

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

Monday, April 12, 2021
2009 Township Drive
Commerce Township, Michigan 48390

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

ROLL CALL: Present: Brian Parel, Vice Chairperson
 Brian Winkler, Secretary
 Bill McKeever
 George Weber
 Chelsea Rebeck
 Sam Karim
Absent: Larry Haber, Chairperson (excused)
Also Present: Dave Campbell, Township Planning Director

Vice Chairperson Parel – It is my first meeting chairing. I'm taking over for Mr. Haber. A couple notes. Please silence your phones. We're obviously operating under some difficult circumstances tonight. We'd appreciate it if everyone could remain socially distanced, keep your masks on and be respectful.

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by McKeever, supported by Rebeck, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda of April 12, 2021, as presented.

AYES: **McKeever, Rebeck, Weber, Winkler, Karim, Parel**

NAYS: **None**

ABSENT: **Haber**

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Winkler, supported by Rebeck, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of March 1, 2021, as written.

Discussion –

Winkler – All 40 pages of the minutes from the March meeting looked good.

Parel – Brian, I'd like to say thank you. Last month, you brought a woman from your organization who spoke on the subject of sustainability, and I thought it was very helpful. I think that's something that our Township and this board should be striving for.

AYES: **Winkler, Rebeck, McKeever, Weber, Karim, Parel**

NAYS: **None**

ABSENT: **Haber**

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES

Bill McKeever – Zoning Board of Appeals – I'm hoping to lean on Dave Campbell as I could not get my notes to print out.

Dave Campbell –

- There were two items on the ZBA's agenda, which was Thursday, March 25th.
- One was a project that this Planning Commission was familiar with, the new Jiffy Lube, which received site plan approval on March 1st to go on a newly created outlot in front of the Meijer store along Haggerty. They wanted to put an extra

wall sign on their building, which would require a sign exception from the ZBA. The ZBA approved the additional sign on the north side of the Jiffy Lube building.

- The other request was along Charlevoix, and it was a homeowner who had a preexisting shed on his lakefront property, between the house and the lake, which is not something the Township typically allows. He inherited the shed when he bought the house. Not knowing any better, he tore down a portion of the shed, then essentially rebuilt it and made it a lot nicer, but in so doing he replaced a lawful nonconforming structure. To be able to keep that shed, he had to go to the Zoning Board of Appeals. They did approve his right to keep that structure. I think they asked him to dress it up a little bit and put a fresh coat of paint on certain portions of it.

George Weber – Township Board of Trustees

- I have a couple of items of note.
- First, Johnny Walker was appointed to the Parks & Recreation Committee for a term of four years. One of his assignments will be to act as the liaison between the Parks & Recreation Committee and the Horse Farm on Wixom Road.
- We've spent lot of time with the residents of Lower Straits Lake. We had a virtual Town Hall meeting with those residents, and then we had a subsequent discussion during the Township Board meeting on moving forward with the 2021 plan.
- We gave an update on the Township property management strategy. If you'll recall, those are the 166 properties that the Township owns, of which a portion of those will be divested, either sold to potential developers, or sold to adjacent property owners for those that are in residential environments.
- We've had further discussion on 8585 PGA Drive and the utilization of that, specifically whether or not it makes sense to make that the new Sheriff's substation for Oakland County.
- We had a discussion with the DDA on Parcel L. I think many people here will remember, that was originally going to be sold to a franchisee for the Goddard School. We discussed a pathway waiver for that site. Subsequent to that discussion, the Goddard franchisee has pulled out of that sales agreement, so that property is back up for sale.

Brian Winkler – Downtown Development Authority

- At the March 16th DDA meeting, I'll summarize what was discussed.
- On the Insite Commercial Report:
 - For Parcel B1, Phase 1, which is the Aikens' Five & Main development, the site plan for the entire project is to be revised.
 - The joint meeting that was tentatively scheduled for April 27th has since been tentatively moved to June 22nd, and that's subject to confirmation, to give Aikens more time to pull some information together.
 - Parcel B1, Phase 2 of the retail property; the originally scheduled closing date for this property was October 31, 2021. However, this date is to be pushed back to a later date, to be determined, due to pandemic related delays in the project.
- Regarding other properties still available in the DDA, Insite reported an uptick in activities and inquiries about the remaining parcels.

