

**FINAL  
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF COMMERCE  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Monday, March 3, 2025  
2009 Township Drive  
Commerce Township, Michigan 48390

**A. CALL TO ORDER:** Chairperson Parel called the meeting to order at 7:00pm.

**ROLL CALL:** Present:

Brian Parel, Chairperson  
Brian Winkler, Vice Chairperson  
Joe Loskill, Secretary  
Bill McKeever  
George Weber  
Brady Phillips  
Caitlin Bearer

Also Present:

Dave Campbell, Township Planning Director  
Paula Lankford, Senior Planner  
Mark Gall, Township Fire Marshal  
Hans Rentrop, Township Attorney  
Debbie Watson, DDA Director

**B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**MOTION** by Loskill, supported by Phillips, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda of March 3, 2025.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**MOTION** by Winkler, supported by Loskill, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of February 3, 2025, as written.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**D. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES**

Bill McKeever – Zoning Board of Appeals

- We have not met since the last Planning Commission meeting.

George Weber – Township Board of Trustees

- The Township Board had its most recent meeting on February 11<sup>th</sup>. A few items of note.
- We reappointed Bob Mistele as a member of the Zoning Board of Appeals for 3 years.
- We agreed to have our water and sanitary sewer rates studied by an independent auditor. We want to make sure that we have enough of a fund to cover any capital expenses that might be coming. I'm sure everybody has seen some of what's been happening down in Detroit with water mains breaking, et cetera. We want to make sure we're properly funded for that, and at the same time keep the balancing act with rates as low as possible for residents.
- We approved the site condominium and plat for Schafer Development's Townes at 42 North on Crumb Road.
- We discussed the Island Club sanitary sewer system, which is a neighborhood consisting of about 35 homes on South Commerce Lake. They want to decommission their present septic and sewer systems and have the Township take over the sewer and maintenance. In order to do that, certain repairs have to be made. It has quite a big price tag for them before we'll take it on. We have

asked them to review those numbers. Our Township Engineer and Building Inspector have met with them a few times to go over costs and try to get something as economical as possible, but at the end of the day, we need them to make a decision on which way they want to go. Legally, we have the ability to force the repairs prior to the connection, but we really want them to understand what they want to do since a large portion of this is going to come from them over the next 10 to 15 years.

- We've agreed to move forward with investigating a sidewalk repair program.
- We approved the DDA cash advance for the Downtown Development Authority.
- We have studied what's happening with the County. They are asking us to sign a new agreement for the maintenance of our water and wastewater treatment plants. Some of the language they're asking us to include negates any liability they would have as it relates to budget. They're basically saying they can spend Township residents' money without any prior authorization or approval, irrespective of how much that might cost. We tried to negotiate a settlement that said we understand emergencies might happen, and we offered them a \$250,000 leeway; saying that if it is up to \$250,000, do the work and we will sort it out later. They refused that. They want basically no accountability. That's not sitting well with us, so we're looking at our options. Correct me if I'm wrong, Hans, but it would also include management of employees. They would not be responsible for any malicious misconduct or gross negligence on anything that they did, which is just standard, almost boilerplate language in any agreement. So, we're still perplexed on why they're mandating such language in an agreement, but we will find out as time goes on, and we will find out what reasonable alternatives there might be.

**Brian Winkler – Downtown Development Authority**

- We had a meeting on February 18<sup>th</sup>. It was pretty routine as usual.
- Insite Commercial Report:
  - Five & Main: Bruce Aikens is scheduled to meet with the Township Board on April 8<sup>th</sup>. His long awaited update to the DDA Board is yet to be scheduled, but we hope it happens around the same time.
  - Parcel M (Five & Main outlot next to Walmart): A Letter of Intent has been received from a user that remains unidentified. The potential purchaser has been told that the DDA needs to know who the user is before the DDA can respond to the LOI.
- Directors Report: Fox2 news recently interviewed Bruce Aikens on Five & Main. And, as Debbie has informed many of us, the Fox2 news story aired over this past weekend. I complimented Dave Campbell on how he looked on TV.
- Other miscellaneous items discussed include the preliminary proposal for the Dort Credit Union, which we will see tonight, and the approval by the Township Board and DDA Board of the most recent advance to the DDA by the Township, as George mentioned.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, anything from the Building Department other than what was in the agenda packet?

Dave Campbell – Not that I'm aware of.

**E. PUBLIC DISCUSSION ON MATTERS FOR WHICH THERE IS NO PUBLIC HEARING SCHEDULED**

**Chairperson Parel opened to Public Discussion on matters for which there is no public hearing scheduled.**

Maddie, Carey Road – It was said at the end of the last meeting back in February that there was potential for the rezoning of the property on Commerce and Carey from R-1A to potentially R-1B for a PUD. I was just curious if anything had moved forward with the developer on that. Is there any update?

Dave Campbell – We have not received any new information. They're still looking at their options. I believe they told us they have been in communication with the Road Commission to see what, if any, improvements could be made to the intersection of Commerce and Carey. He mentioned they might want to do this as a PUD, which means they would have to offer public benefit, so they were looking to see if a public benefit could be some upgrades to the intersection. It is all still in the preliminary discussion phase. Nothing formal has been submitted. You're correct; unless they want to develop it under R-1A zoning, which it does not sound like they want to do, then they would either need to rezone it or do it as a PUD, either of which would require a public hearing.

Maddie – Okay, so that would be at a following meeting?

Dave Campbell – Yes, if it's a public hearing, which it sounds like it would have to be based on what they want to do, then it would be at a Planning Commission meeting like this. The public hearing would have to be noticed in the Oakland Press. There would have to be letters sent out to every property owner within 300 feet of the subject site, and they would have to put a sign out front that says "Rezoning Proposed". They have not identified a meeting as of yet that they want to target for that public hearing.

Maddie – Thank you so much.

**Chairperson Parel closed Public Discussion on matters for which there is no public hearing scheduled.**

**F. TABLED ITEMS**

**ITEM F1. PPU20-02 – MIDTOWN ON HAGGERTY – PUD AMENDMENT – TABLED FROM 2-3-25**

Schafer Development of Farmington Hills MI is requesting approval for a first amendment to the approved "Midtown on Haggerty" Planned Unit Development (PUD) to eliminate the residential apartment component of the development and replace it with a new Kroger store and fuel center located at 155, 255, 279, & 297 Haggerty Road. PIN#'s 17-36-400-035, 17-36-400-036, 17-36-400-037, & 17-36-400-038

**MOTION** by Loskill, supported by Phillips, to remove Item PPU20-02 from the table.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Chairperson Parel – Dave, I know we have been through a few iterations of this. We've had many meetings and many calls. As we get into this, I don't know if the developer

has a plan to present some things tonight. I know there were a few modifications, but maybe it would be possible to just focus on what has been changed.

Dave Campbell – That was my intent as well, to focus on an update from the February meeting where, as you mentioned, the item was tabled and no action was taken, which even that was somewhat of a sequel to the January meeting where no action was taken. The Planning Commission is obviously very familiar with this project. However, we do have a huge audience here this evening, so I don't know if you want me to bring the audience up to date.

The PUD in question is Midtown on Haggerty, which is at the northwest corner of 14 Mile and Haggerty Road. It's this property where I'm moving my cursor around. What was originally proposed and approved was three retail buildings out along the Haggerty Road frontage, along the west side of Haggerty Road, with residential apartments totaling 187 units on this undeveloped portion to the west. The three retail buildings obviously came to fruition and they're up and running and mostly occupied.

The apartments never came to fruition, and that's for a PUD that was approved back in 2020. So, fast forward to 2024 and now into 2025; what the developers, Schafer Development, are proposing is for the portion of the property that was going to be the apartments to instead be a Kroger store with a fuel center. So, the store itself would be about 103,000 square feet, with the fuel center up here at the north end of the Kroger parking lot, and then this area over here is the existing three retail buildings.

With the originally approved PUD, there were recognizable public benefits, as are always required for a PUD, and for the most part, those were centered on the residential portion of the development. Now that the residential portion of the development has gone away in lieu of a proposed Kroger, the role of the developer is to present a new offer of recognizable public benefits to the Township. The intent is for those public benefits to be proportionate to the deviation that the developer is seeking from what could otherwise be achieved under the property's base zoning.

So, in this case, the property's base zoning is B-2 community business. B-2 is not a zoning district that allows for fuel. Fuel centers are only allowed as a Special Land Use and only in B-3 zoning. The other wrinkle to this is that any sort of drive-through, whether it be a drive-through restaurant, bank or pharmacy – Drive-throughs are a Special Land Use in either B-2 or B-3. So, we've got three existing buildings that are already built and occupied, two of which have a drive-through component and then the Kroger store itself is also proposing a drive-through pharmacy along the north end of their building. So, the recognizable public benefits are meant to be proportionate to the deviations in the form of the existing and proposed drive-throughs, and the deviation for the fuel center on a property whose base zoning is B-2 and would not otherwise allow for a fuel center.

This is now at least our third meeting where we've discussed the offer of recognizable public benefits. The January meeting, the February meeting, and now, this evening. The offer of recognizable public benefits has evolved along the way. I know Spencer Schafer from Schafer Development wants to make a presentation on his own behalf, but what I hope to do tonight is to summarize the latest offer of recognizable public benefits, which is in the letter that my Department sent to the Planning Commission dated February 27th.

If I go to the aerial photo, this is taken from October of last year, and I think it is representative of what's out there today. The first recognizable benefit that we'll discuss is the offer of sidewalk extensions, off-site sidewalks. So, the original offer was an

option to either take the existing sidewalk out in front of the existing three retail buildings and extend it southward all the way to the northwest corner of 14 Mile and Haggerty Road, in front of Newberry Square and the Community Choice Credit Union. It would run southward, all the way to the existing intersection, and link up with these landing ramps at the northwest corner. That was considered Option #1.

Option #2 was to instead take a sidewalk and run along the north side of 14 Mile westward, and get it just past the existing driveway of the existing Kroger store, which sits right here. That was at the January meeting. So, in February, the developer said all right, we won't make it an option. We'll offer both of those segments of sidewalk.

Fast forward to tonight's meeting; that offer of sidewalk extensions has been extended even further. So, in addition to the two segments along Haggerty and along 14 Mile, now they're offering an extension along the northside of 14 Mile, from the existing ramp at the northeast corner of M-5, and extended as far eastward as Loop Road, which will get it to there. The challenging segment along this stretch is getting across here. This is a big regional pond and regional wetland that services a lot of the commercial users in this area, the hotels, Newberry Square, and would be the detention area for Midtown on Haggerty. This is a very challenging area to get a sidewalk across. It would most likely require a boardwalk, which is expensive and requires a lot of maintenance.

The developer is offering to get these three segments of sidewalk in, and leave this portion open with the expectation that the Township could come in at some later date and traverse this wet section. Kroger, as the owner of the property, would provide an easement to the Township to get that sidewalk across when that day comes, so that the connection could be made.

The second area of recognizable public benefits that has been discussed is the future of the existing Kroger store. That kind of comes in two phases. One is, what users would and would not be allowed within the existing Kroger store. Kroger has committed to not signing any less than a 5-year lease on the existing building. If you remember back in February, I think it was an offer of no less than one year. Kroger's now offering no less than five years, which to the Township's perspective, limits the ability for a transient user to move into that. The transient users that we often cite are the Halloween and fireworks stores. That would preclude users from signing anything less than a 5-year lease.

Kroger is also saying that they would not lease the store to a so-called dollar store within its first two years of vacating the existing store. Kroger's committing to actively marketing the store to any and all prospective users, with the exception of the aforementioned dollar stores, and also they would not offer to sell or to lease it to a direct competitor to Kroger. They would not sell or lease it to another grocery store or food store, which seems like a reasonable limitation. Otherwise, Kroger would actively and aggressively market the store, for sale or for lease. The Township wants to avoid a repeat of when Kroger vacated the Hiller's store at Union Lake Road and Commerce. We all agree that the Hiller's store was left vacant for far too long. Kroger is writing into the development agreement as a recognizable benefit that they will avoid that scenario with the store they are going to vacate.

In addition, they're making commitments with the existing store that they would be vacating with its tax appeal. They are saying that they would not appeal the tax assessment for the existing store for three years, or as long as they own or lease the store. Once they sell it or lease it to someone else, then presumably all bets are off. But for the first three years after they vacate the store, they would not contest its tax assessment.

The fourth and final area, and the one that has generated the most conversations over the last few weeks, is how the proposed new store would be assessed and potentially appealed. So, what the Township has sought as a recognizable public benefit with the new store is that for the first five years of its existence, Kroger would not appeal its tax assessment. Assuming the tax assessment came back from Oakland County Assessing as a valid tax assessment with no errors and with no omissions, Kroger would not contest that for the first five years. That was important to the Township, and particularly because this property is within our Downtown Development Authority, whose funding is predicated on tax increment financing, so it was important that Kroger not appeal their tax assessment shortly after occupying the new store.

This generated, as I mentioned, a whole lot of conversations with Kroger's representatives and with the developer. What they are now offering is updated from what we saw in February. They're saying they won't appeal within the first five years except for they do have a window to appeal, for any reason, within the first 30 days of receipt of their initial assessment. Now, Hans Rentrop, our Township Attorney, can explain it better than I can regarding that 30-day window versus the scheduling of when your tax bills come out, when your assessment is received, and the schedule of when and how you can appeal. But effectively, they would have until May 31<sup>st</sup>, of their first full year of being occupied within their new building, to file a notice of appeal with Michigan Tax Tribunal.

What Kroger said is, outside of that window, they will not appeal for the first five years. And, if they do appeal within that window, they will not appeal to a taxable value of less than \$3 million. They've called that their floor. They will not go below a floor of taxable value of \$3 million. Now, the Township asked Oakland County Equalization, who is our contracted assessor, to do a preliminary assessment estimate of what this store would be valued at. They think the taxable value would be something close to \$4.65 million. Kroger is saying their floor would be at \$3 million. So, as I explained in my letter, I think the Township has to fairly assume that Kroger would want to have that option to appeal their tax assessment, up until May 31<sup>st</sup> of the year that they receive their initial assessment.

That is my best effort at updating the Planning Commission from what we saw back in February, and updating all of you on the revisions to the offer of recognizable public benefit that are memorialized with the most up to date development agreement that you have before you. The last thing I might want to mention before I see if there's any questions is, since this is our third meeting discussing these recognizable public benefits for this amendment to Midtown on Haggerty, seemingly this would be a good opportunity to move this forward. By moving forward, I mean the Planning Commission's role is to make a formal recommendation to the Township Board, who would ultimately make a final decision on this amendment to the Midtown on Haggerty PUD. The Planning Commission can make a recommendation to approve or to deny. I think the time is right to come to that decision. We've had two meetings, and now this is the third meeting to discuss this with the developer. I think this is the right meeting to move this forward.

What do I want to avoid and is trying to utilize this meeting as any sort of negotiation. I think we've had three months to negotiate this. And so I think there's been plenty of time to negotiate. There have certainly been plenty of phone calls, emails and meetings back and forth about this topic. What you have in front of you with this latest and greatest language for the PUD agreement is what the developer and their partner, Kroger, is able to offer in terms of recognizable benefit. I want to avoid, both on the Planning

Commission side and the developer side, any enticement to try to negotiate this here this evening. I think we've had plenty of time for negotiation.

With that, I will see if there are any questions for me. I've obviously tried to summarize a long history in what I hope is a short amount of time. Our Township Attorney is here and he is also good at talking a lot. So, if you want to give him an opportunity to do so, he'll certainly take advantage of it.

Phillips – Is it safe to assume that the preliminary assessment is based on current economics? I might assume that by the time that store gets built, that assessment would increase with construction costs getting higher.

Dave Campbell – It's a fair question. I don't know whether the preassessment that Oakland Equalization gave us was based on 2024-2025 numbers, or if they did an adjustment, assuming that this store is probably not going to open until the middle of 2026.

Phillips – Okay.

