GENOA CHARTER TOWNSHIP PLANNING COMMISSION PUBLIC HEARING APRIL 11, 2022 6:30 P.M. MINUTES

<u>CALL TO ORDER:</u> Chairman Grajek called the meeting of the Genoa Charter Township Planning Commission to order at 6:30 p.m. Present were Chris Grajek, Jim Mortensen, Marianne McCreary, Glynis McBain, Jeff Dhaenens, and Tim Chouinard. Absent was Eric Rauch. Also present was Kelly VanMarter, Community Development Director/Asst. Township Manager, Brian Borden of Safebuilt, and Shelby Byrne of Tetra Tech. There were approximately 100 people in the audience.

<u>PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:</u> The pledge of allegiance was recited.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA:

Moved by Commissioner McCreary, seconded by Commissioner Mortensen, to approve the agenda as presented. **The motion carried unanimously**.

<u>DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST:</u> Commission McBain stated she has a residence in close proximity to the property for Open Public Hearing #1 so she cannot deliberate or vote on this item.

Moved by Commissioner McBain, seconded by Commissioner Dhaenens to recuse herself from Open Public Hearing #1. **The motion carried unanimously.**

<u>CALL TO THE PUBLIC:</u> The call to the public was made at 6:32 pm with no response.

OLD BUSINESS:

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #1... Consideration of two special use applications, environmental impact assessment and site plan for a proposed 19,843 sq. ft. church and sports field in the Low Density Residential (LDR) district and a special land use for site grading and storage within the wetland protection setback located at 3850 Golf Club Road, southwest corner of Golf Club Road and Latson Road. The request is petitioned by Bible Baptist Church.

- A. Recommendation of Special Use Application (Church)
- B. Recommendation of Special Use Application (Grading in wetland protection setback)
- C. Recommendation of Environmental Impact Assessment (3-16-22)
- D. Recommendation of Site Plan (3-16-22)

Mr. Scott Tousignant of Boss Engineering and Mr. Tim Christoson, the pastor of Bible Baptist Church, were present.

Mr. Christoson provided a review of their church and the proposed project. They are meeting the setback requirements of the ordinance by almost double. They have met with Township Staff and the neighboring property owners. These meetings have resulted in some changes to the plan. They will be providing a buffer of mature trees between both the building and the parking lot and the neighbors, which is now double what is required. Their lights will be on timers, and they have updated the outside building materials, and they will be able to contain the sound of the worship within the building by using specific building materials. There will also be an outdoor walking trail, serene lakeside areas and grassy fields, all of which will be available to be used by people who are and are not members of their church.

Mr. Tousignant reviewed the site plan, which included the size of the lot, buildable portion, the topography, drainage, vegetation, the access drive on the site, onsite utilities, etc. He also described the reasons why they are seeking a Special Use Application for the grading in wetland protection setback, noting they will not be entering into the wetlands themselves, just within the setback. He showed renderings and a colored rendering of the north side (front) of the building, reiterating Mr. Christoson's statement that they have changed the outside facade after meeting with their neighbors.

Chairman Grajek noted there were concerns from the neighbors regarding the drainage. Mr. Tousignant stated the drainage is being improved on the south side of the site.

Commission McCreary asked if the proposed expansion could be the first church location. Both Mr. Tousignant and Mr. Christoson explained their reasons for placing the first building and the parking lot in its proposed location.

Mr. Tousignant stated a traffic study was completed. They did one study with Phase I, which requires an acceleration lane, a deceleration lane as well as the extension of a left turn lane. With Phase II, they would need to add a designated right turn lane out of their site. Additionally, the level of service at the light would decrease on Sunday peak times when the church was letting out. The Livingston County Road Commission stated they can mitigate that service level decrease by changing the timing of the lights for that time period. The Church would pay for these improvements and changes.

Mr. Borden explained the steps of the review and approval process for this project. He then reviewed his letter dated April 7, 2022.

- In order to find that the church is compatible with the Master Plan, the Township needs to find that the project is consistent with the goals of the Plan, which he provided in his letter.
- The applicant has addressed previous concerns with regard to lighting, and they noted this
 evening that they will be using specific materials to help with containing the sound from the
 auditorium.
- The activities within the natural feature setback are necessary for access and stormwater management and/or will not result in adverse impacts upon the wetland areas. An EGLE permit has been obtained for work along and within the wetland areas.
- The applicant must address any comments provided by the Township Engineer and Brighton Area Fire Authority.