- A purchase agreement was received for the Beaumont property, and more information will be available regarding this PA at the April DDA meeting.
- Deb Watson was approved as President of the HOA on February 25th.
- The Township Board approved a 1.75M advance to the DDA at their March 9th meeting.
- Susan Spelker is getting acclimatized to her new role as the head of the Finance Committee for the DDA, a role that our late friend, Mark Stacey, held.

Weber – Brian, the review of the Aikens PUD is going to be moved to June. Is the discussion on the Library parcel also going to be moved to June?

Recording Secretary Watson – The discussion on the Library parcel should actually occur April 27th at the Township Board quarterly meeting. You will be receiving information in the near future on that, George.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Dave, typically we would now look for an update from the Building Department and the Township Engineer, but they are not here today. Is there anything you'd like to add on their behalf?

Dave Campbell – Given the restrictions that we had on capacity, I asked the Engineer and Building Official to sit this one out and they didn't argue with me too much. I did not get a report from either one of them.

I know our Township Engineer had a meeting today with a possible developer. I feel like we're getting a lot of oil change places, but if you can picture the vacant lot between the Costco gas station and Bar Verona; there has been an empty pad there ever since that whole development came online. Valvoline Oil Change had a meeting with us today, and with the Engineer about the storm water implications, and questions on water and sewer capacity for that project.

We're also trying to get some projects done throughout our parks for new sidewalks and other pavement, so he has been involved in that, particularly one along Haggerty Road, where On The Dunes is located. Relative to the Michigan Airline Trail, there's a sidewalk gap there that we would like to fill. On The Dunes has volunteered to serve as a trailhead, which would be great, and frankly, people are doing it now anyway. We want to make that a legitimate connection by filling in this tricky gap. We're trying to determine the pricing and how to get that done.

As far as Jay, he acts like he's busy so I would trust that he actually is, but I don't have his report for you.

Vice Chairperson Parel – I think that's going to be great connection. That will be a good kickoff point.

E. PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Vice Chairperson Parel opened to Public Discussion of Matters Not on the Agenda.

Ray Golota, 1595 Vanstone Dr., Commerce Township – I've been on all of the Zoom meetings. On the last couple with the Planning Commission, I want to speak about the Schafer development, because I'm not sure if I'm going to be in town on May 3rd when that comes up again. Two things were said by some members of the Planning

Commission that kind of disturbed me. I just have to get it out. One was with it being a 4-story building at the west end that they're proposing. I just have to say this, the two hotels that are on M-5 that are 4 stories, in my opinion, and I know I raised it before, they look like projects. Whereas, the Schafer development, those apartment buildings look beautiful, outstanding.

The other thing is, someone mentioned the fact of having the stores on Haggerty, and having the parking lot behind the stores. I just didn't think the Township would want that. You have it at Meijer and it looks hideous. You walk by or drive by, and all you see is the rear of a store. Those are my two comments. Thank you.

Dave Campbell – If I may, Mr. Golota is correct that we anticipate that the Midtown on Haggerty, which is what the Schafer's are calling that development, will be back in front of the Planning Commission on May 3rd for the public hearing for the PUD.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Thank you, Dave.

Vice Chairperson Parel closed Public Discussion of Matters Not on the Agenda.

F. TABLED ITEMS

None.

G. OLD BUSINESS

None.

H. SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Vice Chairperson Parel noted that there would only be one public hearing this evening. Dave Campbell added that the request for PSU21-04 had been formally withdrawn in writing by the petitioner's attorney.

ITEM H1. PPR21-01 – DAVID MENSCH – ACCESSORY STRUCTURE – PUBLIC HEARING

David Mensch of Commerce MI is requesting approval as provided for in Article 33 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance to construct an accessory structure with an attached carport totaling 1,328 square feet located at 1995 Four Oaks Drive, on a 2.2-acre parcel. Sidwell No.: 17-04-300-055

David Campbell, Planning Director, gave a review.

David Mensch, 1995 Four Oaks Dr. Commerce Township – I am looking to take down a 600 square foot garage and build a bigger garage that is 26x40 with a carport. There is one error on the carport size, it says, "12x24". It should be "14x24". I want to make sure that's corrected. Other than that, it's just a bigger, more useful garage. We're going to raise the elevation of it about 15 inches because we have a flooding problem in the current garage. That's more of a fix than a want.