Bearer – Do we have anything to measure, any comps for what a successful appeal by Kroger, or another similar big box, have been?

Dave Campbell – In our conversation with Oakland Equalization, we've talked about comparables of Kroger specifically. The three that they brought up was one in White Lake Township, obviously right next door, one in the City of Royal Oak, and then one out in St. Clair Shores, Macomb County. What they demonstrated to us was that there is a pattern with Kroger to appeal the assessment of a newly constructed store within the first year or two of the store being open.

Bearer – And have they been able to get below the \$3 million floor?

Dave Campbell – I don't know if they've gotten below the \$3 million floor necessarily. Each store is different, the square footage is different and so forth. The market is different and the comparables are different, depending on the community, but they have been successful in significantly reducing the taxable value of their stores, at least in those three examples.

Attorney Hans Rentrop – Dave did a good job of summarizing what we've learned and where we left off. Just some clarification. Number 1 is, 30 days was really carryover from the initial language that was being proposed. At the time, that concerned errors and omissions. At this point it time, that's pretty much irrelevant. The Kroger store, upon completion, will be assessed by Oakland County. All tax bills are based upon the tax day, which is December 31st of each year. They will get their assessment by February or so, and they will have it until May 31st of that year to challenge or appeal. The second thing I wanted to point out is that you had asked about the current estimates and would it be more or less upon completion? I do want to note, it's hard to tell. During construction, changes are made, construction prices go up or they go down. This is an estimate. I spoke with the developer's attorney today and he indicated the \$3 million floor, which I to remind you is half of the actual true cost of the store, which would be \$6 million, is the number that he allegedly pulled out and used as kind of a

basis. It is not a prescription for the value at the store as apparently proposed, or as constructed. The idea was to throw out a number as a floor.

The final thing I wanted to point out was that the Kroger store contemplates the appeal for any reason after the first assessment, with the exception that it can't be used as a deed restricted property because it's comparables. So, these are properties that have some restriction in place, privately upon them, that would preclude their use for certain things.

There had been some talk about the Dark Store theory of assessing and some of those discussions throughout the terms of the agreement. I'll make it clear that that's really not what this is. Private deed restriction language was linked to the old bill introduced last year in legislature, which included Dark Store, so it was kind of wrapped up in one large discussion. Dark Store theory of assessing is saying that properties that are vacant are treated as comparables for other properties similarly situated. So, that is not part of this discussion. The only thing we're talking about in terms of the offer being made in this particular situation is that it will not include deed restricted properties.

Weber – So the Dark Store is still on the table then, as part of a potential argument?

Attorney Hans Rentrop – To use that term, yes, arguably it could be on there. It is my understanding, talking to the attorney today in terms of the other three appeals that we've talked about tonight, White Lake, Royal Oak, and St. Clair Shores, he indicated to me that there are a number of other new Kroger stores which were not appealed. So, I don't have a good beat on whether they would be ... Certainly they have appealed in the past, other new stores. The frequency is unclear to me. I'm happy to answer any questions.

Spencer Schafer of Schafer Development, 31400 Northwestern Hwy, Suite H, Farmington Hills, MI 48334, were present to address the request.

Spencer Schafer – Good evening, Planning Commissioners and Township staff. It's Round 3. We can call this the semi-final.

We've obviously made lots of changes to the public benefit section of the PUD. And I want to thank Dave and Hans. I did review the review letters in advance of this meeting and I think they did a very good job of giving a synopsis and an explanation of where we are tonight. Just because we ended on the Dark Store loophole, I want to touch base on that briefly. In all prior iterations of the PUD agreement we did have that in some form. Our attorney, Alan, is not here tonight, unfortunately. He had to deal with a consent judgment in Orion Township. But, that was language we always had proposed in other PUD agreements and I don't know if Hans wants to speak to it. I don't know if it is or isn't a concern in this situation. I know in review letters by Hans previously he stated this was a red herring event. So, if that is an issue, I don't want to negotiate anything right now, but I know the PUD agreement is supposed to be 90% done before we get to the Planning Commission. If that's something that Hans feels is material, we would be willing to put that back in the PUD agreement. I don't know why that was taken out. I haven't had conversations with Alan to that effect. I know Hans and Alan have been talking directly, so I don't know if you can address that any further. With that private restriction, I know that issue was a little bit more pertinent in this example, so we did include language in there to that effect.



So, this presentation's going to be short. You all know me by now, and you all know this presentation and the development that we're looking to propose here. What I want to highlight are the big key changes that we've made to the PUD agreement. And really, it comes in two forms.

Number one, we've modified the language around a short-term lease and that was per Commissioner Phillips' comments at the prior meeting. Initially, we had agreed to not enter into a short-term lease of less than one year. We changed that to five years and as Dave mentioned, the whole goal around that was to prevent the Halloween and fireworks stores from wanting to come in on a short-term lease. We did increase that language. Again, the only restriction that Kroger's looking to implement, and only for a two-year period, is for grocery stores. So, that hasn't changed. Beyond that, there are no other restrictions whatsoever, and there are no restrictions on the Halloween store, that five years. That will be applicable as long as Kroger owns the property and leases the property.

Sidewalk extensions; Dave talked about the network extensively. I just want to focus on two things. What we're proposing in terms of offsite sidewalk extensions are really going to branch the improvements that the Township has already done on the west side of M-5 to Long Park to where the residents are. We're just continuing to extend that network east. In total, it's slightly over 1/3 of a mile and the cost estimates that we've put together and shared with you previously, that's a \$270,000 improvement and the Township is getting over 1/3 of a mile of sidewalk networks that is consistent with the Pathways Master Plan. So again, a big form of our public benefit is obviously extending that network so residents can get from their homes to the commercial node here on Haggerty and 14 Mile Road.

Here I show that area. The only thing I did want to highlight is the area in purple and yellow. Dave mentioned that is a little bit more difficult area with the topography, with the wetlands as a result of the regional detention basin. So, we would be willing, free of cost, to put together easements so the Township could do a future extension of that, should a pathway millage or something like that come to fruition here in the future.

Here, I know we talked about this a lot at the last meeting, but just wanted to give everybody, and some of the residents and other people over here, an idea of some of the difficulties that we're going to have with regrading, tree removal, crosswalks, et cetera. And this shows you some of that work on the 14 Mile side as well. I put this together. We'd be looking to extend the sidewalk from that terminus where there is currently a landing on the northeast corner of M-5 and 14 Mile, going all the way east to Loop Rd. It's obviously a vast improvement to the sidewalk network.

This hasn't changed much; the tax commitment for the existing store. This was per conversations in the January meeting. We did modify this up initially. We had agreed to a one-year period, post vacation of the existing store, where Kroger would agree not to challenge any type of assessment of property taxes. We've now increased that to three years.

I know Dave talked about this a lot. I actually have another slide in here afterward, but essentially, we put a floor on it of \$3 million. It's not representative of what we believe taxes should be. It's not consistent with what the County proposed, but it was a floor that we had tried to propose because the Township's concern was, we have all these big box retailers, really it's these legacy big box stores who came in here recently appealing property taxes, post-COVID, and that's obviously leaving the Township to have to place a bigger burden on residents as a result of commercial users not paying their fair share. So, we did agree to a floor to try to provide some element of certainty.

But, if there are any questions on taxes, I'm going to defer those off to Zack. I know we've talked about it a lot at this point. Kroger has over 40 stores here in the Southeast Michigan area.

I know Zack has some data that he can share about tax appeals. One thing I will say is that we've done a lot of research on this subject. We've looked at a lot of the other big players in this space, whether they're grocery or some type of retail. I will say, Kroger does have a long standing history of challenging their property taxes, but substantially less than a lot of these other users. Take that for what you will. I know the Township was able to find a couple examples where Kroger did recently appeal taxes, but Zack will be prepared to address that further because they do have a lot of stores. It's not like Lowe's where they have five stores in a market. Kroger has 40-60 stores here in this market.

So, they've got a long history that we think speaks for itself on that issue. Hans really talked about everything else I was going to address on property taxes, so unless there are any other specific questions, I'll leave that to Hans or Zack to address. The last thing I'll say is we have really gone as far as we can on the tax issue. This is the concept that has been talked about here since the very beginning. There has only been one other commercial user that has agreed to this. To our knowledge, it is the new LaFontaine dealership next to the Walmart on Pontiac Trail and M-5. Otherwise, there's not a single retailer in the Township, or in any adjacent community, in the State of Michigan, or any other state that Kroger does business with that has ever heard of a similar request.

We have talked about Kroger's statutory rights under Michigan tax law, and this is a voluntary condition that we are looking to propose. This is our line in the sand. This is the best offer that we can do. I just wanted to state that for the record. Now from the onset, our vision has been to transform this vacant property at the gateway of Commerce Township into a vibrant mixed-use destination center. We believe that the new Kroger at Midtown would mark a significant upgrade over the existing location, which no longer aligns with the current Kroger platform. This state-of-the-art store will provide customers with a vastly enhanced shopping experience while addressing demand for a larger, more modern facility. The Midtown store would be the largest Kroger store in the area, and we believe that this store would offer critical relief to the Union Lake location, which currently serves a high volume of non-Commerce Township residents. Now, the Union Lake Store is 91,000 square feet. It's not quite a marketplace store. That store was built before the marketplace concept was designed, but the only other store of similar caliber in this area is in White Lake on M-59, and that is a marketplace store.

The store we would be looking to propose at Midtown at 103,000 square feet, would by far and away be the largest store in our general area, really in a 15-mile radius. The only marketplace store right now in the in the State of Michigan is the White Lake store in our area. There are some in St. Clair Shores and other areas, but it's not really within a 20-minute drive of where we are here. I get that it is on the edge of Commerce Township. There's still going to be a ton of Commerce Township residents that shop here. No question, undoubtedly, there's going to be some from West Bloomfield, Farmington Hills and Novi, but we feel this new store at Midtown is going to really bring relief to the Union Lake store that is stressed. It does have issues at times with stocking because it is such an in-demand store for Commerce Township residents, and residents of other communities, namely for the Union Lake store.

So, beyond meeting local demand, the expanded store we feel is going to help attract shoppers from surrounding communities, which is going to increase demand. It's going to increase shopping. It's going to increase consumer spending within Commerce Crossings, which is going to benefit retailers and the broader community alike. If Commissioners have any further questions, we're happy to answer, but I believe everybody is familiar with the development at this point. And again, the point of tonight's meeting was to really highlight those two changes and understand if this is enough in terms of public benefit for the fuel center that we are asking for. With that, I want to thank you for the opportunity and we're more than happy to answer any questions.

**Commissioner Comments:**

Chairperson Parel – Okay, let's go down the line and see what the Commissioners think.

McKeever – I have no questions.

Weber – I have no questions for Spencer. I don't think it meets the threshold, for all the reasons I have voiced over the last three months.

Loskill – Nothing for me.

Phillips – A comment; in the last meeting, I had proposed some alternate procedure process language for doing the tax assessment and how we'd manage the 5-year period. Attorney Greene restated that, what I had said, and we agreed to that. I believe the Kroger representative also said, "Yes, we can do that." That's not what you came back with. My proposal did not include a floor, which I believe is far too low. This makes it look like you're going to come in immediately and start looking for a reduction. I think you did a good job addressing everything else, but that tax assessment is a no-go for me.

Winkler – Brian, I did have one quick item to mention that Dave did mention in his report. Dave, can you pull up the packet and go to the concept floor plan? It was a Google Maps generated site plan. I wanted to point out on this plan and mention it to Spencer. You'll see on this plan, of all the site plans in the current packet, this is the only one that has the alignment of the main drive coming in between the retail and one of the drives into the Kroger parking lot. This is something I mentioned a couple meetings ago, that we should get those aligned rather than the offset that is shown on the other site plans. I just wanted to point that out, but we're going to see the site plan again at the Planning Commission. If you could get your plans all updated to show that alignment, that would serve the project the way it needs to.

Dave Campbell – That's correct. If this were to proceed to the Township Board and if the PUD amendment were to be approved, the detailed site plan would still have to come back to the Planning Commission for approval. That's where we get into more of the details of the site plan. The layout that you have before you tonight is meant to be preliminary for the purpose of an exhibit to the PUD agreement that the Township Board would ultimately make a decision upon. This isn't your only bite at this apple.

Bearer – I have no questions.

Chairperson Parel – I don't really have any further questions or comments. I'm not sure if it's relevant, but I disagree that this is going to free up anything at the Union Lake store. My opinion of the Union Lake store is that they have an employment problem and they just don't have enough staff there. Dave, anything else? Or are we ready to make a motion?

Dave Campbell – It's up to you if you're ready to make a motion and take any action. If you are ready, the Planning Department did provide potential motion language, depending on which direction you want to go. There is a motion to approve and a motion deny. A reminder that the crux of the motion is whether or not the recognizable public benefits are sufficient for the deviation, and recognizable public benefits in totality. Obviously we've spent a lot of time on tax issues, but recognizable public benefit in totality, including the sidewalks, and including what happens to the former store. That's the action that you could potentially take in making a recommendation to your Township Board.

Chairperson Parel – And regardless of the outcome of this recommendation, it is a recommendation that goes to the Township Trustees at their next regularly scheduled meeting.

Dave Campbell – That would be something I would discuss with Spencer as well. From a timeline perspective, the Township Board's meeting is a week from tomorrow. I would look to Hans. Is the development agreement in a position where it could be executed as soon as a week from tomorrow?

Attorney Hans Rentrop – Yes.

Dave Campbell – Then, unless Spencer and his team have a better idea, this could potentially go to the Township Board next Tuesday.

Spencer Schafer – That would be our plan.

**MOTION** by Phillips, seconded by McKeever, **to recommend denial**, to the Commerce Township Board of Trustees, of Item PPU20-02, Midtown on Haggerty, PUD Amendment, the request by Schafer Development of Farmington Hills MI for a first amendment to the approved "Midtown on Haggerty" Planned Unit Development (PUD) to eliminate the residential apartment component of the development and replace it with a new Kroger store and fuel center located at 155, 255, 279, & 297 Haggerty Road. PIN#'s 17-36-400-035, 17-36-400-036, 17-36-400-037, & 17-36-400-038  
Move to recommend denial of an amendment to PPU#20-02, a PUD application for a first amendment to Midtown on Haggerty, a commercial development by Midtown on Haggerty LLC (Steve and Spencer Schafer of Schafer Development) consisting of approx. 20,000 sq ft of retail within three existing/constructed commercial buildings, an approx. 103,000 sq ft commercial building expected to be occupied by Kroger, and a Kroger fuel center including canopy, 7 pumps, and staffed service kiosk, upon approx. 25 acres on the west side of Haggerty Road north of 14 Mile Road. The Planning Commission's recommendation of denial is based on a finding that the project will not offer recognizable and substantial public benefits proportionate to the deviations from

the Zoning Ordinance being requested by the developer, most notably the inclusion of the Kroger fuel center.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Weber – Can I ask a procedural question on what we just discussed? There was a recommendation of denial. Is it still going to the Board a week from tomorrow?

Dave Campbell – Yes, and the Board would have the option to make a final decision either way.

## **G. OLD BUSINESS**

None.

## **H. SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS**

None.

## **I. NEW BUSINESS**

### **ITEM I.1. PSP25-01 – DORT FINANCIAL CREDIT UNION**

Dort Financial Credit Union of Grand Blanc MI is requesting PUD site plan approval to construct a new credit union located on the northwest corner of Pinewood Avenue and Pontiac Trail upon Unit 1 of Phase 1 of the Five & Main PUD.

