD AGREEMENT.
  - D. RECOMMENDATION REGARDING CONCEPTUAL PUD SITE PLAN.

Mr. Mike Boss of Boss Engineering introduced Ms. Paula Hepp from Adler Enterprises. They are requesting to rezone 60 acres from RR to multiple residential PUD. It is adjacent to Sunrise Park. Both the Lorentzen PUD (industrial to the west) and the DelGuidice PUD (approved for apartments to the west) abut the parcel. The Lawson Drive cul-de-sac is located at the south of the property. The boulevard entrance would be in this location. The property has some regulated wetlands. The site has many natural features and is heavily wooded. They have tried to limit the impact. Some detention ponds will be constructed.

East of the main drive off of Lawson Drive are two-unit condos which would be developed to look like single-family homes, some with side-entry garages. West of the main entrance would be apartments and a clubhouse and pool area. The northern portion of the site would be undeveloped except for some walking paths. It is bordered by multiple to the west and Sunrise Park is on the east. There would be at least a 75' setback from the Sunrise Park properties and natural growth will remain to provide a natural buffer. The interior roads would be private. It is in the Master Plan at 2-4 units/acre. Four units/acre are proposed. He distributed concept sketches of the building elevations.

Mr. Boss stated that in reference to Mr. Purdy's letter, he has talked to Mr. DelGuidice and they are in agreement to allow for permanent access on the west. A through passage would be provided, not just an emergency access.

A traffic study has been done. During peak afternoon times (4:30-5:30 p.m.) cars coming out of this development to go eastbound on Grand River would have very poor service. This could be alleviated with a traffic signal. The study did not include the future interchange at Latson Road.



Mr. Boss stated he believed the project would not be overly developed. It would make a good transition for the surrounding areas and they have provided some real strong buffers.

Vice Chairman Pobuda noted that they don't have a copy of the PUD Agreement and so action could not be taken on one tonight.

Mr. Boss stated he submitted a preliminary PUD Agreement to the township.

Commissioner Joseph commented that he was concerned with the density and traffic.

Commissioner Mortensen stated he agreed with Commissioner Joseph. He also was concerned with the front yard setbacks. He would like to see a parallel plan with no PUD. How many units would there be?

Mr. Boss answered that he could triple the amount of apartments without a PUD. They are asking for a multiple PUD zoning with 4 units/acre.

Mr. Purdy stated the overall density is 4 units/gross acre, and 4.7 units/useable acre.

Commissioner McCririe asked if this development was brought to the Planning Commission as a subdivision with 4 units/acre, how many units could there be?

Mr. Purdy stated the proposed density of the project is slightly higher than the future land use map of the Master Plan. The Master Plan designates the site for 2-4 units/acre. If a typical rezoning to a zoning district were proposed, then a single-family district such as Urban Residential (UR) would be appropriate with 18,000 sq. ft. lot sizes.

Commissioner Mortensen wondered if multiple zoning would be consistent with the Master Plan. In his mind that is the parallel plan that has to be looked at (UR). He needs clear evidence that one is better than the other.

Mr. Boss stated he disagreed that the Master Plan says that. He disagreed with the planner. He felt the multiple zoning being asked for is consistent with the Master Plan.

Vice Chairman Pobuda noted that the Planning Commission has asked for a parallel plan in the past from developers.

Mr. Purdy stated the Master Plan would not support rezoning to medium density multi-family residential; it would be UR. But, the PUD would give the township some flexibility in looking at multiple family if there were some benefits to the township and community.

Vice Chairman Pobuda noted to Mr. Boss that it appeared the Commissioners want a parallel plan with UR. It is important to compare. If this is going to be a PUD, the Commissioners need to see what the trade-offs are.

Commissioner McCririe suggested to Mr. Boss that he be sure to speak with Mr. DelGuidice's partner about the road access, too.

Mr. Archinal noted that a left-turn lane will go all the way to Sunrise Park.

Mr. Purdy reviewed The Strader Group letter of 9/7/99. The duplexes should be setback 30' from the sidewalk. If not, he would like to see justification for less than 30'. They should not be less than 20'. Mr. Boss agreed to the sidewalk requirements, as well as space between the road and sidewalk for street tree plantings. The private roads must meet Road Commission standards. Regarding the side entry garages, Mr. Boss stated he will try to do all of them this way. He will have to work on it and see what can be done.