Mr. Mensch reviewed the plans on the overhead for the Commissioners.

Mr. Mensch – These are the plans, looking straight on. It's a 2-car garage with a carport to the right side. The bottom right is the front elevation, facing the road. The right

elevation, which faces the house, has a carport off to the side. On the neighbor's side, there's no windows or skylights. The back just has a window and a door. I think this was required because we're going over 900 square feet, and the mid-height of the roof is going to be about 16 feet instead of 14 feet, so I had to write into the deed that I can't split the lot. The lot is 2.2 acres.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Thank you, and I apologize. I should have gone to Dave first for a summary of the petition. Dave, is there anything you'd like to add to that?

Dave Campbell – Just procedurally, I want to explain why this comes to the Planning Commission. Our Zoning Ordinance says that for a detached accessory structure, the maximum size is the ground floor square footage of the principal residence, or 900 square feet, whichever is less, unless you live on a property 2 acres or greater, which Mr. Mensch does. He is on 2.2 acres. In those instances, you can have a detached accessory structure greater than 900 square feet, so long as you get it approved by the Planning Commission subsequent to a public hearing.

It's also relevant to point out that we take into account the combined square footage of all detached accessory structures. So, Mr. Mensch, the new accessory structure that you're proposing is 1376 square feet, and then there's also a 104 square foot shed that's going to remain on the property. That grand total of accessory buildings is 1480 square feet. As Mr. Mensch mentioned, the report was off. The carport is actually 14x24. That's why those numbers I just cited are a little bit higher.

It would be at the discretion of the Planning Commission to approve the structure that's larger than what would typically be allowed on a property less than 2 acres. Mr. Mensch mentioned, when the Planning Commission does consider these, one of the criteria is that the property have a deed restriction recorded upon it that says the property can never be split. What we want to avoid is Mr. Mensch, or anybody who owns the property in the future, splitting this 2-acre lot into two 1-acre lots, and then one of those lots would still have the 1300 square foot pole barn on it.

Vice Chairperson Parel opened the public hearing.

No comments.

Vice Chairperson Parel closed the public hearing.

Commission Comments:

McKeever – I don't have any questions.

Rebeck – Can I see the aerial of the property again?

Dave Campbell – It would essentially replace that existing detached garage.

Mr. Mensch – When you see the site plan, you can see how it overlays where the old garage is.

Rebeck – I don't have any further questions.

Winkler – I have no comments or objections with what is being proposed.

Weber – I have no questions and no issues.

Karim – I don't have any issues. I think it's going to enhance the look as we are replacing an old garage with a new building.

Vice Chairperson Parel – That was an easy one. Would anyone like to make a motion?

Dave Campbell – If someone does, the Planning Department did provide some recommended motion language. One of the conditions that we included for the Planning Commission's consideration is Mr. Mensch is proposing an evergreen buffer along the east property line, or to maintain what is already there, correct?

Mr. Mensch – Yes, it's already there.

Dave Campbell – The reason we included that condition was that if ever those evergreens were to die off, or if Mr. Mensch were ever inclined to take them down, we would want the condition to be that those trees be maintained and/or replaced to create a buffer along the east side of that building.

Mr. Mensch – That's no problem.

MOTION by Rebeck, supported by McKeever, to approve, **with conditions**, Item PPR21-01, the request by David Mensch of Commerce MI for approval as provided for in Article 33 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance to construct an accessory structure with an attached carport totaling 1376 square feet located at 1995 Four Oaks Drive, on a 2.2-acre parcel. Sidwell No.: 17-04-300-055

Move to approve PPR21-01, an application submitted by David Mensch for an accessory structure that is greater than 900 square feet, for his home at 1995 Four Oaks. The motion is based on a finding that the proposed structure satisfies the applicable standards of Section 33.01.A.5 of the Commerce Township Zoning Ordinance.

Approval is conditional upon the following:

1. A deed restriction recorded with the Oakland County Register of Deeds shall be provided to the Township's Building Department prior to the issuance of any building permits. The deed restriction shall prohibit any land division creating a parcel of less than 2 acres for the property the structure is located upon.
2. The evergreen buffer be maintained along the east property line.