PIN# 17-24-402-001

Dave Campbell – So I will start by bringing up the overall development plan for Five & Main that this Planning Commission is very familiar with. The northeast corner of the big roundabout at M-5, Pontiac Trail and Martin Parkway. Five & Main has a long history. The PUD was originally approved by the Township back in 2018. There was an amendment in 2019 to add the hotel, which would land right there. And then more recently, there was an amendment in 2023, which shifted the location of the development's residential component, which back in 2018 landed right about here, and shifted the residential component to over here, adjacent to the Walmart store. The PUD amendment was approved in 2023 with that shifting of the residential. Shortly thereafter, the developer, the development partner for the residential, got PUD site plan approval for the residential component and that's what you see under construction as we speak. So, what you have before you is the next PUD site plan within the Five & Main development. The residential component was the first PUD site plan, and the next PUD site plan is in this area, at what would be the northwest corner of what will become a four-way intersection of Pontiac Trail, Walnut Lake Road, and the main driveway into Five & Main, which they're calling Pinewood Avenue.

This property here that we're about to talk about tonight is Unit 1 of the Five & Main site condominium. I should have mentioned that also in 2023, Five & Main was divided into a condominium, into 5 condominium units. One of those units is the chunk of property being developed with residential, and one of the units is the one that we're about to talk about here tonight.

Tonight, we're going to talk about Unit 1 of Five & Main being developed as a Dort Financial Credit Union. So, the overall layout for the proposed Dort Financial Credit Union is what you have up here on the screen. So again, Pinewood Avenue coming into Five & Main. This road going across is being called Main Street; Five & Main, so that's the Main Street. The Dort Financial Credit Union would be bounded on three sides by Pontiac Trail to the south, Pinewood Avenue to the east, and Main Street to the north.

If you compare this site plan to the approved development plan, you will see that what was always envisioned at this property on the development plan was a drive-through building of either a drive-through restaurant or a drive-through financial institution. And what was at least conceptually envisioned was for the drive-through lanes to be on the south side of the proposed building.

If we go now to the site plan that the Planning Commission is to consider this evening, you will see that it's a drive-through financial institution of 3200 square feet, which is what was more or less envisioned on the overall development plan. One of the key differences, though, is that the drive-through lanes have been shifted. The whole building and the drive-through operation have been rotated counterclockwise, so now you have the drive-through lanes on the east side of the proposed building. Usually a drive-through is a Special Land Use, but because Five & Main was approved as a PUD as a whole, and because drive-throughs were specifically allowed for within the PUD agreement for Five & Main, no Special Land Use approval for this drive-through bank is required. That was already decided when the PUD for Five & Main was approved and then approved in its subsequent amendments.

What's interesting about this, at least interesting to me, is that this is the first commercial site plan within Five & Main, and so to a large degree this maybe kind of sets the game plan for how the rest of Five & Main gets developed as these individual PUD site plans come before the Planning Commission. If we go back to the development plan, the next development plan we expect the Planning Commission to see for Five & Main is next to the Dort Financial to the west, which is a multi-unit, what they're calling a "shopette". From there, what everybody really wants to see happen is the commercial downtown core of Five & Main, all this area in through here.

What we don't have yet, and what we were hoping to have by this stage, is an overall set of guidelines and a vision for Five & Main; guidelines with respect to architecture, building materials, overall aesthetics, color palettes, things like that. And then also an overall sign guideline. So, what is everybody allowed to have as far as signage? Wall signs, freestanding signs, how many can they have, and how big can they be? If it's a freestanding sign, how big can it be? How tall can it be? We don't have that yet. So, with this Dort Financial Credit Union, the Planning Commission is having to make some decisions on things like architecture and signage without really having a full vision of how Dort's signage and architecture will fit into the overall vision for Five & Main.

To some degree, it's a fairly straightforward site plan in that the roads are already established, the use is already established, the layout is already established. But I want the Planning Commission and the development team to be mindful of what is approved and permitted for Dort Credit Union seemingly is going to set a precedent for what is allowable for all of the other uses within Five & Main.

For example, the freestanding sign; is every user within Five & Main going to be permitted a freestanding sign? The proposed building for Dort Credit Union, which we're going to look at the architecture here in a moment, but there are three wall signs proposed. So, is every user within Five & Main going to be permitted to have multiple wall signs? And if so, which sides of the buildings will they be allowed to have them on, and how big can those wall signs be? So again, that's what I want the Planning Commission to be mindful of if there is to be any action taken this evening.

As I mentioned, the overall layout is in front of you. There is going to be a driveway stub connecting to what develops next door, which is what we anticipate to be the shopette. They are proposing the first phase of the street furniture that is going to be throughout Five & Main. There's going to be a bench and a bike rack in this corner of the site.

There is a sidewalk proposed along the Pontiac Trail frontage, kind of this meandering sidewalk. But again, thinking ahead to what happens next, one of the things that we should talk about tonight is getting a sidewalk across Pinewood Avenue, because this boulevard has been designed and approved, but the boulevard should account for this sidewalk crossing and having a landing on the other side for whatever develops on this property on the east side of Pinewood. And so, if nothing else, there should be curb drops in this boulevard island so that this sidewalk can be extended across to the east side of Pinewood without anyone having to tear into the curb of a freshly poured boulevard median. These are the things we want to think ahead to. With respect to sidewalks, we want to think ahead to a sidewalk along the west side of Pinewood Avenue, and along the south side of Main Street.

Five & Main has always been envisioned to be this walkable, mixed-use downtown environment, and so the expectation is that there's going to be sidewalks along both sides of every street. Given that Dort Financial is going to be the first one up to bat, is now the appropriate time to require the sidewalks along Pinewood and along Main Street for Dort? Or is it more appropriate to wait until Five & Main is further built out before those types of shared amenities get installed?

With respect to architecture, I know Dort Financial's architect is with us this evening and they have a presentation ready for you on their own behalf. This is the rendering of the proposed building, and one of the things that we talked about with the design team for Five & Main, led by Sue Neumann who is also here this evening, was how does this building, its architecture and its materials, how does it fit into the overall vision and design for Five & Main? And Ms. Neumann replied that their team went through many iterations with the architecture team for Dort Financial for this building, and pushing them to do some upgrades to materials and to design in order to meet the high expectations for everything that's going to be built in Five & Main.

Some of the upgrades that were sought by the Five & Main design team that Dort Financial's architect then incorporated, are more of the brick and stone elements to the building. I know I've heard from some of the members of the Planning Commission that there is still concern about the amount of EIFS material along the top portion of the building, and particularly at this prominent entry feature. The Township has tried to move away from EIFS and tried to promote more durable materials, whether that be stone, or whether that be architectural metal, or whether that be some sort of a tile material. That's the kind of thing that the Planning Commission can discuss with Dort's team this evening, but also keeping in mind how the decision on the building materials for this building would factor into future buildings within Five & Main. I know somebody needs to cut the grass in this picture, but again, EIFS along the canopy drive-through, there's a good amount of EIFS there. Then the EIFS material for the cornice elements around the primary building.

While I am bringing up the building renderings and the building elevations, I'll go back to talking about signage again. So, two signs on the entry feature; one on this side, one wrapping around this side, and then there's also a wall sign. So again, one of the things I think we need to talk about this evening is the amount of signage that's being proposed and what sort of precedent that would set for every other building within Five & Main.

Another thing I want to discuss this evening is lighting. The parking lot is obviously going to have its exterior lighting, and they are of a certain style and a certain height. One of the questions is, is everybody within Five & Main going to have that same lighting fixture at the same height and the same illumination levels, both for the parking

lot lighting and for the pedestrian scale lighting? This is the photometric plan for Dort Financial, and it's probably hard to see up there on the screen, but they show the light fixtures for the parking lot and then they also show some of the more pedestrian scale light fixtures out along Main Street.

So, whatever light fixture is used for Dort Financial seemingly sets the precedent for the pedestrian scale lighting throughout Five & Main. At the risk of repeating myself, we have to think about setting a precedent with what they do here and that seemingly is going to extend throughout Five & Main.

That's my best effort at giving a summary of the project that's proposed this evening. From a procedural standpoint, it is a PUD site plan, so it is the domain of the Planning Commission. The Township Board has already approved the overall PUD for Five & Main. Now, as each individual site plan comes along, it's the domain of the Planning Commission to approve each individual site plan and assure that it's a quality that we all hope to achieve and is also consistent with the overall development plan.

I did bring up the landscape plan. It's a well landscaped site. And again, this landscaping is meant to be consistent with the overall landscape plan for Five & Main, particularly along the prominent road frontage of Pontiac Trail. I know I talked to at least one of you about the dumpster enclosure location and how it lands in what will be the southwest corner of the site, which kind of puts it right along Pontiac Trail. There was a concern brought up of whether that makes it a prominent feature to anybody driving along Pontiac Trail. But what the design team pointed out was that, the way the elevations are, the elevation of Pontiac Trail versus the elevation of site, the dumpster enclosure actually sits down in a bit of a valley. Then, as you can see, it's pretty well landscaped around its perimeter and the enclosure itself is going to be a brick material to match the building. The intent is that the dumpster enclosure would be very well screened, and more or less hidden from view from the traffic along Pontiac Trail. I'll take a pause there and see if there are any questions for me. Otherwise, as I mentioned, the architect for Dort Financial has a presentation ready that she would like to present to the Planning Commission as well.

Phillips – Dave, previously we saw the broader presentation on Five & Main, so it had renderings and the buildings were shown. How does this compare to what we saw previously?

Dave Campbell – The overall renderings that we had of Five & Main are zoomed out; a perspective of being up in the air a few hundred yards away perhaps. I don't know that it zooms into the level of this specific building. I can bring them up for you if you'd like. The building certainly fits into the overall site plan and layout for Five & Main, because it sits right there where we always knew there was going to be a drive-through, either a restaurant or a financial building. But, how it fits into the overall aesthetic and the lovely pictures that we've seen of Five & Main; it may be difficult for me to answer that.

Phillips – Should we look at that?

Dave Campbell – It might take me a moment to find it.

Phillips – I wouldn't want to approve or say this looks great and then find out it was completely contradictory to what we saw previously.



Dave Campbell – So what I might recommend is, while I try to find where I have that saved, maybe have Dort Financial's architect go through their presentation.

Shannon White – Hi, my name is Shannon White and I'm with Funchitecture. I'm here actually with the whole team representing Dort Financial Credit Union. Andy is from Dort Financial, Jim Butler from PEA Group. He just has to take one hat off for Aikens and put his hat on for Dort. And then the team, Sue and Jim, from Aikens are here representing the Five & Main development team. So, hopefully you can ask any of us a question pertaining to whichever aspect you need answered.

I think Dave's done a really great job of describing the overall picture. I can't say enough about how Dort Financial is super excited to be commercial building #1. To Dave's point, we have been working on this really for about a year. I talked to Dave probably a year ago about the potential for Dort Financial to occupy this site. We've been through many iterations about rotating the building, and I can talk to you a little bit about why we did that, what the motivation for that is. And then we've had numerous meetings, and I think Sue has been an excellent guide on behalf of the development team for massaging what ... Dort Financial has many, many credit unions there. They occupy Michigan and Florida, and so they have a corporate brand and a corporate palette. I will start with that. This isn't something that we've designed just for this particular site. We try to follow, because they have a corporate image and a corporate palette that they would like to follow. So, we have changed from a traditional red brick to a brown brick. We have changed some of the coloring to better fit within what Aiken's overall development is for the site.

Like Dave said, we're occupying this unit highlighted in the red dashed line in the overall development plan. When you zoom in, this is the same site plan that you saw. I would just say that we were really thoughtful when we were locating the building, that perhaps thinking through what we want to see from Pontiac Trail as like sort of the main strip of commercial traffic in your highest traffic count; the best face forward for Dort might not be the end cap of an ATM drive-through canopy. It doesn't allow for very much signage. It blocks the view of the building. So, that was part of our motivation. We thought if we could put a face of the building that has windows, that is bringing natural daylight in, and that we can tuck because it is a little bit bermed on the side of Pinewood, that side where the drive-through canopy is located is a somewhat hidden. There are many trees along that entire right side on the site plan, and we feel like that was a better side to provide screening.

We have oriented the corner of the building, as you saw in the entry. This is the entry and it is facing so you're getting a visual in greeting and signage, and it's very clear. Here's where all of your glass is when you enter into the site from the main drive, because that is the only place you can get into the site is up here, off of Main.

The property has a ton of green space on all four sides of the building. We're really heavily landscaped. I'll give you a little bit of rationale, because we went back and forth with the Aikens team too. We literally tried on for size the dumpster on nearly every surface of the site. On the original proposal it was here, and we moved it here. The problem with the dumpster location here is that this is the employee exit, and when employees are leaving at night, or arriving first thing in the morning in the winter, this is the perfect space for someone to hide. So, it's a security issue that Dort doesn't ever have the dumpster right next to the employee entrance if they can at all avoid it. We tried it on for size over here, where it would be bumped up against these trees, but this is actually a lower elevation and we felt like we could screen it beautifully. This way,

nobody looking from Pontiac Trail is ever looking at the dumpster gates, because I don't think that's the best face forward either.

Phillips – I have a question on the landscaping. Dave, you talked earlier about sidewalks. Are we putting in trees that we're going to have to remove to put a sidewalk in there?

Shannon White – This is the sidewalk, in gray, right here.

Phillips – No, we were talking about Pinewood.

Shannon White – We are putting in an awful lot of trees.

Dave Campbell – I would agree that particularly on the west side of Pinewood, you have limited space to get the trees and what I hope is going to be a future sidewalk.

Weber – I'm assuming the landscape architect would have taken that into consideration. There are species of trees that are sidewalk friendly in terms of their root systems.

Dave Campbell – There are trees whose roots tend to grow downward rather than outward.

Weber – Is that something that Giffels takes into consideration when they're reviewing and providing their comments?

Dave Campbell – They would if they thought there was going to be a sidewalk along the west side of Pinewood. I don't know that the landscape architect who did our review from Giffels assumed that. He was basing his review on the site plan that was in front of him. So, if we get to a point where the Planning Commission is getting ready to take action on the site plan, and it's agreed that there will be a sidewalk between the credit union and Pinewood sometime in the near future, then it might be something where we look to relocate trees as necessary, and maybe pick some different species so that the sidewalk and the trees are not in conflict with one another.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, I get the concept, but what I don't understand is that the original site plan was approved, but overall, they did not have a sidewalk on the west side?

Dave Campbell – It didn't have that level of detail. If you really zoom in there ...

Chairperson Parel – So really, nothing has been approved at a higher level of detail.

Dave Campbell – I would agree with that. Based on my read of the approved PUD plan, we did not get down into the detail of where the sidewalks would be, what side of the streets they would be, how wide they would be ...

Chairperson Parel – Any mention of the sidewalks and how they would meander the property?

Dave Campbell – I don't remember getting to that level of detail, other than to say I think it has been everyone's expectation that this is going to be a very walkable development overall. So, I think it's reasonable to assume that every street is going to have a sidewalk on both sides of the street.

Sue Neumann – Dave, can I interject?

Dave Campbell – Sure, of course. Take advantage of the microphone, please.

Sue Neumann – Dave, I think you have the color concept plan.

Shannon White – It was in my presentation if you want to go back to that slide.

Dave Campbell – This one?

Sue Neumann – Yes.

Dave Campbell – I'll zoom in. What would you like me to focus on?

Sue Neumann – Just the area at Pinewood Avenue. We did not show a sidewalk coming up either side of Pinewood Avenue. There was a discussion when the Springs was coming online on whether to extend a sidewalk up through to the residential, and Continental did not feel that any of the residents would walk down there. Our intent was for people, if they were actually crossing Pontiac Trail, was to take the curvilinear sidewalk that runs along Pontiac Trail down to the access road that's in between the roundabout and Pinewood Avenue, and come up into the heart of the project. So basically, they're coming up at the beautiful park that we have envisioned for the center of the project.

Weber – From our standpoint, we're expecting connectivity to M-5 and the Airline Trail at some point in time in the future, which would take people to the Pinewood intersection. If we had connectivity from the south, that's where we had envisioned they would be able to get into Five & Main.

Dave Campbell – Yes, if you're walking or biking from the south, there's no way you're getting across the roundabout, not safely anyway. So, part of what's approved for this overall PUD is there will be a traffic signal at what will become a 4-way intersection of Pontiac Trail, Walnut Lake Road and Pinewood Avenue. With that signalization, we hope to work with the Road Commission to have pedestrian signalization as well, so that this becomes your safe point to cross Pontiac Trail, to walk or ride a bike into Five & Main. That brings me back to thinking there's a reasonable expectation that there's pedestrian amenities from this entrance.