Commissioner McCririe suggested that when they come back for another review, they provide photographs of similar developments.

Vice Chairman Pobuda noted that he is always looking at road widths in developments.

Ms. Talley reviewed the McNamee, Porter & Seeley letter of 9/8/99. They will need to contact MDOT for accel/decel lanes; revise the traffic study if the DelGuidice connection is made; drainage calculations are needed; and they need to be aware of the connection fees.

Vice Chairman Pobuda made a call to the public at 9:12 p.m

Ms. Elaine Grote, 612 Sunrise Park Drive, stated she is the President of the homeowners' association. She reviewed their letter, dated 9/13/99, which outlined their concerns with this development. She stated they have been asking for a traffic light and have been told that it would be impossible because it would stop traffic on the expressway. She didn't feel a traffic light was likely. Also, they are a lake-front community, and they are concerned with trespassers. They would request a 6' high fence or a 200' setback with a berm and plantings. They are concerned with their property values. Also, there are school bus stop concerns. The walking path could upset the wetlands. The wetlands are vital to Lake Chemung. She stated she didn't envy the Commissioners' job and didn't know how they kept up with all the development that is going on. But she hoped they would keep in mind the wishes of the residents who are already living here. They are against the rezoning.

Ms. Sherry Swabs, 6478 Sunrise Park, stated she is very concerned with the density and traffic, too. It is already very difficult to make a left-hand turn onto Grand River. She couldn't even conceive 600 more automobiles in the area.

Mr. Jim Lafferty noted that the traffic does not even consider the Wal-Mart and Meijer stores.

Mr. Dave Schwepp, 648 Sunrise Park, asked if the Commissioners realize how many trucks come out of Lawson Drive every day?

Mr. James Litton, 792 Sunrise Park, asked why there are survey stakes on Sunrise Park private property?

Ms. Talley stated stakes for the water expansion should be on Grand River.

Mr. Archinal stated he will look into why they are there and what they are for.

Ms. Patty Jacobs Warner, 1030 Sunrise Park, stated the property is very hilly. Will there be run-off from the construction? Can it be deterred?

Ms. Talley stated the developer has plans showing how the storm water will be handled. During construction they will be required to put up sedimentation fences for the run-off.

Mr. Harry Arnold, 647 Sunrise Park, voiced his concern with the possibility that sometime in the future, the developer decides to develop the northern part of the parcel and increases the density. He stated it worried him. He is in favor of a fence.

Vice Chairman Pobuda noted that the PUD Agreement would limit the "what, when, and how" of the development.

Mr. Purdy stated that a PUD Agreement could include that deed restrictions are placed on the property.

Mr. Steve Flarinen, 873 Sunrise Park, stated he was a little confused. Is the parcel currently zoned RR? Will it be UR?

Commissioner McCririe answered that when the Master Plan was reviewed, this area was discussed. There were several meetings. The Master Plan land use map shows this area with 2-4 units/acre. A question that has to be answered is if now is the appropriate time for that zoning to be on the parcel. He noted that it is probably a foregone conclusion that this area will see 2-4 units/acre.

Mr. John Warner, 1030 Sunrise Park, voiced his concern about the wildlife. Is a wildlife impact study planned?

Ms. Swabs stated she didn't want to see a 6' fence. She sees deer and other wildlife now.

Mrs. DeGeorge of Sunrise Park Drive asked if there was going to be a left-hand turn lane going into Sunrise Park?

Mr. Archinal answered "Yes." He has the drawings.

Mr. Richard Swanson, 699 Sunrise Park, asked about the source of the development's water, wells or City water?

Ms. Talley stated there is currently a water main on Lawson Drive. It would be extended to the north to serve the development. Some connections would be made to the west to the DelGuidice property. She is not aware of any plan to bring water to Sunrise Park.

Ms. Elizabeth Swanson, 699 Sunrise Park, stated that these residents will not only have automobiles, but they will have boats. The lake is already over-crowded with boats.