AYES: Rebeck, McKeever, Weber, Winkler, Karim, Parel

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Haber

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

~~**ITEM H2. PSU21-04 JOHNATHON SHAMMAS SPECIAL LAND USE PUBLIC HEARING**~~

~~*Johnathon Shammass of Novi MI is requesting approval of a Special Land Use for a new Medical Marijuana (Primary Caregiver) Cultivation Building proposed inside the building at 1120 Rig Street. The property is zoned I – Industrial. Sidwell No.: 17-27-302-002*~~

>>Item PSU21-04 was formally withdrawn in writing by Mr. Shammass' counsel.

I. NEW BUSINESS:

ITEM I1. CAREY CROSSINGS – CONCEPT REVIEW

M. Shapiro Real Estate Group of Farmington Hills MI is requesting a conceptual review of a proposed mixed use Planned Unit Development (PUD) on the north east corner of Carey and Commerce Roads. Sidwell No.: 17-04-300-066

Dave Campbell – Just by coincidence, the property we're about to discuss at a conceptual level is directly to the south of Mr. Mensch's property. This is the 40-ish undeveloped acres at the northeast corner of Commerce and Carey roads.

The owners and prospective developers are the M. Shapiro and Galbraith real estate group, who are potentially partnering with a group called Smith-Packett out of Virginia, represented by Mark Kassab and Troy Dehaven. They want to propose a mixed-use development comprised of single-family homes, and also a senior living facility.

I know they want to go through the PowerPoint on their own behalf, but this would be the prospective layout. They want to divide the property into quarters, with three-quarters of it single-family, and then the southeast quadrant of the property would be a 198-unit, 3-story senior living facility. Smith-Packett operates their senior facilities under the Harmony Senior Services operating brand.

The property is currently zoned R-1A, which as mentioned in our conceptual review is a zoning district that typically calls for single-family homes. In the R-1A zoning district the minimum lot size is 100-feet of lot frontage and 20,000 square feet of lot area. What the developers are proposing, at least at a conceptual level, is 71 single-family homes along with the senior living facility. The 71 homes are lots that would be smaller than the R-1A zoning requirements as far as lot size and lot area. They would be doing that as a means to cluster the homes together and preserve open space, both on the property and along the perimeter, with the goal of still developing at the single-family density that the property is currently zoned for.

We've had at least one in-person meeting with the prospective developers about this property and this proposal. What we've discussed to date is developing it as a PUD in order to accommodate some of the aspects of the plan that are not in strict compliance with what our Zoning Ordinance would require, specifically the smaller lot sizes and the senior living facility. The senior living facility is not a land use that would typically be allowed in our R-1A zoning district.

We scheduled their plan to come in front of the Planning Commission as a concept to get some informal comments. The developer is not necessarily committing to anything, and neither is the Planning Commission. It's a good opportunity for the developer to go over the proposal with the Planning Commission and get initial feedback so that they can incorporate that into their decisions as to how best to move forward.

Mr. Kassab, M. Shapiro Real Estate Group, 31550 Northwestern Hwy, Farmington Hills, MI, was present along with Troy Dehaven, Real Estate Manager, Smith-Packett, 4423 Pheasant Ridge Rd, Ste 301, Roanoke, VA, to address the request and provide a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Kassab – We put this together with the anticipation of going through a Zoom PowerPoint meeting, so it was done. Then Dave reached out to me when I was in Florida and said get back early because we're doing it in-person. We just got back about three hours ago.

As Dave mentioned, the 42 acres at the northeast corner of Commerce and Carey; we've dubbed it Carey Crossings. This evening, we hope to cover the aerial site plan review, a little history on the developer, some of the development details, and discuss some of the natural features on the site. We have some renderings of what we would propose to have on the site, some renderings of the senior facility, and some financial information and impact to the Township, as well as contact information for myself and for Troy as well.

The northeast corner, it actually covers all the way to Carey Road. Quite frankly, I have been challenged on putting together the PowerPoint presentation, but it's almost a perfect rectangle. Within Dave's write-up, the southwest corner, those of you that travel that area, it is kind of being used as a cut-through. It really needs a clean-up there. That's where it's an overlay of a commercial district on the southwest corner. We're certainly familiar with the commercial district in some of our history, but this is pretty much a perfect rectangle. The parent parcel is 80 acres. We acquired it about 18 years ago from the Hopkins family. They retained the easterly 40 acres, and we acquired the westerly 42 acres.