Sue Neumann – If you take the curvilinear walk to the center of the project, then we have connectivity through the whole development, and to a sidewalk that was extended along the north side of Library Drive to the trail system. Currently, The Springs is being developed with a sidewalk. The only sidewalk near Main Street is to the south, right here at the south of that building. You can see that it does not come down and connect with Main Street. It does connect across to our development, and it can run through the development and link back to this curvilinear walk. Incidentally, that curvilinear walk is

envisioned to come across, and whoever develops Pad A would continue that and tie into Walmart.

Chairperson Parel – So, if a pedestrian is crossing at the signal that Dave just mentioned, and they want to go to the credit union, we're proposing they go all the way down Pontiac Trail, go into your development at the park, and then come down the main lane? Dave, with your cursor down there; so if someone crosses Pontiac Trail at the new signal, the expectation of the developer is that if they had to get the credit union, the legal expectation, without crossing over grass, would be to follow that sidewalk all the way down, go into the development, and then take the access road all the way back to the credit union, which no one is going to do. Alternatively, if they had to go to the apartments, they would do something ... Nobody is going to do that. We have to expect that no one is going to follow by those rules.

Weber – And it's probably less likely somebody is going to walk or bike to the credit union from the south. There's probably a fair expectation that people at The Springs are going to use the credit union.

Chairperson Parel – Who is crossing there? You could also say folks going to the retail building, just west of the credit union, would have the same issue.

Weber – To me, I think that's more of a realistic concern.

Chairperson Parel – I'm just making the point that people aren't going to do that.

Shannon White – No, and from the credit union's perspective, they want people to come right to the credit union. We were trying to discuss ... Like we said, where the dumpster and the drive-through are set down from the elevation, you could easily make a connector from that sidewalk here, it just probably wouldn't be ADA. You could access it with bikes, but it's steep; it's like a 3-foot grade change from here to here to make a really easy access.

Chairperson Parel – But then again, there's still the challenge of accessing the retail to the west, when you're in the parking lot of the credit union and you have to traverse the grass to get there. People are going to take the path of least resistance. They're not going to go around.

Sue Neumann – Are you talking about connectivity to the rest of the development?

Chairperson Parel – Yes.

Sue Neumann – There's an opportunity to make a connection. Obviously this is the layout, so their building is sitting a little higher, and you could cut through the median and make a tie into Building G, and then you're along all of the sidewalks.

Shannon White – Yes, I mean we have the drive connection stubbed already.

Chairperson Parel – I'm just looking at somebody who crosses with a bike. Is the expectation that in order to get to that strip center, they're going to ... Maybe we put a

bike path down into the parking lot of the bank, and then from there, they're going to go through the bank parking lot around cars to get to the next building? It just doesn't sound like a great solution to me.

Weber – This kind of gets back to Dave's opening preamble; we can't look at this as just a credit union. It's really about, what is the totality of this? And, while I think the volume of people walking to a credit union is going to be very small, walking or biking, I think, in theory, going to the next building that is going to be built, which is the shopette, I think we need to understand the connectivity of how the credit union, the shopette, and the meandering sidewalk all fit together.

Sue Neumann – Well, it was always Bruce's intent to pull people into the heart of the project first. There is connectivity from building to building, with the exception of what we just discussed, and possibly cutting across the median to connect the shopette with Dort. Internal to the development, we're covered, and we're meeting his original intent of bringing people along the curvilinear sidewalk along Pontiac Trail and into the heart of the project. Yes, that was not shown in detail. That will come, and we will have to review that with you with each development that comes along, but that curvilinear sidewalk is going to continue and come into the project.

Weber – I get it. I like the concept of it and I learned a new word, curvilinear, to bring people into the heart. That's where we want them to go. But we have to also expect that they're not going to do that. Not as much for the credit union, but for the shopette, they're going to cut through something. They're not going to loop around. I think as we go forward, we need to recognize and understand that, and solve for that.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, we don't have a lead on the other parcel to the east?

Dave Campbell – This one here?

Chairperson Parel – Yes.

Dave Campbell – The DDA retains ownership of that and they will sell it once it's ready to be sold. There is an expectation in the very near future that parcel will be marketed, sold and developed by someone.

Chairperson Parel – I'm just thinking about options. My personal opinion is, if we anticipate folks crossing Pontiac Trail at the new signal, and they want to get into the development, there's no way they're going down to that entrance. They're either going to walk down this road, or they're going to walk down that hill and go into the credit union. And, if they're walking on the road, that becomes a safety issue.

Dave Campbell – Agreed.

Sue Neumann – Jim and I were just looking at a possible connection. It could occur in line with the sidewalk, come up and tie through.

Dave Campbell – Maybe my question to the Planning Commission, at least on the sidewalks, is if you are otherwise ready to take action on this site plan tonight, which I don't know yet if you will be, are the sidewalk locations, sidewalk alignments and

connections something that you would be able to approve as a condition of approval, and then let my department work with Sue and the engineers just to make sure? What I want to accomplish is to not regret that we didn't get something done when we could have done it, and had to go tearing into something two years from now because we didn't think of it tonight. If the Planning Commission is okay with taking that approach, you could condition any approvals, if you're ready to give them, on the development team working with the Planning Department on making sidewalk connections.

Chairperson Parel – I can't speak for everyone else, but I would be okay with that if I had the opportunity to see what we came up with before the approval goes into effect.

Weber – I think what we're trying to solve is connectivity and safety, and understanding. I get the funneling them, which is what we all want, it's just recognizing the connectivity and safety, and having the forethought to solve for that. Having this discussion to say what we're trying to accomplish here is not just with this building, but also specifically the building to the west. Once you get further west with that next phase, then I think it is solved for because you have it going to the center of the development.

Chairperson Parel – George, do you think this is something that could get resolved by Dave's group?

Weber – I think if we put the parameters in; his responsibility is with this building and the building to the west of it for safe connectivity for bikes and pedestrians.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, could you zoom out? I understand that a lot of people probably aren't going to walk to a credit union. I have concerns about the shopette. But, if you look at the path of least resistance, I think it could be 50/50 what people are going to do. I look at the apartments; no one is going around for the apartments. They're going to walk down that drive between Pad A and the bank. And I think, if you look at that entertainment complex at the top left, I think if there's people coming from that intersection at Pontiac Trail and Pad A, they're not going around. There you have maybe a 50/50 shot. Some people are just going to walk down that boulevard next to Pad A. But, I'm just one person. I know we have a couple architects here. You guys have any thoughts?

Loskill – Me, no. My big concern is that this doesn't tie in with any of the aesthetics that were shown on the original renderings for Five & Main. We have no idea what the design aesthetics are going to be for any of the shopettes, or any of the smaller buildings. There's no developed signage program. There's no sidewalk program. There's no site lighting program. In order to approve something, I'd really like to see what the direction is supposed to be going forward. My concern is that we're going to design this thing piecemeal and it's not going to tie in with anything that's going on in the rest of the development.

Dave Campbell – I hear the concern. Maybe to that point, if we want to take a pause on any sidewalk discussion, I think you still had a presentation you were going through. So maybe let the architect go through her presentation and maybe it will answer some of the questions or concerns you have.

Chairperson Parel – Yes, sorry to take us off track.

Shannon White – I think we talked about this one. So, just the green space around the sidewalks connecting from the parking spaces here close to the building, and the parking spaces here close to the building. I do think, just in a side conversation, that we probably could figure out a sidewalk connection here, and that would connect into this sidewalk. You could do a crossing here because this drive stub we are putting in anyway connects to the shopette. I would just offer that as conversation that we were having as well, how to solve this or strategically plan for the future.

This is the floor plan. I don't know how interested you are, but again, we've really situated all of the frontage and welcome to this side which is servicing these parking spaces and the parking spaces along this, and then we've got an employee entrance to what would be the south side of the building that connects to another sidewalk. We're servicing the drive-through here on the east side. I don't know that these are super exciting. I mean they're the black and white renderings, and the area in question of EIFS is hatched. We went back and forth with the development team and reduced from the corporate palette.

Remember, this is a building that Dort feels comfortable in the size and scale, but that we've modified to fit in this development. So, I would actually argue that we've made a lot of concessions based on the feedback and the guidance of the Five & Main development team in terms of changing our material pallet, in terms of the use of stone. We've got a stone apron everywhere on the low side. We have no EIFS that's anywhere below 12 feet. Per your Zoning Ordinance, everything is above 12 feet, and I think your Zoning Ordinance says 10-feet. And even really below 13 or 14 feet, because that's the threshold of cars driving under the drive-through. The EIFS is only kept up high and we have less than 10% on two sides of the building, and under 18 or 19% on the other two sides, and the only reason for that is because of the drive-through canopy. We were using EIFS on the drive-through canopy side here because we were trying to avoid a heavy steel lenti and adding cost to the project to support brick masonry or another heavy material up here.

So, we made the compromise to really have a fairly ornate stepping. We're using three different color palettes. The color palettes again have been revised to sort of three shades of gray, which, if you look at the palette that's on the ground, that's representative of the actual material samples. Again, Aiken's team and the Five & Main development team have really given a lot of guidance on that. We've switched to sort of a brown and gray palette, which is much more cohesive I think with the remaining buildings yet to be developed. We tried really hard to be mindful of that. So, you can see the palette out in natural daylight. It's definitely reading more brown brick than red. The Fond du Lac is a very timeless stone palette that's durable. And then the Pantone 280C is Dort's corporate and it's not something that I think they would wiggle on. It's their corporate palette in all of their branding and signage. I do think that there was some concern around signage so I wanted to touch base on that.

We do have one sign here, which Dave talked about. Again, we wanted this facing the road instead of this sort of boring, dead-end of the drive-through ATM canopy. We've put windows for the staff breakroom in this area. We're trying to, again, put the best face forward for the Pontiac Trail side. Again, this is your main entry and main viewing as you drive into the site. It's the only drive into the site. We did actually take a look at all adjacent buildings. You have allowed signage on three sides of the building on the credit union that's directly across the street, so I do believe a precedent has been set.

There's signage on both sides, and on the chamfered corner. We did not opt for a chamfered corner in order to reduce this to one side first of all, because frankly I don't think it's as architecturally exciting and a little bit dated. And second of all, I think this architecture with the flat façade and the stepping of cornices and stepping of the variety of different volumes is far more cohesive with the rest of the development.

Awnings, signage ... One question you did have about signage, and this doesn't have the lighting in here, but if I go back to this. There were five light poles indicated. Dave, I think you had a question within your write-up about whether it was the 12-foot pedestrian landforms, and that fixture type was in the lighting package. Then, the remaining parking lot lights are using the light fixture that the Five & Main development team gave us. So, both of the site lights are what the rest of the development is using. Dort Financial is using landforms for the 12-footers, and ...

Sue Neumann – Let me just clarify that statement. We are using Landscape Forms streetlight; it's called Ashbery. They've incorporated that into their plan. It will line Pinewood and Main. The parking lot lighting is the exact same light that The Springs is using. The rest of the development will either use that light fixture, or something very complementary to that light fixture. We want to keep it very simple. We want the parking lot lighting to basically go away.

Shannon White – This is the other fixture.

Dave Campbell – So these are the parking lot pole lights, or these are the pedestrian scale, or both?

Sue Neumann – This is parking lot lights. The pedestrian lights ... Did you put that cut sheet in?

Dave Campbell – I don't remember seeing it.

Shannon White – Sorry. It was listed but there wasn't a picture. It was the one cited here. It's Landscape Forms. If you Google that really quick, this is the catalog number. It's very cute. It has a pedestrian scale. It's sort of round and has no direct, visible light.

Sue Neumann – It's a very simple fixture.

Dave Campbell – Okay, and so that's what's anticipated to be throughout Five & Main?

Sue Neumann – Throughout the whole Main Street.

Dave Campbell – It's called Landscape Forms?

Sue Neumann – Yes, it's called Ashbery.

Winkler – One question about the lighting. Is that going to be the standard for Five & Main?

Sue Neumann – The parking lot lighting that they have presented is exactly like Continental's at The Springs. We will either do that fixture, or something very



complementary. We want to stay very simple and make the parking lot lighting basically disappear.

Chairperson Parel – Maybe I missed it, I apologize. As far as other buildings, are we utilizing similar lighting fixtures on the other buildings?

Shannon White – I don't think the other buildings have been designed yet, so I can't speak to that.

Dave Campbell – Do you mean actual wall fixtures?

Chairperson Parel – Yes, wall sconces and other types of pedestrian lighting. I would like to see a look that ...

Dave Campbell – I think what I'm hearing is the pedestrian lighting, the 12-foot fixtures are going to be consistent throughout.

Chairperson Parel – Or complementary.

Sue Neumann – No, the street lighting will stay the same.

Chairperson Parel – The parking lot lighting will either be this for the entire development, or at least something complementary.

Sue Neumann – Correct.

Dave Campbell – And then as far as wall sconces, I assume every architect is going to maybe have their own opinion.

Chairperson Parel – Are we okay with that? I'm just asking.

Dave Campbell – It goes back to this question of architecture and materials, and the overall vision.

Chairperson Parel – It just seems to me, and I know Joe had his comments, but to me, it seems like we are so far into this development and we don't have specifications for the development, the standards for this entire PUD.

Dave Campbell – I will remind you that when we approved the amendment in 2023 for the overall PUD, we tried to say, okay, when we get our first PUD site plan, this is when we need overall guidelines for architecture and for signage.

Chairperson Parel – But that's not on us.

Dave Campbell – We should have that.

Chairperson Parel – But we do not.

Dave Campbell – We do not.

Chairperson Parel – Okay. I'm not crazy.

Shannon White – I think that was the bulk of the things I wanted to cover. I'm happy to take any questions. Like I said, we've got a lot of the design team here if you have specific questions. We've reviewed our landscape plan multiple times. We have a pretty cool tiered landscaping that mimics Village of Rochester where there's multiple layers of landscaping.

I did want to speak briefly about parking. That was a concern that Dave had brought up. If I go back to the site plan, one thing I would say, and Andy can speak to this even further, would be that we do have ... I don't know why it won't go to Slide #4. We can start at this one. There was a commentary around eliminating these 6 spaces. From Dort Financial's perspective, if we were only to use these 4, and then this remaining, and remove 6 of the 18 spaces, 6 employees are what will always staff this credit union. So now you're reduced to 12 or less that can be used for members, if the Planning Commission requires us.

I would say that Dort Financial's business model is based on customer service. When you have been a victim of fraud, for example, or you have a credit issue, or you need to make a payment and you have a problem, Dort wants you to come into the building and talk to a human. They don't want you to talk to a call center in a foreign country. They don't want you to have to be with a chatbot. They're really membership and customer service driven, and customers do interact with them. To take up 6 of the spaces with just staff doesn't leave a lot of parking for members. So, there was rationale behind why we proposed this many parking spaces on the site.

Chairperson Parel – The thought behind banking spaces is that sometimes we can work with developers to work around some of the requirements of the community to avoid putting in spaces that won't be utilized. So, if you think you need them and Dort thinks they need them, I don't know that there's much of a push back from us.

Shannon White – Our mindset is that these across the street would be the employee parking so that members can park near the building.

Chairperson Parel – I think it works the other way, but I'm good with it. Thank you for bringing that up.

Shannon White – Other questions?

Chairperson Parel – I just have two questions and then maybe we'll go down the line. Dave, maybe these are questions to you. The credit union we approved across the street; I think mention was made of the signage there. Do we know what kind of signage they have there?

Dave Campbell – It's something I can look into, but I don't remember what they were permitted as far as signage. So, sign permits typically go through our Building Department, and that credit union goes back at least 5 or 6 years. I don't know is the answer. Even if I did, I don't know that it's necessarily an apples to apples comparison in the sense that it was a straight site plan on an appropriately zoned property. This is a PUD, so by design, this is its own animal with its own standards. I don't know if that comparison is ...