Vice Chairman Pobuda noted that the Commission has two residents who live in that area and are well aware of the situation. With no other comments, he closed the call to the public at 9:32 p.m.

Mr. Purdy suggested to Mr. Boss that if they do a road connection to the west, they might consider changing the road lay-out.

Mr. Boss thanked the Commissioners for their input and asked to be tabled.

**Moved** by Figurski, supported by McCririe to table the rezoning request of Adler Enterprises at the request of the petitioner. **Motion unanimously carried.**

Commissioner McCririe noted to the residents that they will probably not receive any new notices in the mail about this petition. They will have to call the township or watch for the notices in the newspaper.

The meeting was recessed at 9:35 p.m. and reconvened at 9:40 p.m.

6) OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #6...REVIEW OF A REVISED SITE PLAN FOR A PROPOSED ADDITION OF CAR PREP BAYS AT 5000 EAST GRAND RIVER, PETITIONED BY CHAMPION CHEVROLET.

A. DISPOSITION OF REVISED SITE PLAN.

Mr. Stan Schafer of Schafer Construction, Inc. introduced Mr. Len Nadolski from Champion Chevrolet. Mr. Schafer explained that they had received approval for an addition for car prepping. They recently discovered they could add 364 sq. ft. more to be used for storage for a snowplow, used tires, oil dry and ice melt. They would like to have all of this in an enclosed area.

Commissioner Figurski noted that the applicant will be coming before the ZBA. She voiced her concern with voting on something that will be in front of the ZBA, too.

Commissioner McCririe noted that the Planning Commission has, at times in the past, made recommendations to the ZBA. He didn't feel there should be any concern on her part.

Commissioner Litogot asked if they will solve the problem by having this building?

Mr. Nadolski answered "Yes." And they will restripe the area.

Commissioner Litogot asked if the cars are supposed to be double-parked by the fence?

Mr. Schafer noted the cars are part of inventory, on display.

Commissioner Joseph asked if the Commissioners talked about requiring a sidewalk at the last meeting? The Commissioners have been pretty consistent with requiring them.

Mr. Purdy stated the sidewalk requirement was an oversight in his last review.

Mr. Nadolski noted that would be very costly, and the water will be coming through which would mean tearing up any sidewalk.

Commissioner McCririe noted that Wilson Marine had to post bond for a sidewalk for the same reason. The Planning Commission has been requiring it for all projects along Grand River. He would be reluctant to deviate from the requirement.

The other Commissioners voiced their agreement that a sidewalk or a bond for one should be required. The petitioner agreed.

Mr. Purdy also noted that two more evergreens are needed due to this new addition.

Ms. Talley noted that the connection fees will be increased with the new addition.

Vice Chairman Pobuda made a call to the public at 9:53 p.m. with no response.

**Moved** by McCririe, supported by Litogot to approve the revised site plan for Champion Chevrolet with the following conditions:

1. Township Board approval of the Impact Assessment.
2. Township engineer review and approval of all plans and specifications.
3. All banners currently on the fence shall be removed immediately and no banners shall reappear at any time.
4. The materials and colors for the expansion shall match the materials and colors contained on the existing building.
5. Petitioner acknowledges and accepts the amount of \$3,100/REU for connection to the sanitary sewer for a total amount to be determined by the township engineer and staff pursuant to the township schedule of

- costs and fees.
6. Petitioner shall provide five evergreen trees to screen the overhead doors from I-96 which shall appear on the plan prior to submission to the Township Board.
  7. Petitioner shall cooperate with the township for the needed possible easements for the installation of municipal water along their Grand River frontage.
  8. Petitioner shall sign the application for site plan review.
  9. If there is now, or will be in the future, a water softener used on the site, it shall not be connected to the sanitary sewer system and shall only utilize potassium.
  10. The bays shall only be used for car prepping.
  11. Petitioner shall install and/or bond for the installation of the sidewalk along Grand River with plans approved by the township engineer.

**Motion unanimously carried.**

#### ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

There was no Planner's Report.

**Moved** by Litogot, supported by McCrie to approve the minutes of the August 23, 1999 meeting with two minor changes on pages 5 and 9. **Motion unanimously carried.**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:59 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Dia M. Moulton  
Recording Secretary