When Troy's group approached us, we were kind of surprised that a senior facility was interested in this site. It's not our core business, and Troy explained why they felt this was a good site for them. We've always learned that if someone is willing to invest a tremendous amount of dollars, we listen to them and understand what their business concept is, and why. What this is showing is that they want to keep loved ones going into senior care in the same area with residential, schools and churches. The neighborhoods have matured here. You've got the fire and EMS that's local to this market already. There are schools already within this market if there's any grandchildren that are going here. From a fire and EMS standpoint, I think what you might hear is that they would prefer to have centrally located services.

A little bit about us, and about Smith-Packett. Mickey Shapiro and Jim Galbraith have been in this town for about 50 years. I've been there a little less than half that.

Barrington Apartment Homes right up the road is one of our key projects, along with Maple Crossing Condominiums, Trillium Park Benstein, Shearwater, and retail between 14 and 15 Mile Roads off M-5.

Smith-Packett, formed in '82, operates under the Harmony brand and holds approximately 31 communities throughout the U.S. They currently have five other sites in Michigan that are under one planning stage or another, and last year, they completed approximately \$150 million in projects. You guys are ranked as the ...

Mr. Dehaven – If we're not the largest, we are one of the largest in the country.

Mr. Kassab – That was news to us. As Dave had mentioned, we are proposing 71 single-family lots. The typical lot size is 70x130. Some will be a little bit bigger, some are as high as 100 and some will be smaller. Again, about 71 lots, 42 acres, simple math is 2 per acre, and you're at about 82 or 84 lots. We're proposing to preserve the natural features, preserve the wetlands and some of the woodland buffers along the boundaries. As the Planning Department knows in this Township, when we're adjacent to residential, we want that screening as much as the residents do from our project to the other. The one nice thing about doing a unified PUD is that we can combine the walkways, natural features, and the amenities to both the senior living and to the single-family. Our single-family is being built at 2.3 units per acre, so we're not asking for much

more. We believe this is a much more compatible use with single-family, versus a retail component on the hard corner.

Proposed development on the single-family side is approximately \$35 million. On the senior living component, proposing approximately 198 units, independent, assisted, living memory care, so it's all in one housing and you move from one department to the other. It's 3 stories from grade. Let's talk about that. On the way here, I drove by the Maple and Haggerty site. I think one of the biggest differences is, and I know Dave mentioned it in the letter, is the height. That site is probably 40-50 feet back from the curb. You'll see from one of the renderings here, we've set this back further. Again, I think one of the largest impacts to this site from the senior living component will be to the proposed single-family adjacent community that we're proposing.

We believe the architectural style is going to be consistent to match our architectural style with the single-family homes, the natural features, and the walkways. A \$40 million approximate investment.

Again, some renderings and what we believe about how it's going to tie in. We're not showing some of the walkways within here yet, but shared gazebos and walkways, a walkable type community. As we proceed, we've kept open space between the detention pond and the preservation area for a walkway and reflection area. We want to make this unified and that's the key. Troy and I have talked on numerous occasions, developing this and improving this collectively, utilizing a lot of the same resources. We've taken some of the single-family homes that we have going on in Wixom right now, Wixom Road on the west side, on the other side of the Township. We believe the range will be \$400,000 to \$475,000, with home sizes of 1600-2700 square feet. Lots, again 70-90 feet, with ranches and colonials; basements, 3-4 bedroom homes, 2.5 baths, possibly 6-8 different floor plans, premium finishes, granite countertops, stainless steel appliances, hardwood floors, 8 foot door walls, and premium light fixtures. If you really want to get crafty, you can click on the virtual tour.

Dave Campbell clicked the link to view the virtual tour and shared it with the Planning Commission.

Mr. Kassab – Many of you who may be in the single-family housing market know, it's very hot right now. Within this particular development, we were proposing to sell about 2-1/2 per month within this development, and we've sold on average about 7 per month. MJC would be our building partner.

Mr. Kassab shared additional conceptual renderings of the single-family elevations, highlighting the 2.5 car garages. Sample finishes incorporated natural earth tones.