Weber – I agree. It's not precedent setting because of what this site in totality is.

Winkler – I could mention that the MSGCU across the street, it only has two wall mounted signs, per the plan that we approved back in 2018.

Shannon White – It does have a large sign though in the glass area on the chamfered corner.

Winkler – They only had two wall mounted signs. Sorry to interrupt, George.

Chairperson Parel – Maybe again, to Dave and George's points, that's not as relevant. The other thing I wanted to ask about. It's the first time I'm hearing it. Is there an EIFS height requirement?

Dave Campbell – That's the first I've heard that too.

Shannon White – It's in your Zoning Ordinance. It must be anything over 10 feet.

Sue Neumann – It's in the overlay district.

Dave Campbell – Okay, so I'm still working on memorizing the Zoning Ordinance. Again, I'll say that the PUD is its own animal, and it is meant to have its own standards, and those standards, by design, are meant to deviate from the Zoning Ordinance to the benefit of both the developer and to the municipality, with the outcome of it being a better project than could have otherwise been achieved if we had all adhered to the Zoning Ordinance.

Chairperson Parel – Okay.

Dave Campbell – It's rare that I get to say that the Zoning Ordinance doesn't apply, but this is one of those occasions.

Chairperson Parel – I'm looking at the credit union. They do have a monument sign.

Dave Campbell – And I wanted to talk about the monument sign, too. The freestanding sign is, to a large degree, precedent setting too. Maybe it is a question back to Sue Neumann of, is there an expectation that every user, or at least every freestanding building within Five & Main is going to have its own freestanding sign? And, if so, do we want there to be consistent standards for height, size, illumination method? What is the base material? In this case, if we go to the freestanding sign for Dort, the base material is a stone that is meant to match the stone they're using on the building itself, which makes sense. But then the question is, is every building going to have a different material on the base of their freestanding sign, or is there going to be a consistent signage model for every freestanding sign within Five & Main?

Sue Neumann – Well first, I would answer that by saying that not every building will have a freestanding sign. Much like the Village of Rochester Hills, there are not signs throughout the development. There are, however, on out parcels, freestanding signs. You will note that The Springs was approved with a stone base. Their stone matches

their building. I think there was a comment that said, should it stay consistent throughout the development? I would say no. The main goal of setting this project up was to have some individual character. I don't know if you found the renderings or not, but if you remember the renderings that we produced and presented, we purposely broke up the storefronts so that there wasn't sameness. It wasn't a strip center of all the same material. We wanted individuality to mimic a town. We're trying to develop a town for Commerce Township. I would say, no, we don't want each freestanding sign to be the same, and we don't foresee seeing many freestanding signs at all. We're allowed two development signs along Pontiac Trail or Martin Parkway by the approval. We will develop two development signs. One where we have reserved a right along Pontiac Trail on the Dort property for one of the development signs. The other one will likely happen at the roundabout. We always saw a nice feature as the gateway into the development.

Chairperson Parel – I'm sorry, when you refer to a development sign ...

Sue Neumann – That says "Five & Main" basically. It names the project.

Weber – So there is not a criteria for which tenant gets a monument sign, and which ones don't at this time?

Sue Neumann – No, not at this time, but we are not going to have individual monument signs in the majority of the project.

Weber – So why does Dort get one? Because they're first?

Sue Neumann – Because they're an out parcel. They're a unique out parcel, much like The Springs is. And, I would guess that the hotel would probably have one. But our tenants within the development, they're going to be signed by Five & Main, the two signs on the outer rim of the project.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, could you scroll down to the southwest corner?

Dave Campbell – Yes.

Chairperson Parel – Those two pads there on the corner, those restaurants. Are we saying those restaurants would not have a freestanding sign?

Sue Neumann – They may.

Dave Campbell – It sounds like we need sign guidelines.  
Discussion continued regarding the need for guidelines for the project.

Chairperson Parel – It looks like there is another restaurant to the east of there as well. I have a concern, if we're just talking monument signs, that's the potential for 3 restaurant monument signs, a development monument sign ...

Sue Neumann – Well, and if they had a monument sign, it would be internal to the project. They are not allowed to go on Martin Parkway.

Chairperson Parel – Oh, that's what I was asking. I'm sorry. So, there can only be two monument signs on Pontiac Trail, and only two on Martin Parkway?

Sue Neumann – No, two total.

Weber – Yes, so they're having one at Pinewood and one at the roundabout, the Five & Main signs.

Chairperson Parel – For the development signs. But I'm speaking of freestanding monument signs like the one that we're talking about for Dort.

Sue Neumann – No more than those two project signs that just say "Five & Main" are allowed along Pontiac Trail or Martin Parkway.

Chairperson Parel – What about the freestanding sign that is proposed for Dort?

Sue Neumann – That's internal to the project.

Chairperson Parel – Where does it sit?

Weber – Across from The Springs, on the north side.

Shannon White – Yes, it's not on Pontiac Trail.

Chairperson Parel – Got it. That was my confusion.

Weber – So the restaurants could have monument signs on the north, from the internal side.

Sue Neumann – Potentially.

Weber – So, let me put you on the spot, since we're struggling with this.

Sue Neumann – Okay.

Weber – Do you have an ETA on being able to have sign guidelines, lighting guidelines, landscaping guidelines?

Sue Neumann – Unfortunately, Bruce couldn't be here tonight, and he's really the one that is leading that charge. So, I don't have an answer. I'm sorry.

Chairperson Parel – So we don't call these monument signs?

Sue Neumann – I would call it a monument sign.

Chairperson Parel – Okay, so it's possible we have several of these monument signs along the boulevards coming in on the internal portion?

Sue Neumann – I don't see a number of them. If you look at Village of Rochester Hills, we let the buildings speak for themselves. The Aikens group mandated that right from the start. They have their signage on the buildings and they let the project speak for itself.

Chairperson Parel – I'm sorry, but we are saying there would be one of these for the credit union, and potentially three more for the restaurants?

Sue Neumann – You know, I see one for the hotel. I'll turn to Jim. Possibly...

Jim Fielder – The big thing is that they need the identification. You've got a big building there. Most of them will have a huge sign on them, and to put a small sign like that in front of them on the interior, unless you're directing traffic, there's no real point for them.

Loskill – As small as this site is, you're asking for 3 wall signs, plus a monument sign. It's not like you won't be able to read the building sign from any of the drives.

McKeever – A precedent is being set. Everybody who walks through the door is going to want a monument sign.

Chairperson Parel – Every restaurant.

Loskill – Three signs and a monument sign.

Chairperson Parel – That's my concern. I understand the intention, but they're potentially all going to look different throughout the project.

Sue Neumann – We want character within the development.

Chairperson Parel – I'm not saying that's a bad thing, and I understand you're the architect. I'm just saying that we have to keep that in mind if that's not what we were looking for. I can see character, I get that. But to Bill's point of setting a precedent, that's not what we're looking for. I don't know if there's much more we can talk about as it relates to signs. I think, in my opinion, you might get some push back regarding that, if a vote was to happen. Maybe we can move on, unless anybody wants to talk about signs any longer. Maybe we can go down the line and talk about a few other things. I have a couple things I'd like to talk about in regard to the building itself. Caitlin?

**Commission Comments:**

Bearer – I'm going to have a hard time approving anything without having some of these standards set. I'd like to see a sidewalk up that boulevard, not just a cut-through. I'm a newbie here, so I'm having a hard time visualizing. I get character, but I'd also like to see some cohesiveness within the character. Like has been said, my fear would be the piecemealness; not looking cohesive. And, if we don't have standards to go by ... I need standards.

Winkler – I will speak for the Planning Commission as well as the Township in wanting the Five & Main project to proceed. I don't want my comments to be construed as against the development, but in the absence of standards for the Five & Main

development, as Dave mentioned in his report, if the Dort Credit Union is to be looked at as the standard, I see 7 precedents being set for the Five & Main development.

- You've got the exterior elevations with an abundance of EIFS. I know that the PUD allows a lot of flexibility in not meeting the letter of the ordinance in regard to exterior building materials. What they're proposing goes far beyond what the ordinance allows for decorations and accents only for EIFS. I think that's the benchmark that we should hold the credit union to, as well as the development itself.
- There's a precedent for the freestanding sign that George brought up.
- Many of these Joe brought up as well.
- There's a precedent for the landscaping plan, for it to be unified with the Five & Main development.
- There's a precedent for the exterior lighting; the pole-mounted fixtures that we've talked about.
- There's a precedent for the site directional signage.
- There are precedents for the benches, the bike racks, and the other amenities on the Five & Main site that are being presented in the Dort Financial Credit Union proposal.

There are so many precedents being set that if the Dort Financial Credit Union is the standard for Five & Main, I agree, that we might want to see the standards for Five & Main before we approve something for Dort that could come back to haunt us when we actually see Five & Main. They'll say, well, you approved it for Dort. Well, like I said, I really want to see Five & Main take place, and it's not meant to put a wrench in the machinery, but it's really important we make decisions that result in a unified development. And, if it starts with the Dort Financial Credit Union, then that's what we've got.

Chairperson Parel – I appreciate it. Brady, maybe you could give me a moment. I just want to piggyback with something Brian said. We talked about the standards here. In just comparing the proposed building, Dave, I'm glad you pulled this up. In looking at this, I see a very high-quality building standard. Not to insult the developer, and maybe it's just me, but I just don't see this when I look at a bank proposed with this amount of EIFS. To me, it just doesn't have the same type of feel as what we were promised here. I'll leave that and add comments later. Brady?

Phillips – I agree with everything that has been said-

Shannon White – Can I just offer ... I did bring this, and I don't know if this is at all ... but your Zoning Ordinance allows for 10% EIFS. If you take the average, we have 13%. There is specific language in the Zoning Ordinance that allows you to approve specific overages on standalone elevations.

Chairperson Parel – I appreciate that, but don't the rules change in a PUD?

Dave Campbell – Yes.

Shannon White – But without guidelines, we can only design to your Zoning Ordinance.

Chairperson Parel – I was just going to say ...

Dave Campbell – That brings us back to why we've been wanting guidelines for years.

Chairperson Parel – Okay, Brady. Sorry. And thank you for this.

Phillips – I agree with all of the concerns about consistency and having standards. To be honest, I'm a little surprised this hasn't come up earlier. This project has been discussed for a long time, and we're getting to the point where I'm really happy we've got people coming in to put business in place and get this going. It's great to have Dort in here, but I think we have to answer some questions overall for Five & Main. I think that's a pretty consistent message from our group.

Loskill – In addition to my concerns about the aesthetics of everything in the development, I do have concern with this facing ... Unfortunately, it reminds me of what happened in front of Meijer where we got the back end of every building facing the street. The doors are facing away from the street. We're getting a view of ATM machines. The electrical panels are wall mounted on the side of the building, yes?

Shannon White – Yes.

Loskill – So those are going to be visible. This stuff is not really contributing to a high-end aesthetic. I do think there's too much signage. I understand they have multiple sides, but I think they need to be a little bit more selective with the signage. I'm concerned that we're setting a precedent for everything else going on in this center, in the blind.

Phillips – Brian and I were having a sidebar. I think it ties into the standards, but it's the screening for the rooftop.

Dave Campbell – Mechanical equipment?

Phillips – Yes, any of the equipment.

Chairperson Parel – Just that we have to consider it?

Phillips – Yes, in looking at the renderings for Five & Main.

Shannon White – We have internal systems in this particular building, so the only thing that's on the outside is the meters and the transformer.

Phillips – Okay. Again, it's something that we need to think about for the whole project.

Weber – Shannon, I appreciate what you've got here and I won't rehash it. When I saw it on the agenda, I thought it was going to be a fairly straightforward credit union, and the complexities of it were a bit overwhelming. It's a challenging site for us, as well as Joe mentioned, that you've got significant frontage for high traffic coming from the east. You have significant frontage on the south side. The front of your building is what the



least number of people are going to see. That's a little bit of what we're kind of wrestling with. Personally, I think you've done probably as good as you can with that. I struggle with the standards too, but at the same time, if this is our opportunity to set the standards ... Do we have that ability to set the standards? My guess would probably be no because I can't imagine Bruce is going to just say, okay, if this gets approved, this is the standard for the entire development. As you can tell, we're frustrated that we don't have the information to make it easier on Dort in this case.

I would say, as it relates to the building materials, I have concerns with the palette. I have no issue with character. I think it's a good looking building, but I'm going to ask Dave to pull up the new Brighton Credit Union, the MSU, just to review the materials that they used. I don't know if they've opened yet, but it seemed to be more in character with the look and feel of Five & Main, with warmer tones, some earths, some woods, and I don't think any EIFS.

Dave Campbell – Now, we don't like the MSU part. I mean other than that, it's fine.

Weber – So I get that Dort has a palette and they have some corporate standards.

Shannon White – Yeah, I mean in order to change the entire corporate look, we'd have to go off the ladder. It's a whole different kind of conversation.

Weber – And not looking for all different color standards, but I don't want to ... Please forgive my bluntness. As I was driving home down Haggerty Road, before I looked at our 250-page agenda, but the color palette that was used for this is similar to the Culver's that we have on Haggerty. The blue is different, it's a darker blue, but the rest of it with the stone and bricks, that's what it reminded me of. This is the first building and this probably is the most prominent entrance into Five & Main. I get using EIFS structurally maybe around the canopy for weight and for cost, but is there something that could be done with the cream on the tower there that would create a little more warmth and less EIFS on that piece? That's obviously the most prominent piece, as well as the EIFS then that goes down the east side of the building.

Chairperson Parel – George, I would piggyback on what you said. I don't believe the Culver's has anywhere near this much EIFS. I mean that in a respectful way.

Weber – So, I think it's a fine looking building on its own. I struggle with, again, the setting standards for the rest of the development without having more specificity on those items. I can get past the landscaping, but when it comes to signage and lighting and connectivity, those are critical elements to have a cohesive unit and not have some disparity as we go forward. Those are my comments.

McKeever – It has been covered. I feel the same way as everybody up here. Before we could consider approving anything, someone needs to give us some standards that are going to be upheld throughout the entire development.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you, Bill. The only thing I guess I could add is I agree with Joe. I don't need to rehash it, but I don't like looking at the back of the building. I'm concerned about the drive-through, even though I believe people will be entering at an angle that isn't facing Pontiac Trail. My concern is seeing cars lined up. I think if it was

oriented like this, I would want a heavier amount of buffering. My other challenge remains with the sidewalks. I think we have a couple issues; connectivity is one issue, but I also think there's a big safety issue coming off that intersection on Pontiac Trail.

Weber – Brian, when did you say Bruce is coming to the DDA and the Township Board?

Winkler – From what I understand from Debbie, he will be at the April 8<sup>th</sup> Township Board meeting.

Weber – So two months?

Winkler – That's my understanding.

Debbie Watson – George, I believe the last time Randy mentioned speaking with Bruce, he said Bruce is coming to the April 8<sup>th</sup> Township Board meeting, and he does anticipate that Bruce will also attend the April DDA meeting, but hence the word anticipate. We're still waiting for confirmation on that. Thank you.

Weber – So Jim? How do we move forward on what we've asked for? We want to move quickly for Dort.

Jim Fielder – I understand your comments. [inaudible 9:09pm]

Debbie Watson – Jim, would you mind coming up to the microphone so that we can all hear you? Thank you.

Jim Fielder – I understand your comments and I agree with most of them. The issue we had trying to use Dort as the development standards for the rest of the project was manyfold. I mean the first thing was, in my development career I've done 20 McDonald's. As much as I hate the damn yellow arches, I've not been able to get them off one time. So, the issue we had trying to take the standards that we were hoping to apply universally and apply them to Dort was very difficult because we were in a totally different place to start.