- The use requirements of Section 3.03.02(I) of the zoning ordinance are met.
- The façade facing Latson Road is comprised simply of metal siding. In terms of design and materials, the rear façade is not "comparable to the front façade". This is required by ordinance. Mr. Christoson provided details of the siding materials and colors for all four of the elevations. Their architect will be providing building material samples. Commissioner Mortensen is not comfortable sending a 20,000 square foot building to the Township Board without seeing colored renderings or samples of building materials. The applicant provided the manufacturer's website that was shared with the Planning Commission this evening. Mr. Tousignant asked if the materials could be approved administratively after the samples are provided prior to the plan being sent to the Township Board.
- The applicant should be prepared to present building material and color samples (and/or a color rendering) to the Commission.
- The applicant is proposing to delay the installation of the bike path on Latson Road due to the
 anticipated changes to Latson Road. If it is not required to be installed at this time, the
 Township may allow a performance guarantee in lieu of pathway construction at this time.
- The landscape plan is deficient by two parking lot trees.
- The Planning Commission may allow existing vegetation in lieu of new greenbelt plantings.

Ms. Byrne reviewed her letter dated April 5, 2022.

All of her major concerns have been addressed; however, more details will need to be provided for the utilities.

- After final site plan approval, the Petitioner will be required to submit construction plans to MHOG Sewer and Water Authority for review and approval.
- The Petitioner is proposing a dead-end water main with a stub to the south for potential future connection to the existing 8-inch water main on Sugarbush Drive. The petitioner has included a 25-foot utility easement to the edge of the property to facilitate this future connection.
- The Petitioner is proposing an on-site lift station and force main that will discharge to the
 existing 8-inch HDPE force main on the west side of Latson Road. Additional detail should be
 provided for the lift station during the construction plan review process and the lift station and
 force main connection will need to be coordinated with MHOG Sewer and Water Authority.
- Two stretches of 18-inch pipe have proposed slopes of 3 percent, which is greater than the max allowable slope of 2.84 percent. The proposed pipes should be revised to ensure that the proposed storm sewer does not exceed that maximum allowable velocity of 10 feet per second.
- The plan proposes a commercial drive with a dead end that is approximately 1,400 feet long. If the property is further developed in the future, the petitioner will need to work with the Township to determine if the driveway will need to be considered a private road.

The Brighton Area Fire Authority Fire Marshal's letter dated April 6, 2022 states that all of his previous comments for Phase I have been addressed.

The call to the public was made at 7:46 pm.

Ms. VanMarter noted that there were several letters received from the public that were included in tonight's packet. There were also two received today, which were provided to the Planning

Commission. One from Jeremy Doody of 3825 Sugarbush and another from Brian McBain of 280 Lane Drive.

Mr. Michael Siterlet of 3780 Golf Club Road stated his property abuts this property. He is concerned about the preservation of the wetlands. He owns a portion of Crescent Lake with the applicant and there are easements that must be acknowledged. The speed of the traffic on Gold Club should be addressed.

Mr. Jeff Hauk of 3873 Sugarbush Drive appreciates the applicant making changes to the plans based on their discussions. He wanted to reiterate the drainage issues he has on his property and anything that the applicant can do to make it better would be appreciated.

Ms. Patricia Murphy of 139 Lake Shore Vista has concerns with the traffic and the traffic study that was done. She does not believe it included necessary data, such as church event traffic, seasonal traffic, traffic from other roadways in the area, and the inclusion of the Livingston County Road Commission and Oceola Township.

Mr. Bruce Macey of 3878 Sugarbush Drive asked what the dotted lines are near the common area shown on the plans. Mr. Tousignant stated those are water main easements. Mr. Macey would like to see a final rendition of the building. He asked if the flooding onto Golf Club Road will be remedied. Mr. Tousignant stated the wetland will have more sufficient drainage.

Mr. Paul Rottach of 3897 Sugarbush Drive was concerned with the building being so close to his house, the parking lot lights, and the drainage issues he experiences. He stated that Mr. Tousignant and Pastor Tim met with him, and he appreciates the changes that they are proposing that will address his concerns.

Ms. Kara Miller of 2885 Acorn Lane stated this is a completely appropriate area for a church and they care about addressing the concerns of the residents.

Mr. Brian McBain of 280 Lane Drive stated the Master Plan has just been redone recently and questioned what the purpose is of having a Master Plan if it is not followed. This will be a commercial building in a residential area.