Mr. Dehaven continued the PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Dehaven – Thank you for having us. We have a group of research staff that look at 17 different factors to determine what markets they want to be in. When they say that we want to be in Commerce, they don't say all of Commerce. They give me maybe a 4-mile square radius to try to find a site that would work. Here, factors include being close to the hospital and the very nice neighborhoods that are there, and a senior population where there's a need for what we provide.

Typically, we do 4 stories, but we've already heard that might be an issue, so we've downsized it to 3 stories to help accommodate that concern. All of our communities offer

a lot of amenities, such as library and theater. We'll have a bistro in the assisted living. We'll have a pub in independent living and actually have happy hours occasionally with the residents. They really enjoy that.

As Mark mentioned, our projects are typically over \$40 million dollars in taxable value to the municipality, and combined with what Mark is doing, that's about \$75 million. Two good things about our development. One is that most of our residents don't drive. Memory care obviously don't drive. Assisted living, for the most part, don't drive. Independent living, what we find is that they may move in with cars, but after a couple years, they tend to get rid of the cars and use our van and shuttle services. The other good thing is, our residents don't have any school age children, and that's probably your biggest burden on taxes. It's a \$40 million taxable real estate investment with very little impact.

This is a rendering that our architect has done to propose, similar to what Mark was saying, Hardi-board, brick with elements going up to the 2nd and 3rd floors, architectural shingles. We've heard concern about proximity to the road. As you can see, we've pushed this building back and it's about 200 feet from the road. We'll have landscaped berms. We'll put our storm water detention pond in front of the building to give you more distance from the road.

Also included are some images of our existing communities. We try to make our architecture fit into the communities. I believe these examples are from Ashville, NC, Morgantown, WV, Roanoke, VA, and Savannah, GA.

We're really engaged with our residents, offering a lot of services. We even have rooms where doctors can come onsite, prescribe medicines, do evaluations, et cetera.

Mr. Kassab – We believe with a PUD; we will be combining all 42 acres collectively, preserving the natural features, giving the Township some control with some additional zoning requests that we can incorporate with the PUD, increased input from the Township with regard to the elevations of single-family, one management association to manage the common elements of the senior living component, in addition to the single-family, and again, with shared walkways. We're not creating barriers between both developments. We're combining both for one harmonious development.

Jim Galbraith is the face and the name you hear often. He's the smart guy who is still in Florida, and that's why I'm back. Our contact information is there for you. We want to get the Planning Commission's input, and at this stage it will help us tremendously moving forward.

Commission Comments:

Karim – I'm looking at the site plan, and since I'm an architect, I'm particular of the details in here. That crossroad is a busy road. I've lived on Commerce Road, a mile from this site, and that is becoming a very busy road. Why can't we move the senior facility to the back end, and move the houses out to the front. That will give you two advantages. One of them is that you don't see that 3-story building from the main street.

Paul Rasmussen, 5500 Carey Road, Commerce Township – Then we'd look at it.

Karim – The second issue is noise for the senior citizens, with the cars going by, especially at night.

Mr. Kassab – Those are fair comments, Mr. Karim.

Karim – The site plan is beautiful. I think the project is good.

Mr. Kassab – We're sensitive to the surrounding neighbors. It's a lot more palatable for us to sell the homes to a homeowner who recognizes what's coming up behind them. In fairness, nobody wants this in their backyard. One of the considerations we took, and as Troy alluded to, the detention pond in the front. If you look at Shearwater, I was very involved there, at Maple and Beck, and we put the pond along Maple Road for the purpose of noise filtration. With fountains in that pond, those are premium units now. If you're living along Maple and in front of the pond, you have a premium unit. There's ways to buffer that, and I also believe with what they're proposing as a setback, approximately 200 feet off the back curb, it gives them an opportunity for additional screening with berms and plantings. We're very sensitive to the neighbors and we want to address issues as much as possible in advance.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Dave, could we pull up the aerial?

Dave Campbell had the aerial for Shearwater on the screen and Mr. Kassab commented on the two ponds with fountains along Maple Road. Dave then proceeded to bring up the aerial for Carey Crossings.

Weber – Presently, this is zoned R-1A, and I'd be okay listening to solutions that would keep the density at the R-1A level for the residential component. I can't see myself supporting a 3-story building in this area of the Township. This is our more rural, obviously much less dense area than on the eastern side of the Township. It's my personal opinion that I would have a hard time supporting the senior living aspect of this. I'm only a vote of one, but I think the rest of the Board would have some serious heartache over any discussion on a 3-story, any place on the western side of the Township.