The second part of that was, as you look at it, the project was always to be internal. It was never supposed to be facing Pontiac Trail. By default, you were going to get the back of the buildings. So, to say that we need to improve the look and make it as good as we can, they landscaped it, they've hidden the meters. She didn't mention it, but they're on the side of the building behind the junipers there. That's where the utilities come into the building.

Shannon White – We've done our best in a building that has literally every façade facing the public, on a corner lot with three road fronts, to hide them behind screening and we've specifically recessed that wall so that they were hidden and not on a prominent face.

Sue Neumann – And they've also carried the materials around the whole building as opposed to doing a plain back.

Weber – I think they've done as good a job as you can in that challenging location.

Jim Fielder – Yeah, considering it was a very difficult thing for everybody. We had several meetings with the whole group, including Jerry and everybody else from Dort regarding, these are our core concepts that we do everywhere. We've got to hold these issues in terms of color and some of the signage. We did address pretty much everything you guys said here, but at the same time we understood that because they have that unique thing, and because they're an outlier, they're not going to be the one that sets the standards for the remaining buildings. When we look to Building G, where you have a multi-tenant building, then all your comments come forward front and center, because that is going to be the standard for the rest of the buildings. Look at the signage; well, Building G is going to have signage facing Pontiac Trail because you don't want to have a big blank building there. It's also going to have signage facing Main Street. There's some practical things that we're going to have to deal with, but the reality is that Building G is where you're going to get your questions answered about what's going to happen in the entirety of the center, where this one, in spite of what you do in terms of requirements, is not going to be what's applied to the rest of the shopping center entirely, because they're going to want to keep their identity which is not going to match up exactly with what we're trying to do everywhere else. That's the problem that we have debated for ...

Shannon White – Months.

Jim Fielder – Six months.

Shannon White – Months.

Dave Campbell – Is Building G the shopette?

Jim Fielder – Yes. It's going to be a more normal part of the shopping center versus an outlier. I mean we have a Bank of America in front of Village of Rochester Hills. We all thought it was ugly, but changing the Bank of America?

Chairperson Parel – Can I ask you a question? The shopette, do you anticipate the look and feel of the building will look and feel like that rendering Dave was showing of the overall development?

Jim Fielder – Much more so than what we're talking about here because we don't have necessarily a criteria staring us in the face to say, this is our look and this is what we're trying to sell to our customers. How do you change that? When somebody is a successful retailer, the reason why we want them is because they're successful. And to say, oh, by the way, we're going to change the way you do everything; is that going to make them more successful or make the customer go, was that really the same people we knew? That's the ...

Loskill – In Bloomfield Hills, every sign is black and gold, everybody's, and it doesn't matter who you are. So they can do it.

Jim Fielder – Yes, right. You can do it, but Bloomfield Hills as it relates to that is not that original.

Weber – So what are the Dort color palettes that are their priority? It's obviously their blue and the sign, and ...

Jim Fielder – The blue and the sign. The circulation and the way the drive-through works. We turned the building. The site ...

Weber – I'm not hearing beige EIFS.

Jim Fielder – Beige EIFS? Well, it's going to be everywhere at some point. Maybe you can say there won't be as much of it. Maybe you can use it slightly different, but unfortunately in today's market, the cost of not using EIFS prohibits projects too.

Dave Campbell – I'll ask the Planning Commission first; if this EIFS material on this tower were to be upgraded or changed to something else, does that move the needle for the Planning Commission?

Shannon White – Changed to metal panel or something?

Loskill – It takes one of the issues off the table.

Dave Campbell – So then my question back to the Dort team. Is that a possibility, or is having EIFS up here a must?

Andy Adrianse – I think as long as we have a contrast, right. So, to your point, if it's a wood like surface or a darker wood, we would probably want white text for example.

Loskill – It could be a metal panel of that same color.

Andy Adrianse – Yes, right.

Loskill – We know you want the blue, we know you want the white background for contrast. Instead of being EIFS ...

Weber – But he just said the opposite. What you're interested in is visibility. The contrast that you have, irrespective of the what the background is, you want your name to pop.

Chairperson Parel – But can't that be accomplished with any material? It's about the colors making it pop. Maybe we just upgrade the materials. You could have another material the same color as that EIFS.

Andy Adrianse – Yeah, it could be the same shade as long as it's visible.

Chairperson Parel – I see where you're going and I love it, looking at the main focus of the building, but what about the other parts of the building that are EIFS as well?

Dave Campbell – I don't know that we want to try to design it here at the meeting tonight. And if I played for the Dort team, I also don't think I would want to push the

Planning Commission to make a decision tonight because I'm not sure it would be the decision I want.

Chairperson Parel – I would agree with that as well.

Dave Campbell – If what happens tonight is no action is taken to give the Dort and the Five & Main teams an opportunity to go back and address some of these comments, I guess I would want to give them some direction of what they should be looking to do, and if there's any specific focus areas, what might those be?

Chairperson Parel – I would say, I think you're onto something with the EIFS as it relates to this corner of the building, but I think we should also have a conversation about the other sides. There's quite a bit of EIFS on the drive-through canopy that is facing Pontiac Trail, and to me, it's ...

Dave Campbell – So I hope they're hearing loud and clear that the Planning Commission does not like an overabundance of EIFS.

Jim Fielder – Well, the practical reason for the EIFS on the drive-through as she pointed was white.

Chairperson Parel – Yes, but you can accomplish white with other materials.

Jim Fielder – If it looks just like EIFS, and it happens to be a different material, you're okay with that?

Loskill – Yes, the color is not the issue. It's the material and the lack of longevity of EIFS. Unless it is meticulously maintained, it will fall apart in 10 years.

Jim Fielder – Well, we've had it at the Village for over 25 and we've still got it.

Loskill – There's a long history of EIFS failures in architecture.

Jim Fielder – Well, I didn't say that, you know, but you're talking about maintenance.

Loskill – Like I said, if you meticulously maintain it, it will last, but the greatest majority of retail tenants are not going to meticulously maintain that sort of thing on a yearly basis.

Jim Fielder – But the maintenance of the thing-

Loskill – I'm not saying Dort won't, but the majority of retail tenants don't.

Chairperson Parel – And we're trying-

Jim Fielder – But isn't that part of our development agreement, where the Township has the right to come in and say, you're not maintaining this properly?

Dave Campbell – We're trying to avoid having it come to that.

Jim Fielder – Well, I'm not suggesting that it ever would. Nobody has ever said a word as far as the City of Rochester Hills.

Chairperson Parel – But it has for tenants in this community and I don't think it's possible to have enforcement for every building like that. And honest to God, we're trying to protect this building and make it look good for decades to come. It's going to look great in Year 1 and 2, but as soon as you get some birds up there, or get some minerals coming off the metal caps on the roof and things like that, it looks like garbage. And you talk about image, if you want to have a great image for Dort Financial, my personal opinion is that EIFS is not a great image provider.

Shannon White – Point taken.

Weber – So, let's go back to specifics.

Jim Fielder – Yes, if nothing else, I would appreciate you guys giving us some point by point things so that we don't end up coming back the next time and saying, well we didn't do this or that. If there's an issue, we'll address it the best we can.

Weber – So the first thing we talked about was safety and connectivity of the sidewalk, which I think is probably the easiest thing to solve for.

Jim Fielder – Yes, I think Jim has already got that written up.

Weber – We do need a better understanding of the landscaping, and again, not just for this but for Building G. It's the frontage of Pontiac Trail and how that cannot look like the outlot at Meijer. That's the raw nerve that we have on that. Personally, the orientation of the building, my view, I don't know how you'd do it any better than what you've got with where it is.

Jim Fielder – Right, with the building being that design, we started out with it 90 degrees different than it was, and then you don't have enough room to stack to get to the drive-through ...

Shannon White – And there's crossing of pedestrian traffic, so it was more of a safety issue for Dort of queuing all the way to the internal main street drive. We didn't want to see that happen.

Weber – So, I guess then the issue of signage; my personal view is that if you're going to have three signs, you give up the monument sign. I think the monument sign is overkill if you have those two signs in front of it. I'm not sure that you're getting anything by having a monument sign there.

Jim Fielder – It's more of a traffic direction.

Weber – I don't think you need to be a rocket scientist to figure out this is how you get in.

Jim Fielder – Okay.

Weber – The lighting is a bit of a concern, and maybe if we get something back that says, just as Sue said-

Jim Fielder – We thought that was already actually in the packet because we agreed on the fixtures. I thought those had been submitted.

Weber – Okay.

Jim Fielder – Those would be the ones that will be throughout the center.

Weber – If you can get that, then that's great. That one I think is easily solved. The one that is probably more of a challenge for Shannon is ... I get keeping the corporate colors and the key design cues that make it easy to identify a Dort Credit Union from somebody else, but if I'm looking at that, I would look more at the renderings of the Five & Main project. I have no issues with the signs popping, but something that just creates, and I hate to say it, a little more warmth and class, and a little less Culver's. Maybe that's not fair to you, or maybe that's not fair to Culver's, I'm not sure. I think solving the EIFS issue and maybe warming the beige or the cream color can accomplish that, especially around the parapet with it not being EIFS. Maybe using some other material that is more representative of what the rest of Five & Main is going to have, because the rest of Five & Main isn't going to have, I don't want to say "any" EIFS, but it's going to be very small. And yes, we're probably hypersensitive because this is Building #1 and we're still trying to make sure we get all the rest of the buildings to this vision. Is there anything else on what we've talked about? I know Brian mentioned 6 or 7 things, but I think we've addressed them, other than amenities.

Loskill – The other thing we need from the developer is a set of standards and design guidelines. Whenever I've developed a mall, you have a tenant manual to give to tenants; what you're going to use, what you're going to do, how you're going to do it. We are looking for something like that so we know.

Jim Fielder – But at this point, we don't have it. I mean we're not talking about doing individual tenants. That's going to happen with Building G. I mean this was a one off.

Loskill – I understand that but we just want to make sure this doesn't look completely out of place. If we had an idea of what your design palette was, what your materials were going to be, what your design aesthetic was looking toward, what colors you're going to be using, the things that are going to define this center so that we know what we're doing when we look at some of these ones that are going to be outliers from the typical, and to make sure we don't have something that is completely contrary to what is going on around it. I understand how developments go, this is something that is going to come out of your pocket to develop this, but I think at this point, we need better direction from the developer so we know where you're going with everything.

Jim Fielder – It's just that, as we got into it, we sort of realized that this was not necessarily the tenant to develop the criteria around, and that was as much a problem as anything else. And I've already discussed the fact that they have their own look, and we pushed them as far as we thought reasonable, and you guys have obviously pushed them further, so we'll see.

Weber – So how about for the Dort team, have we added any clarity, or have we just added confusion?

Jim Fielder – Or have they decided to cancel the deal?

Andy Adrianse – We'll certainly do our best. I think ...

Weber – Is there anything we've talked about that's a showstopper for you?

Andy Adrianse – Not necessarily.

Shannon White – I have one process or procedure question. I hear you loud and clear, all of your comments and concerns. We will do our best with the corporate team to change the entire corporate look of this building, but from a process procedure, are you not wanting Dort to come back to the Planning Commission until you have guidelines from the developer? Because we can't be held to a standard that we don't have.

Loskill – Understood.

Shannon White – And we are also being pushed a lot, for like months and months and months, to hurry up and get in. And now we're here, and now we can't move forward. So, do we need to wait until they come in, and process-wise, what is the timing of that? The design guidelines get approved at one meeting, and then we come in a month later, or are we re-presentation? How do you want us to handle that?

Loskill – I think it would depend on how quickly the design team can come up with some basic guidelines to help us understand where things are going with the development. I don't think you necessarily have to wait for them to come up with full blown, detailed drawings, but I think before the next meeting, that would be enough time for them to put together enough information for us to feel more comfortable with reviewing yours, knowing we have a context to review this against.

Chairperson Parel – I think if you came in with a proposal and renderings of a building that looked like the renderings we've seen for Five & Main, and I think we need a plan in front of us that shows the connectivity that was promised with this development, and I know that's not the Dort team's fault. It sounds like maybe we got through some of the lighting issues, but that was a challenge to us. If we had seen this today, and if we had those things, I think it would be a different conversation. I don't know how everybody else feels, but I think we might be able to get through some of these other issues.

Dave Campbell – So what I'm hearing is if the Dort team, and the Five & Main team can address the bulk of the comments that they heard this evening, they could get that back in front of you as soon as next month, even if the Five & Main team is still refining their overall design guidelines, and their overall signage guidelines?

Chairperson Parel – I think that could be a slippery slope.

McKeever – Me too.



Weber – So what do we ... if we have the ...

Shannon White – We need direction on this from our perspective because there are financial penalties that Dort is now starting to assume because it has taken so long to get to this point, that every month delay, we now have to pay a penalty. So, I do feel strongly that Dort needs an answer on this, like how many more months. Because in order to be on the next Planning Commission, we would have to have the drawings in like this week, right?

Debbie Watson – Have you asked the seller that question on how long this will take? Because we'd love to see the guidelines.

Shannon White – Well, he's here.

Debbie Watson – [To Jim Fielder] Can you answer that question? How long will it take?

Weber – Which guidelines are the priority? It seems like lighting is one. That's a pretty big priority.

McKeever – I mean this has come up before.

Dave Campbell – Yes, that's worth pointing out. This has been requested for years, and it has been deferred for years, and for good reason. It was always said, well, it would be premature at this stage to try to come up with signage and design guidelines for a project of the scale and the magnitude of Five & Main. That was always acceptable to the Township. So, when they amended the PUD most recently in 2023, the condition of the approval was, when we get our first PUD site plan, we've got to have these guidelines, signage guidelines and design guidelines. It was not just a wish. It was a condition of the PUD amendment approval. And so, now here we are without those still, and therefore we're having these conversations, where I think somebody said we're trying to approve this thing blindly. So this is why we've been wanting these for years. To answer the question of timing and scheduling, our April Planning Commission meeting would be on the 7<sup>th</sup> I hope. Deb, do you have that in front of you by chance?

Debbie Watson – I'll look it up.

Dave Campbell – I'm hesitating because I don't know if we moved it for Spring Break or Easter.

Debbie Watson – It looks like it is April 7<sup>th</sup>.

Dave Campbell – So, if the intent was to try to get back in front of this Planning Commission on April 7<sup>th</sup>, Shannon, by the week of the 17<sup>th</sup>? The middle of that week maybe. But again, that leaves the unanswered the question of, before we even get to that point, do we want guidelines for the whole of Five & Main? I don't know if we've answered that question. The Planning Commission has deferred on that for years, and maybe we're at the point where we don't want to defer anymore.

Chairperson Parel – On the standards?

Dave Campbell – The design guidelines and the signage guidelines.

Chairperson Parel – I would not say maybe. I would say I don't think we should have even taken a look at this. I think it was a requirement of the development and I think that maybe you weren't told that by the developer.

Shannon White – So we shouldn't come back until the guidelines are ...

Weber – Which guidelines are we talking about?

Dave Campbell – Design guidelines and signage guidelines.

Weber – Because we have lighting, apparently, or it's in process.

Dave Campbell – Design guidelines and signage guidelines were specific conditions of approval the last time this PUD was amended.

Weber – And just so I'm clear, what are the elements of a design guideline?

Dave Campbell – Architecture, materials, color palettes, general aesthetics.

Weber – But it's primarily materials and color palettes? Is that what we're most concerned with?

Loskill – Yes, lighting, signage, colors, aesthetics.

Chairperson Parel – Sidewalks for me.

McKeever – There were 7 or 8 [crosstalk inaudible 9:36pm].

Loskill – You know, what is the aesthetic we're shooting for?

Weber – I want to make sure we've got real specificity on what we need to make a decision so that nobody is spinning their wheels. I don't know what's in a design standard.

Dave Campbell – I might look to Sue, I might put you on the spot. Do you have an understanding of what a reasonable set of design guidelines would look like?

Sue Neumann – Yes, everything we've done in the past, the standards, architectural language, materials, colors, signage, types of signs, lighting ...

Dave Campbell – Do you have any sense of how far away we are from having that? Are we months, are we ...