Ms. Barry Swatsenbarg of 4100 Stephanie Lane in Oceola Township stated the hills on Latson Road cause problems. He is concerned about the traffic and the safety in this area.

Mr. Matt Spencer of 3035 S. Latson Road stated this is a good idea for the area and a lot of the concerns noted by the people who spoke today are due to the Road Commission approving the streets off of Latson Road at the bottom of the hill. That is not the church's fault.

Mr. Lance Lockhart of 3440 Woodridge Drive stated this proposed church on this site will be an added amenity to the community. He is a member of Bible Baptist Church.

The call to the public was closed at 8:16 pm.

Commissioner McCreary stated that the traffic engineer of any project has never been before the Planning Commission. She would like to have that person present for this project as traffic and safety is a concern. She asked when the traffic was done. Ms. VanMarter stated the traffic study was dated March 2022.

Commissioner Dhaenens appreciates that the church has listened to the concerns of the Township and the neighbors. They have made changes by moving the church and the parking lot, adding an additional landscape buffer, addressing the drainage, and mitigating the light and noise concerns. It is very open and green. He agrees with allowing Township Staff to approve the building materials.

Commissioner Chouinard is familiar with the building materials, and he believes that the way the petitioner is proposing to use them is done well.

Commissioner Mortensen proposed to have the materials approved by Township Staff as well as two or three Planning Commission members.

Commissioner McCreary suggested tabling this item so they can return with the building materials and a representative of the company who completed the traffic study. Commissioner Dhaenens does not agree that hearing from a representative of the traffic study is necessary.

Chairman Grajek stated that the traffic concerns and any necessary changes will be addressed by the Livingston County Road Commission.

Moved by Commissioner Mortensen, seconded by Commissioner Dhaenens, to recommend to the Township Board approval of two Special Uses Applications for the Bible Baptist Church, one for the construction of the church and the second for the infringement into the setbacks of four wetland areas on the site, subject to the following:

- The Planning Commission finds that the plan meets, in general, the special land use standards
 of Section 19.03 as well as the use requirements in Section 3.03.02(I) of the Township
 Ordinance.
- The applicant has agreed to replace double doors with single doors on the church to minimize sound drifting into neighboring properties to the south.
- The applicant will address the requirements spelled out in the Township Engineer's letter dated April 5, 2022 and the Brighton Area Fire Authority's letter dated April 6, 2022.

The motion carried unanimously.

Moved by Commissioner Mortensen, seconded by Commissioner Dhaenens, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Environmental Impact Assessment dated March 16, 2022. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Moved by Commissioner Mortensen, seconded by Commissioner Dhaenens, to recommend to the Township Board conditional approval of the Site Plan dated March 16, 2022, subject to the following:

- The applicant will provide a performance guarantee for the pathway along Latson Road.
- The applicant will install the two additional parking lot trees.
- The Planning Commission agrees that the existing vegetation can be substituted for greenbelt plantings.
- The applicant will confer with the Township Attorney regarding potential easement issues on the lake, which transcends two pieces of property, as raised by a citizen this evening.
- The applicant must address any comments provided by the Township Engineer's letter dated April 5, 2022 and the Brighton Area Fire Authority's letter dated April 6, 2022.
- With respect to the building materials, the Planning Commission recommends approval of the front facade; however, only conditional approval is given regarding the remaining three facades and will require favorable recommendation of two Planning Commission members and Township Staff prior to submission to the Township Board.
- The exterior lighting shall be turned off when activities are no longer occurring on the property. **The motion carried unanimously.**

NEW BUSINESS:

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING # 2...Consideration of an amendment to the Summerfield Pointe Planned Unit Development Agreement, preliminary condominium site plan and environmental impact assessment to convert the project from (140-units) attached condominiums to single family detached homes (108-units). The project is located on Lawson Drive, North of Grand River Avenue. The request is petitioned by Healy Homes of Summerfield, LLC.

- A. Recommendation of PUD Agreement Amendment
- B. Recommendation of Environmental Impact Assessment (3-9-22)
- C. Recommendation of Preliminary Site Condominium Plan (3-23-22)

Mr. Fernando Abudeye and Mr. Wayne Perry of Desine, Inc. and Mr. Jack Healy, the developer, were present.

Mr. Abudeye stated they would like to reduce the density of the plan approved in 2002 from 140 units to 108 units as well as change them from attached condominiums to single-family homes.

Mr. Healy stated six of the homes will have the same building materials as the existing attached condominium units they will be abutting.

Mr. Abudeye stated that because they have reduced the density, they will be able to have more common areas, which will be maintained by the homeowner's association.

Mr. Borden reviewed his letter dated April 6, 2022.

- The applicant proposes to construct 108 detached residential units in lieu of the 140 attached units that are included in the approved PUD.
- Dimensional deviations are sought for lot width, lot area, and combination of side yard setbacks.
 The details of these deviations are as follows:
 - The proposal identifies units ranging in area from 0.14 to 0.25-acres, with a minimum width of 55 feet.
 - The revised plan includes a table noting deviations sought from MDR lot width and area (75' and 10,000 SF, respectively).
 - The applicant also seeks to deviate from the combined side yard setback requirement, though this is stated as a spacing between buildings (14') in the draft PUD Agreement.
 - We request the applicant amend the draft Agreement to reference the combination of side yard setbacks (as opposed to building spacing) for consistency with the MDR requirements.
- The draft PUD Agreement should reference the MDR requirement for combination of side yard setbacks, as opposed to building spacing.
- The applicant must address the Township's comments on the draft PUD Agreement.
- The applicant must address any comments provided by the Township Attorney on the draft condominium documents.
- The guest parking spaces that occupy a portion of proposed Unit 6 should be removed.
- Details are needed as to what restrictions are established by the proposed conservation easement.
- Details of the southeasterly open space must be added to the plans.

- The Commission should consider comments provided by the Township Engineer and/or Brighton Area Fire Authority.
- There is insufficient information in the private road application to determine whether the Township may allow variation from public roadway standards.
- The submittal does not include a Private Road Maintenance Agreement.
- The required easement width is not provided.
- The dimensional requirements for medians do not appear to be met.
- The plans do not identify any street signs.
- Design details such as AASHTO standards, pavement, curb and gutter, grades, and curves, are subject to review by the Township Engineer.

Ms. Byrne reviewed her letter dated April 4, 2022.

- The general road layout for the proposed Summerfield Pointe development is essentially the same as the previously approved version with multi-family units. There are no engineering related concerns with single-family units as opposed to multi-family units.
- The proposed sidewalk cross section should be revised to show 6 inches of compacted CL II sand per Township standards.
- After final site plan approval, the petitioner will be required to submit private road construction plans to the Township for review and approval.
- After final site plan approval, the petitioner will be required to submit construction plans to MHOG Sewer and Water Authority for review and approval.
- The Livingston County Drain Commissioner has updated their design standards. The petitioner has noted that they are pursuing approval from the Drain Commissioner and evidence of said approval should be provided to the Township prior to final site plan approval.

The Brighton Area Fire Authority Fire Marshal's letter dated April 5, 2022 states that all of his previous comments for Phase I have been addressed.

Commissioner Mortensen is not in favor of the proposed density.

Commissioner Dhaenens stated the development has been attached condominiums for 17 years and it would be very different to put in single-family homes.

Commissioner McCreary asked if the single-family homes will have an association. Mr. Healy stated that they would be included in the association to pay for the roadway and lawn maintenance, but not the outside building maintenance. She would like to see more details as to how this will be handled. Commissioner McBain agrees. She has reviewed the Master Deed and Bylaws and they are not clear due to maintenance of the lawn, the exterior of the buildings, the irrigation, etc.

The call to the public was made at 9:12 pm.

Mr. Gerald Adler of 4726 Summer Ridge asked about the six homes that will be adjacent to the existing condominiums. They will have different rules for pools, swing sets, etc. and they will look different.

Mr. Gary Laundroche of 4689 Summer Ridge represents the Association Board. It is very odd to have single family homes in a condominium development. It would look like an afterthought. The current condominium association is self-managed and has Master Deeds and Bylaws that help them maintain their common standards. Individual homeowners will have a different association's rules and regulations. He cited sections of the Township Ordinance that address condominium associations.

Mr. Peter Garofalo of 4698 Summer Ridge stated the original PUD outlines that the area of Lawson Drive at Grand River was to be widened and it was not done until in 2020. There is no secondary egress, which is required.

Mr. Robert Webb of 4654 Summer Ridge stated the proposed density is not good for the community. If this is approved, Lawson Drive will have more traffic and there will be increased delivery and garbage trucks, etc. He suggested rerouting the roadway so that it does not go down Lawson Drive to Grand River.