Sue Neumann – I can't answer that tonight.

Chairperson Parel – Could we offer this up? We've got approximately a couple weeks before we would have to get the information in here. I don't know if it would be helpful,

because you can't answer it tonight, but as you take that back to your team, maybe there's an opportunity in a week or so to put together something, and we could offer up a couple of us to come in and meet with you. We understand you're under a strict timeline, but I would offer that. I don't know if it's a possibility or if that would even be helpful, but I know at least myself, and maybe one or two of architects would be happy to meet with you outside of a meeting to make sure you're not wasting your time and spinning your wheels.

Weber – Are you local to the area?

Sue Neumann – Yes.

Chairperson Parel – Dort team?

Andy Adrianse – Yes.

Dave Campbell – So we want that established before we can be in a position to take action on Dort.

Chairperson Parel – This is part of the development, to me. This isn't different and it shouldn't have different design specifications. I understand where you're coming from, this is a customer of yours and they have their own specs, but this has to be one, and I also understand that-

Jim Fielder – It's not multi-tenant buildings, so no matter what our design standards are, you'll have to make something up to interpret them to fit a freestanding building-

Chairperson Parel – But I think the design standards have to be at least somewhat static across the entire development, and that's the point. When I look at the Rochester development, I don't see such a big difference. What we're looking for here – when I look at that rendering, I see-

Jim Fielder – When you look at the outlots at Rochester Hills, you don't see a difference from what the shopping center is?

Chairperson Parel – Yeah, I'm just looking at the main parts.

Jim Fielder – I know.

Chairperson Parel – Yeah.

Jim Fielder – We're looking at an outlot versus you're talking about the interior of the shopping center.

McKeever – So maybe in your specifications, you could give those differences that are allowed in the outlots. I mean we've been given nothing.

Jim Fielder – I understand. I'm just saying that you get standards, but you still will not be able to apply them directly to this-

McKeever – But everybody that comes in here with a building design is going to want the same latitude as what we're guessing at right now.

Weber – I think that's the right word. What we're afraid of is that right now, we are guessing, and we don't want to guess on what some of these items are. We heard you loud and clear that the outlot is going to have uniqueness to it, and it's not going to have everything that the interior has, but it's still one development. We went through this with The Springs as well to make sure it fits with this, and this is the window to that entire development. So, even though it's going to be different, it needs to be held to a standard and we just need to know what the standards are.

Debbie Watson – Can I make a comment, as the DDA Director? I just want to point out that I have a communication with Bruce in front of me from December 16<sup>th</sup>, where I emailed him directly and asked him to please let us know when he would be coming to the Planning Commission with everything that we've just discussed here, all the specifics. He did respond, of course, *We'd be coming in in January, prior to Dort submitting plans*. So, I'm just calling out the elephant in the room. This is the problem. He's not here now. He wasn't here in January as he said he would have been, and that's what's delaying you. I want that on the record myself, that is your delay. If he had been here in January, maybe those could have been approved by now and you wouldn't have any delays to encounter at this point. So, that's my piece. Thank you.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you. So with that, where do we go? We're not going to make a motion this evening. I don't think you want us to make a motion.

Loskill – I think we just move to table.

Chairperson Parel – We table it, but we work closely with David for the next few weeks.

Weber – But you make a key point. If we can get the design standards, or at least those two key elements, and then once we have those, which hopefully will be quick, then a couple members of the Planning Commission would meet with the Dort team to hash some of this out so that the next time you're coming to the meeting, the key issues have been addressed, at least for several key members of the team here who have given a stamp of approval on coming back to the Commission so you're not spinning your wheels.

Dave Campbell – So if it is the desire of the Planning Commission to table action, then you would need a motion to that effect.

Chairperson Parel – Sure, and is that what you want to do?

Jim Fielder – Well, I certainly don't want it denied.

Chairperson Parel – I agree, and neither do we.

**MOTION** by Loskill, supported by Phillips, to **table** Item PSP25-01 Dort Financial Credit Union.  
**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Chairperson Parel – We're here if you guys need us.  
Shannon White – Thank you.

Chairperson Parel – We want to see a great development.

Dave Campbell – We all want the same thing. We want Five & Main to be exceptional. We want Dort to be exceptional. We want everyone to be exceptionally successful. I hope that's the good news, is that everybody wants the same thing.

Andy Adrianse – All right, we appreciate it.

Sue Neumann – Thank you.

Jim Fielder – Thank you.

### **ITEM 1.2. COMMERCE LAKE MARKET – CONCEPTUAL REVIEW**

Property/business owner Steve Bakko is requesting a conceptual review for the redevelopment/expansion of the Commerce Lake Market at 1740 Glengary to include fuel pumps, including the residential lot at 2750 Benstein Road.  
PIN#'s: 17-25-426-015 & 17-21-276-063

Chairperson Parel – Dave, this is our last item of business, Commerce Lake Market, a conceptual review. Mr. Gumma is here, smiling. Can you bring us up to speed? We're kind of running on fumes here.

Dave Campbell – Yes, I don't know if it's a good thing or a bad thing for their team.

Chairperson Parel – It might be good for their team.

Dave Campbell – Let me fly over to the northeast corner of Glengary and Benstein. Mr. Bakko and his team should be familiar to the Planning Commission. I think this might be the third time that he has come to you seeking some preliminary feedback for a concept plan for his existing store, the Commerce Lake Market.

I guess the last time Mr. Bakko and his team were here, the concept was to demolish the bulk of the existing store, but keep a portion of it, and then rebuild it northward so that the store would have more of a presence out onto Benstein Road, keeping in mind that Mr. Bakko already owns this house here. He's currently renting it, but his intent with the prior plan, and now with the plan you'll see tonight is to demolish this home.

What has changed since that concept to the one you have this evening is that the store would be demolished and completely rebuilt with a new store, a bigger store, that would have more offerings, hot food offerings and so forth. But probably what's most interesting to the Planning Commission is that there would be fuel pumps, particularly a fuel canopy along the east side of Benstein Road, with 4 pumps, all double loaded, so a total of 8 nozzles.

The property of the existing store is zoned B-2, but the residential home is zoned R-1, it's either R-1C or R-1D. Regardless, it's single family residential. So, in order to get to a point where you can have gas pumps on this property, you would have to get it rezoned to B-3, and even then, as we discussed back in the context of Kroger, you would still need Special Land Use approval for the fuel pumps. We've had meetings with Mr.

Bakko leading up to this evening and discussed that those are the steps that would have to be gone through. As we often say, when the conversation is about a rezoning, we know that both the Planning Commission and the Township Board tend to favor a Conditional Rezoning, which some people call contract zoning, which is *if you if you can give me the zoning I need, then I promise I'll build this and only this*.

So, we would be entering into a contract to rezone the properties to B-3, and there would be conditions on that rezoning. One of the things that would be included in those conditions would be a concept plan of how everything would lay out. A concept plan would likely look something like this, if this is the route Mr. Bakko chooses to go. We also talked about potential conditions with the operation. Given that this property is adjacent to single family residential, and those folks likely would not want a 24-hour operation right next door to them, for example. We talked to Mr. Bakko about the potential for limiting the hours to more reasonable hours. We talked about limiting the amount of noise that could be generated by speakers and the digital TV screens they put in gas pumps nowadays.

As you can see on this concept, it looks like the intent is to heavily landscape the northern perimeter because there is single family to the north and also to the east. So, whether it's landscaping, or whether it's some sort of a privacy fence wall, something like that, these are all the things that could be baked into a conditional rezoning agreement so that if this were to move forward, we would be protecting the folks living in their single family homes nearby.

We talked about this very briefly with the Township's traffic engineer and because it's a rezoning and because Glengary and Benstein is certainly a busy intersection, there would need to be a traffic analysis of how this would impact both the proposed driveways along Glengary that currently exist, and then the proposed new driveway out to Benstein Road, and how it could impact the signalized intersection of Benstein and Glengary. One of the things we have to think about is the existing center left turn lanes and how those would interplay with the proposed new driveways as people try to make a left turn in and out of this proposed facility.

So, a lot of things to be looked at, a lot of things to be evaluated, and a lot of steps that need to be taken. Oh, I should mention too, on the south side of Glengary Road is the Village of Wolverine Lake, so that's a different municipality than Commerce Township. Anytime you propose to rezone a property along a municipal boundary, by State law, you have to go to what's called the Oakland County Coordinating Zoning Committee, and their job is to make sure that one community is not putting another community in a bad spot by rezoning to heavy industrial on one side of the street where the other community has single family residential on the other side of the street. That would be another step in the process.

So, these are all the things that Mr. Bakko has to consider, both the time and the cost, the commitment and so forth. So before he dives in on any of that, we thought it would be a good idea for him to come to the Planning Commission again now, with the store with the fuel pumps, and try to gauge the Planning Commission's appetite for what would be a zoning change for a significantly different facility and operation than what he has now, and see what preliminary comments the Planning Commission has so that he can make an educated decision of whether he wants to push ahead with this.

As we always say with these concept plans, the Planning Commission is not committing to anything, and Mr. Bakko and his team are not committing to anything. This is just meant to be an informal opportunity to discuss and brainstorm and see if this is a project

that could have some legs, again, so that Mr. Bakko can make some educated decisions on what he wants to do next.

Phillips – Dave, in the prior version, we saw the fuel pumps were on Glengary.

Dave Campbell – Yes, we did have a meeting, including myself, Mr. Phillips, Mr. Parel and Mr. Weber. I think we piggybacked off another meeting with the Kroger team. This goes back a couple weeks ago. And so, yes, you're correct Mr. Phillips, at that time Mr. Bakko was trying to decide whether having fuel pumps on the Glengary side made more sense, or whether the Benstein side made more sense. With this plan that he's putting in front of you tonight, obviously the pumps are on the Benstein side. But if there are strong opinions about that, I'm sure Mr. Bakko and his team would want to hear that.

Phillips – Were there the same rezoning issues?

Dave Campbell – Yes. Well, for one thing, the properties need to be combined, because otherwise you're going to have a property line going through the middle of the site and that creates setback issues and all sorts of problems. So, you're going to combine these into one property and then you're going to want to rezone the new property to B-3.

Phillips – Okay.

Dave Campbell – I think Mr. Bakko can speak to why he felt that having a fuel option on Benstein Road made more sense to him from a business standpoint than having it on the Glengary side. So, I don't know if it's Mr. Bakko or if it's Mr. Gumma or who amongst you wants to do the talking, but you can come to the podium and speak on your own behalf.

John Gumma – Good evening. We saved the best for last. My firm was responsible for providing these drawings. We also have Chris with us from Corrigan Oil. Yes, you are correct; we did originally have the fueling on the Glengary side. We would prefer for it to be there, but I think after doing a traffic study on the ingress and egress out of Glengary, it was a little too congested in there. So, we decided to go to the Benstein side, which is better and safer. I think that the unofficial recommendation to go that route was a great suggestion.

The existing building is in the dashed line; yes, that's the existing building right there. It is old and it needs a lot of help. It cannot afford another renovation, or even an addition to it. It really needs to go. By committing to this, yes, we would commit to a conditional rezoning. We would tap into all the utilities available, eliminate the septic and well that it is on now. It's better for the community, it's better for everybody.

We are heavily screening the northside. We can put a privacy fence or wall on both sides, north and east if it needs to be, with the exception of the sight line. We would probably hold it back a little bit.

This building needs to go, so we are looking for your recommendation. Whatever you may say or guide us with toward getting this approved. You have the renderings, right Dave?

Dave Campbell – We have the last iteration.

John Gumma – Yes, it's similar to that, if they want to see what it looks like.

Dave Campbell – We can pull those up. I forget how many months back we're going, but before they wanted the fuel pumps, back when they wanted to do the partial demolition of the existing store, and then the addition to the new store, they did have some renderings. I can pull those up. But John, correct me if I'm wrong, the intent is for this new building to mimic the elevations that this Planning Commission saw, and I think was mostly favorable toward, a few months ago.

John Gumma – That is correct.

Dave Campbell – So, maybe a question for Corrigan Oil. Because this would be a Special Land Use, then one of the top criteria is a documented and immediate need, and a lot of times that documented and immediate need is provided by market studies and what's available in the area in a specified radius, along with population maps and so forth. Do you have any thoughts or wisdom on how they will be able to demonstrate to this Planning Commission that there is a documented and immediate need for fuel pumps?

Chris Cochran – There are surveys we can put out that will determine how much fuel is needed for this area and how much fuel they will use for this area.

Dave Campbell – Is that based on population and households, or ...

Chris Cochran – Traffic, and population and household, single-family, there's a whole criteria for it, and it's very expensive, but they're within 10,000 gallons a month, which is very good. I don't know for sure as far as documenting the need for the gas station, and as far as the party store, I'm not part of that.

John Gumma – Based on this, we would hire Calgary. They do all of the traffic studies and recommendations of how many gallons and why it's needed there.

Chris Cochran – They're very precise and it's a report that's very detailed. It will solve all of your needs.

Dave Campbell – You're not necessarily having to demonstrate the need for the convenience store, because it's already zoned for that. It's the fuel pumps specifically.

Chris Cochran – Correct, and then that's the special use permit on all municipalities.

Dave Campbell – So you know what we're looking for.

Chris Cochran – And it will draw ... You have your core people that are there in the neighborhood, but it won't draw people from far away. It will be the immediate area. It looks good. I'm impressed. Even though there is a piece of property there in the middle that they won't sell, it's still a good setup. I've got another drawing to show where the tanks would be, the piping and everything. Also, this is a better layout for delivery of fuel with the tanker. They're usually 50-foot radius tankers, and I can hand this out if you want me to. It shows where the tanks are in relation to everything else. At Corrigan, I



build a lot of stations. This is a big footprint compared to some of the party stores that build gas stations.

Dave Campbell – What are some of the good ideas that other municipalities have made you do that we can steal?

John Gumma – The circulation works here.

Chris Cochran – Well, you've got to get that guy to sell the piece of property in the front.

Dave Campbell – He just put a bunch of money into it.

Chris Cochran – Yes, I understand. But, the way the building is set up, I understand not putting the dispensers on that side, because people coming in and traffic, you don't want that. There's a nice, easy flow here. The convenience store is the key. Nowadays, you can make a lot of profit off fuel. Back in the day, the draw was just to get into the gas station and the convenience store made the money. But now, it has turned around. That's why a lot of convenience stores are changing over to fuel sales also. It's a good market. I was an inspector for 15 years for [LARA]. This will do between 70,000 and 100,000 gallons per month. It's a good amount of fuel.

Dave Campbell – How does that compare to a Speedway?

Chris Cochran – 300,000 for a Speedway. We build Sheetz and they're 750,000 gallons. There's one down in Southfield on 75, it's 1.2 million gallons a month. We have tankers coming in there constantly. It's the area and like you said, the study will tell you everything. If you want that, which I suggest for these people that supply, that will explain everything as far as the need for it.

Dave Campbell – We require it. We require you to show that there is a documented and immediate need.

John Gumma – We will provide that. This will have rec fuel also for boating and watercrafts.

Chris Cochran – I did implement diesel also, in the case of guys coming with lawnmowers or something that needs diesel. You can't pull big trucks in there.

Phillips – I was counting all the signatures, and it looks like you've got more than 400. If all of those people come for gas, is there enough?

Chris Cochran – We'll just bring more tankers.

Chairperson Parel – Do we have any concerns with the tankers and refueling this station as it relates to nearby residential and timing?

Chris Cochran – This is what I drew up. (Handouts provided to the Planning Commissioners). The tanks are there. They come in from Glengary and with the radius for the 50-foot, they can fill all the tanks and swing out on the Benstein side. We have

40 to 70-foot radius trucks, and the 50-foot meets all criteria as far as bringing trucks in to fill.

Dave Campbell – Is there any way to control the time of day?

Chris Cochran – For drops, yes sir. That will all be determined by when he's open and when he's not. I know there's a set time frame. We can come after hours.

Dave Campbell – The idea is to try to minimize disturbance to the neighbors.