Mr. Rick Giummi of 4702 Summer Ridge Drive provided a sketch plan showing where new attached condominium units should be built and they would be all part of the existing association. Any new development would be a different association. The right side of Lawson Drive should look like one development.

Ms. Irene Hursh of 973 Lawson Drive does not want single-family houses across from her home. There would also be construction traffic. There is only one way in and one way out of their subdivision. These single-family homes will increase the traffic on Lawson Drive.

Ms. Ann Streeter of 609 Abbington Court stated that if this development connects to Aster Boulevard, it will cause increased traffic on their road. These new homeowners will need to help pay for the maintenance of their roadways.

Ms. Lori Carroll of 4663 Summer Ridge Drive stated the residents in her community do not want single-family homes.

Mr. Paul Manders of 4712 Summer Ridge Drive stated that if these single-family homes are allowed, it will not look right.

Ms. Liz Hoover of 661 Abbington Court in Hampton Ridge is concerned with the 55-foot-wide lots.

Ms. Karen Dorf of 4697 Summer Ridge Drive does not believe that the building materials will be able to match the materials on the existing buildings. She is against this and hopes the Planning Commission takes into consideration what the condominium residents have said.

Ms. Bobbie Davis of 4655 Summer Ridge Drive has lived there for 16 years. The residents of this community have maintained it. She would like their circle of condominiums to be completed and keep their association separate from a new one.

The call to the public was closed at 9:42 pm.

Commissioner Dhaenens questioned why condominiums are difficult to sell. Mr. Healy stated it is difficult to obtain a mortgage for a condominium. Commissioner Dhaenens understands the need for

affordable housing in this community, but he does not want the continuity of this neighborhood to be broken.

Commissioner McBain knows that different associations can work well together and suggested the applicant propose and present complimentary architectural and building materials; however, she does not believe the single-family homes should be on the same side of Lawson as the existing condominiums. She is not in favor of the density. She agrees that these new residents will be driving down Aster Avenue and that should be addressed.

Mr. Healy stated that the density would be higher if they stayed with the original PUD of 140 units.

Chairman Grajek is not in favor of the size of the lots.

Moved by Commissioner Mortensen, seconded by Commissioner Dhaenens, to recommend to the Township Board denial of the Summerfield Point Estates PUD Agreement Amendment because the lot size and setbacks are not acceptable and do not meet the ordinance in terms of MDR zoning. Moreover, the proposed plan for single-family homes on individual lots is inconsistent with neighboring properties. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Moved by Commissioner Mortensen, seconded by Commissioner Dhaenens, to recommend to the Township Board denial of the Environmental Impact Assessment dated March 9, 2022 because the lot size and setbacks are not acceptable and do not meet the ordinance in terms of MDR zoning. Moreover, the proposed plan for single-family homes on individual lots is inconsistent with neighboring properties. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Moved by Commissioner Mortensen, seconded by Commissioner Dhaenens, to recommend to the Township Board denial of the Preliminary Site Condominium Plan for Summerfield Point Estates dated March 23, 2022 because the lot size and setbacks are not acceptable and do not meet the ordinance in terms of MDR zoning. Moreover, the proposed plan for single-family homes on individual lots is inconsistent with neighboring properties. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Moved by Commissioner Mortensen, seconded by Commissioner Dhaenens, to recommend to the Township Board denial of the private road for Summerfield Point Estates because the lot size and setbacks are not acceptable and do not meet the ordinance in terms of MDR zoning. Moreover, the proposed plan for single-family homes on individual lots is inconsistent with neighboring properties. In addition, there is insufficient information to determine whether the Township may allow variation from public roadway standards, the submittal does not include a Private Road Maintenance Agreement, the required easement width is not provided, the dimensional requirements for medians do not appear to be met, and the plans do not identify any street signs.

The motion carried unanimously.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING #3...Consideration of a site plan and environmental impact assessment for 136 apartment units within 17 buildings located north of the intersection of Whitehorse Drive and Arundell Drive. The property is located within the Lorenzen Planned Unit Development and was previously approved for 137 apartment units. The request is petitioned by Elevate Property Partners, LLC.

- A. Recommendation of Environmental Impact Assessment (1-17-22)
- B. Recommendation of Site Plan (3-23-22)

Mr. Robert Langan of Elevate Property Partners, LLC and Mr. Robert Emerine of Seiber Keast, Inc. the engineer, were present.

Mr. Langan addressed the comments in the planner's letter dated April 7. The residents of the new phase will have the same amenities as the first phase and the building materials are the same as what was done in Phase I. They will duplicate what was built for Phase I; however, some of the light fixtures may be slightly different. They will redo the road as requested by the Township Engineer.

They have more parking that what is required, but that is because they have attached garages and then a parking space in front of the garage, so the garage and those spaces in front are considered parking spaces.

Mr. Borden reviewed his letter dated April 7, 2022.

- He noted that Mr. Langan addressed his request to explain how Phase 1 amenities apply to Phase 2 units
- Building materials and colors are subject to review and approval by the Planning Commission.
 He suggested making a condition of any approval to state that they will be the same as Phase I.
 Mr. Langan noted that it has been 15 years since Phase I was built; however, they will be of the same architecture and the material colors will be as close as can be.
- The applicant should be prepared to present building material and color samples, and/or a color rendering, to the Commission as part of its review.
- Per Section 14.02.06, the applicant must provide evidence in support of the amount of parking proposed, which Mr. Langan provided this evening.
- If exterior site lighting is proposed, a detailed lighting plan must be provided.
- The applicant must address any comments provided by the Township Engineer and/or Brighton Area Fire Authority.

Ms. Shelby Byrne reviewed her letter dated April 7, 2022.

- Parking dimensions should be added to typical parking details on Sheet ND3.
- Approval should be obtained by the Brighton Area Fire Authority prior to site plan approval.
- The petitioner has submitted water main and sanitary sewer plans to MHOG Sewer and Water Authority for review and received comments. After final site plan approval, the Petitioner will need to re-submit final construction plans to MHOG for re-review and approval.
- The proposed site plan is being reviewed by the Livingston County Drain Commissioner. Approval from the Drain Commissioner should be provided to the Township prior to approval.
- The petitioner is proposing to extend the two existing private roads of Arundell Avenue and Westbury Boulevard. After site plan approval, the petitioner must submit private road construction plans for review.
- The proposed road cross section shown on the plan notes a 50-foot-wide road ROW. The Township's Engineering Design Standards require that local roads have a minimum road ROW of 66 feet. The 50-foot-wide road ROW matches the previously approved road ROW in Westbury Phase I, so she has no concerns.

• As requested, the site plan has been revised to show the existing asphalt paving on Arundel Avenue as being replaced. The note says that the existing asphalt will be replaced after construction of Westbury Phase II. Due to the poor existing condition of Arundel Avenue, the Planning Commission may wish to require that the Petitioner complete the base of the proposed asphalt prior to construction, then apply the top course when doing final paving of the Westbury Phase II, as construction will only further degrade the current condition of the road.

Brighton Area Fire Authority Fire Marshal's letter dated April 6, 2022 states most of their previous comments have been addressed; however, two items are still outstanding:

- The applicant shall provide no parking fire lane signage every 50-feet along on the hydranted side of the access roads.
- He recommends that the sprinkler riser rooms be provided with separate addresses from the building units.

Mr. Langan stated they will address his concerns.

The call to the public was made at 10:23 pm with no response.

Moved by Commissioner Mortensen, seconded by Commissioner McCreary, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Environmental Impact Assessment dated January 17, 2022 for Westbury Phase II. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Moved by Commissioner Mortensen, seconded by Commissioner McCreary, to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Site Plan dated March 23, 2022 for Westbury Phase II, subject to the following:

- Township Staff will review the documents to ensure the amenities of Phase I apply to Phase II, with the assistance of the Township Attorney, if necessary.
- The building materials and colors are to be consistent with Phase I and will be reviewed by Township Staff prior to submission to the Township Board.
- The requirements of the Township Engineer's letter dated April 7 and the Brighton Area Fire Authority Fire Marshal's letter dated April 6 shall be met.

The motion carried unanimously.

ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

Staff Report

Ms. VanMarter stated there will be a second Planning Commission meeting in April. It is scheduled for April 25. There are five cases scheduled for the May 9 meeting so she may be scheduling a second May meeting.

Approval of the March 28, 2022 Planning Commission meeting minutes

Moved by Commissioner McCreary, seconded by Commissioner Chouinard, to approve the minutes of the March 28, 2022 Planning Commission Meeting as submitted. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Member Discussion

There were no items to discuss this evening.

Adjournment

Moved by Commissioner McCreary, seconded by Commissioner Chouinard, to adjourn the meeting at 10:40 pm. **The motion carried unanimously.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Patty Thomas, Recording Secretary