Chris Cochran – Yes, sir. We don't want to disturb the neighbors, or the clients inside. It's not like in the old days of dropping fuel with vapors. Everything is confined. The vapors go back into the truck. Everything is double-walled piping, the tanks are double-walled. It's a closed system. I've installed these. I was an installer for 20 years before. This is state-of-the-art. In 2015, the State of Michigan picked up all the EPA standards. We have to follow standards as far as weekly, monthly and yearly testing. Inspectors are there every three years, and they surprise facilities now. It's a very good system.

Chairperson Parel – I guess my concern was more related to trucks coming in for delivery, air brakes, the back-up notifications on the trucks.

Chris Cochran – The way I have it planned out, they pull in here, come around, drop their fuel, and leave that area. The radius will work. And I know what you're saying about the air brakes.

Chairperson Parel – I'm thinking timing. Is this going to happen at 5:30am when folks are sleeping?

Chris Cochran – The way Corrigan works is, we work with the customer to meet their needs, and of course, your needs. We drop fuel 24/7 and that is not a problem. We can change it any time, whenever it's necessary. If there's ever any complaints, we can change that also.

Dave Campbell – That might be an example of something that could be written into the Conditional Rezoning. One of the conditions could be that fuel drops can only be ...

Chris Cochran – From 2:00-4:00 or 3:00-5:00 or whatever, yes. Correct.

John Gumma – It could even happen at 9:00pm when it's the slowest time.

Chris Cochran – A lot of our fuel is delivered 8:00-11:00, a huge amount.

Dave Campbell – At night?

Chris Cochran – Yes, sir.

Dave Campbell – Okay.

Chairperson Parel – Dave, should we go down the line and see if anybody wants to add anything, questions, comments?

Dave Campbell – I would love for you to do that.

**Commission Comments:**

McKeever – I don't have any questions.

Weber – I'm going to be very interested to see the data on the documented and immediate need. I looked at the U.S. Department of Energy's data on gasoline sales. Their annual sales are dropping like a rock, or have been since the 2008 time frame. Now, that's a national number. I don't know what it is in this area, but a documented and immediate need – none of the other gas stations near the area have anybody lined up outside on the street trying to get in. That's the information I'm going to want to see. I get why it's a great business decision for Mr. Bakko, but the data that says, in this area, we're deficient right now and people are struggling to get gasoline.

Chris Cochran – With all due respect, you're not going to see that. It's just a volume issue. The people around there will flock to this facility. They will figure out that this is the place to go. It has been years of doing this. There isn't going to be a need for fueling because Speedway has too many. I apologize.

Weber – And I think that's interesting and maybe I hadn't thought of it. What you're saying is you're providing a convenience factor. There's not a need for it, but there's a convenience factor. I don't know if that comes into our definition of a documented and immediate need.

Chris Cochran – And you have rec fuel. There's a need for that for the boats and such, because people are always filling their boats with 5 gallon cans, spilling it into the lake, and the more people that have boats are my age, older individuals, and it's harder to do sometimes.

Weber – So that's the one thing I'm going to want to see. The other is, I have concerns on putting high-impact, high-density right next to residential, meaning the reason we don't have B-3 right next to residential is to provide some kind of a buffer. I know you've got screening, but taking that leap is a concern that I need to wrestle with. Maybe the biggest concern, and again, we've seen a rendering of the market, but when you put a 12-foot gas station canopy ...

Chris Cochran – 13'2".

Weber – A 13'2" canopy at that intersection, which is truly neighborhood, intimate, small commercial, Dairy Twist and Eagles, your present market, I'm concerned with that. I don't know how you can screen for the residential at 13'2". And it's 13'2" to the bottom, so add another 3' to the top of that.

Chris Cochran – 2'6", yes, you're right.

Weber – So, just changing the overall character of that intersection, and obviously, we know traffic is going to be a big part of this. I'm sure there will need to be a study. That's the other concern with that, and I think you've addressed it. The potential of moving it to the Benstein side is far superior to the Glengary side. The impact on putting a giant canopy and fuel service in an intimate neighborhood commercial area is a concern.

John Gumma – George, I respect your comment, but with the new building being taller, and that masonry building at the corner and the heavy landscaping, truly, you're not going to see it like you think you are. It's tucked away where you're not going to see it. Now, if it was at the corner of the property at the intersection, I get it, but it's tucked away. You're not going to see like this big canopy that's overwhelming. It's not.

Weber – We haven't yet gotten to see a mockup of that. I live close to there. My eyeline is just with what's there today. I'm having a hard time visualizing if I'm looking at another 16-foot tall canopy, and I'm not sure, but the whole building or the peak is probably not 16-feet I wouldn't think. My guess is that it will tower over that.

John Gumma – Maybe I'm wrong, but we can do a study on that as well, on the angles and the canopy details.

Mr. Bakko – I was just going to say something about the 500 signatures that we had; 20% of that was actually for diesel also, at least, if not more. So, we're not accommodating of everything, besides hot food. And the hours will be flexible. We can make reasonable hours so we won't bother anybody. Everybody knows us in the neighborhood. I've been there for 11 years and there is no bother to anybody. We're doing the best we can and we're here to stay. We're not going anywhere.

Cameron Bakko – That's why I'm here.

Mr. Bakko – He's going to be here.

Loskill – Just a couple of comments. It looks like people turning left into the station are going to have an issue with the cars sitting at the northern side of the pump. You may want to shift that down so that your island aligns with your landscape island on Benstein. My other comment was, on the south side around Glengary, you've got an asphalt strip that is really not doing much of anything. I think that would look a lot nicer if you turned that into green space between the landscape island and the parking island. If you're not going to do anything but cover it in asphalt, it would look much nicer as greenspace.

Your sidewalk depth; you've got 5-foot sidewalks around the building. When the cars pull up, it makes it hard for people to walk between there. You may want to consider increasing that a little bit.

John Gumma – 7-foot?

Loskill – Yes, normally ... Does the Township require 18 or 20-foot deep spaces?

Dave Campbell – So, we require 20-foot spaces, but you're allowed to have a 2-foot overhang, but like you're saying, in this application, we would say then you have to have a 7-foot sidewalk, because you still have to have a 5-foot clearance for ADA.

Loskill – So you could make the sidewalk deeper and the parking spaces shorter.

John Gumma – Sure.

Loskill – And screening on the north side against the residential. That's part of the Township ordinance you have to comply with.

Dave Campbell – Or go above and beyond it as a condition of the Conditional Rezoning.

Phillips – I was still looking at the petition. Did the adjacent neighbors get a vote? Did they sign it? We're concerned about that intensity business.

Mr. Bakko – I'm not sure. The one next door to me is a vacant house. I'm trying to buy it.

Phillips – I'm thinking about how useful this list of signatures is going to be in getting this approved, and would it relieve some of George's concerns about the adjacent residential neighbors. And, I also noticed you do have a number of signatures from Wolverine Lake, and Dave said there are hurdles to jump through to get this approved. Does that help get any of that done?

Dave Campbell – Again, by State law, we have to go to the Oakland County Coordinating Zoning Committee. Now, having support signatures from residents of Wolverine Lake certainly can't hurt, but procedurally, we still have to go to that meeting.

Winkler – I have to be honest, and I had a brief discussion with Dave before, but when he mentioned about this project I immediately thought the same thing that you brought up, Brady, was the effect it will have on the neighbors. But now that I've seen the site plan, when it comes to the headlights of vehicles in the gas station, they're either going to be pointing toward the building, or toward the shop across the street. That kind of took care of some of the concerns I had about the effect the project would have on the neighbors.

As Dave has let you know, there's a lot of challenges. The Road Commission is one. The storm water retention is another, particularly concerning that you have those gas tanks and the foundation for your canopy, along with all of those other things there. The other one is basically getting the rezoning for this, and that will involve a public hearing.

John Gumma – B-3, yes.

Winkler – And the opinions the adjacent neighbors have will have some bearing on what the Planning Commission takes into account. George, when you talked about the quantity of gas stations we have, you mentioned convenience. It made me think, where is the nearest gas station to this? And it's all the way over in Wixom on Wixom Road. I live on Benstein, south of here, and it would be convenient over going to the usual places you go for gas.

I can see the logic in the placement of the building because, unless I'm wrong, it looks like the user could continue to operate the store where it's at while he's building the new store, and the gas pumps. That's a good idea. The last thing is, you did answer the

question about how gas trucks would get into the lot. Based upon my past experience, you're going to have a lot of heavy duty pavement where that truck pulls in, because the truck will grind up asphalt.

Chris Cochran – 8" reinforced concrete ...

Winkler – So, I just wanted to mention those things. And one other item. I noticed on the southwest corner of your property, there's a monstrous tree. If you could save that tree, it wouldn't be a bad idea.

Mr. Bakko – That's not my tree. It's a county tree.

Winkler – Oh, is that on the masonry shops property? Well, those are my comments. I wish you luck.

Mr. Bakko – Thank you. I'm trying to do something nice for the neighborhood. I have very good feedback from the neighborhood and I became part of the neighborhood.

John Gumma – Do you want to tell them about the full-service that you'll offer?

Mr. Bakko – Oh, by the way, I'm going to offer full-service. I'm going to the high school to hire some kids for the summertime to work and pump gas and keep the place clean, for the same price fuel. We haven't seen this for 40 years.

Loskill – My first job was pumping gas.

Cameron Bakko – As far as the signatures go, that was more so contingent on the customers that we already have coming in. Our nearest neighbor is a vacant house. Our other neighbors are businesses. We asked feedback from people who already shop there; Would you want a gas station to make it more convenient? What else would you see in here, or not see in here? As far as the gas station, is it a go for you? Would you be in favor of it and would it create convenience? Like you said, the nearest gas station is 2 or 3 miles away in Wixom.

Bearer inquired about the vacant house. Discussion continued regarding the property to the north and the potential to acquire it.

Cameron Bakko – The way we see it is, if we acquired that property, which technically we don't really need it, but if we did, it would give us more space for the buffer.

Chairperson Parel – When we had the gas pumps on the south side of the existing building, I looked at that and it's surrounded by commercial. I understand we're combining properties and making it B-3, but on that side, everything surrounding it, inclusive of across the street, is commercial. When we move the pumps to the desired location, we've got some residential to the north to deal with. I understand that it's a vacant house at the moment, but there's no real transition there from the most intense part of this property. That's just something to think about. I'm not saying I'm necessarily opposed to it, I just liked the pumps on the other side because they were further away

from the residential, but this solves a traffic issue. So, it would be nice if you could purchase that.

Mr. Bakko – That's how I like it.

Chairperson Parel – I know. I don't know if it's possible. You could be a year out from obtaining it and by that time, you'd have architectural plans.

Cameron Bakko – Yes, but we would not do anything with it. It would just be a buffer.

Chairperson Parel – I understand, but there's no guarantee right now. That's all I'm saying. And I'm not saying I'm opposed. It's just something to think about. We're looking to give you info and take some. Did we answer all your questions?

Mr. Bakko and Mr. Gumma replied affirmatively.

Chris Cochran – If you have any controller questions, I've left my card. I'm here for you. You can call me 24/7.

Dave Campbell – I have one more question, petroleum related. So, Mr. Weber particularly voiced concerns about the canopy; the mass, height and scale of the canopy and whether it fits in with the surrounding character. I assume it is the jobber and the fuel provider who dictates the design, signage and lighting and so forth. Where I'm going with this is, are there opportunities to make it more subtle and not quite as bright with neutral coloring around the canopy so it's not a big, bright, shiny billboard? Can it be more subtle?

Chris Cochran – Correct, and the way that works is that it's all branded. They have to have a canopy. If they don't have a canopy, they won't put in for his ...

Dave Campbell – Understood, nobody wants to pump gas in the rain.

Chris Cochran – Thank you. So, what they can do on the back end, they can just earth it. Then, just where you're looking at the roadside, they can have the signage. On the back side where it's facing the homes, they can just earth it. They don't have to go all the way around it.

Chairperson Parel – What does earth it mean?

Chris Cochran – Tone it down, bring it to the natural ...

Chairperson Parel – Color palette?

Chris Cochran – Exactly.

Dave Campbell – Can we avoid the NASCAR with the checkered flag aesthetic? Can it be something more aesthetic and neutral?

Chris Cochran – Well, it has to be partially, probably on two sides, okay? Not the back two sides, but they have to have the branding for the product. It would be on both sides of the road, but the sides facing the homes, they don't have to do that.

Weber – I would say a ton of signs doesn't really help your convenience argument.

John Gumma – It's not the sign, it's just the color of the branding.

Chairperson Parel – But we would see that later on.

Dave Campbell – Yes, but I think one of the things you want to think about, in the effort of getting this approved by both the Planning Commission and the Township Board, because Township Board has to approve the rezoning, I think you want to think about keeping the fuel element as non-objectional as possible, as far as lights, noise, odors, and traffic. Part of that is keeping that canopy subtle.

Cameron Bakko – Like natural?

Chairperson Parel – Sure.

Dave Campbell – Not overly bright, not overly gaudy.

Weber – As minimalistic as possible.

Chris Cochran – And we've worked with that before with others, like Birmingham.

Dave Campbell – Yes, whatever they make you do in Birmingham, do that for us.

Chairperson Parel – Okay, gentlemen, anything else we can answer for you?

Cameron Bakko – No.

Chris Cochran – No, sir.

Chairperson Parel – You've got Dave's number if you need it. We're here for you and we appreciate you being a part of this community.

John Gumma – Dave, we appreciate it. I'll call you tomorrow.

Dave Campbell – All right, thank you.

**J: OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION:**  
None.

**K: PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Dave Campbell discussed the following:

- **NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: MONDAY, APRIL 7, 2025, AT 7:00PM.**
- I'm trying to think ahead of what we might be seeing in April.



- Other than the potential for the credit union, which sounds like it might be a long shot given everything they need to do, but I can't think of anything that I know with certainty is going to be on the April agenda. That could change tomorrow.

Weber – Just one question. LaFontaine is rocking and rolling and everything is looking good. I go around the Pontiac Trail roundabout twice a day it seems. We had talked to them about putting in a sign that says, "Commerce Township" and about using the exact same stone and Commerce Township sign that Barrington has for consistency of look and feel. I think everybody thinks the backlit Barrington sign with just Commerce Township and our logo are very aesthetic.

Dave Campbell – Yes, and they actually sent us a copy from their sign company of what the sign was going to be, and the backlit halo letters were specifically something we said we wanted to mimic. They agreed to that.

Weber – So it will be the same stone and the same backlit black lettering?

Dave Campbell – Same backlit black letters. Whether it is the exact same stone, I guess I want to check that.

Weber – Or at least close.

Dave Campbell – It's going to be brick/stone. The color might be more complementary to what they're trying to do with Genesis and Hyundai, but yes, a brick/stone monument sign with backlit black halo letters and the Township logo.

Weber – Yes, but I guess I'm looking to see if it's the exact same. At some point in time, on other parts of the Township ... You see communities that every sign is consistent and to exacting standards. I guess that's my request; the same stone or block. Whatever Barrington has seems like a great standard that, over the years, we can duplicate with other major thoroughfares coming into the Township.

Chairperson Parel – Setting developmental standards. Sounds like a good idea, George.

Weber – Marketing 101.

Dave Campbell – Got it.

Chairperson Parel – If anyone hasn't had a chance to drive by the boat guy on Haggerty, kudos to this team and Dave's team, and everybody involved. I think that the gentleman fixed up his property. The trees and fencing look great. I know we spent so much time on it, but it's no longer an eyesore. I think we all deserve a little bit of credit.

Dave Campbell – I think he deserves credit too. It took a lot to get it there, but he had to write some pretty big checks.

Chairperson Parel – Fair.

Winkler – I wanted to mention, I won't be at the April or May meetings due to travel, but I know you'll carry the banner with Five & Main.

**L: ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION** by Loskill, supported by Phillips, to adjourn the meeting at 10:32pm.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

---

Joe Loskill, Secretary