Mr. Kassab – Fair enough.

Dave Campbell – Mr. Weber, I heard you mention 3 stories, and I also heard you mention concerns about the senior living.

Weber – I understand that demographics of the seniors there, but that still is adding to over-density within this area of the Township.

Mr. Dehaven – Is it traffic you're concerned about, or just population?

Weber – All of the above, and I understand the traffic, and I understand that there's limited driving and there's lots of shuttles, but you're still putting in 198 units, plus the residential at 2.7 people per house behind it. It's too dense for me when you take in the totality.

Mr. Dehaven – As far as traffic goes, typically one of these communities generates about 33 peak hour trips, which is probably equivalent to a lot less than single-family development. What it's currently zoned for would probably be equivalent to our trips.

Weber – Maybe.

Mr. Rasmussen – I'm very familiar because I take care of my dad at Independent Village. You've also got a great deal of support staff that comes and goes for patients most days and things like that, so it's not just residents and family. There's a lot of others involved with it.

Mr. Dehaven – I agree, and what we try to do is we can schedule our shift changes so that it is not peak hour trips and they're not interfering with neighbors who are going to work or coming home, or when school buses are coming in or out.

Weber – Three stories is probably the biggest hurdle you'd have to overcome. Density, even though there's less automobile traffic, you're still going to have a large number of people in a fairly combined geography, in an area of the Township that's rural and we want to keep that rural feel to it, in my opinion.

Winkler – This developer has a history with the Township. In the 14 years I've been on the Planning Commission, everything we have seen from them has been top notch all around.

I like everything I see in this particular scenario, and I'm sure the petitioner knows the hurdles they'll have to go through with the Planning Commission and the Township Board regarding the PUD.

The one thing I would mention regarding what they're proposing is, even though they're using and maintaining a lot of the green space on that site, if there is any way to improve the greenspace even more, it would certainly be an advantage to both marketing of the project, as well as talking to the Township Board.

Rebeck – I don't have much to add that hasn't already been said, but I think that's a lot of houses to put in, in that area, given the zoning. I am looking forward to seeing how the plan develops on this, and keep in mind that our concerns are with it staying rural.

McKeever – One thing that may help if this continues to move forward is to provide an alternate site plan. It would depict the site being developed as zoned, just to point out the difference between smaller lots with open space maintained, whereas if everything was a yard. Sometimes it helps to visualize that. In addition, a traffic study.

Mr. Kassab – A traffic study is certainly something we'd want to present, showing the combination of both, and potentially even showing the retail, which is future land use on this corner. I think you bring up a very good comment to show what it could be. Keep in mind, the density we're proposing on the single-family alone is 2.3 units per acre. The current zoning allows 2. We're not asking for a big variance. These are all good comments.

Dave Campbell – In fairness to the applicant, I did speak to Chairperson Larry Haber today. He wanted an opportunity to get his comments out there. He has similar concerns to Trustee Weber with respect to the senior living facility, particularly the building's size, its height and its mass, and how that relates to the area surrounding it which is predominantly single-family. If this were to move forward, and Mr. Haber is participating in the consideration, preliminarily and conceptually, that is his concern.

Vice Chairperson Parel – I agree with Brian. Obviously, we like the developer. I think the building materials are great on both properties. I think for me, the senior living building itself is out of scale. I guess at this point, Dave, I'll leave it up to you. I think we've got some opinions. Is there anything else we can answer for you?

Mr. Kassab – I think we have enough to go back to the drawing board. And again, this is why we're here, so that we can address these before it gets to a public hearing. Certainly, we'd like to have concurrence of the Planning Commission as we proceed forward. Dave is great to work with and we will continue to do so.

Dave Campbell – If this were to proceed, as a PUD, there are several steps to that, including a public hearing with the Planning Commission, and then formal recommendation from the Planning Commission, and formal action from the Township Board. There are opportunities for you gentlemen and your neighbors, and anyone else interested in this project, if it were to proceed.

Mr. Rasmussen – So with something like that, we would be informed rather than hearing it from the neighbor?

Dave Campbell – For a public hearing, we would send out letters to every property owner within 300 feet. We would post a notice in the Oakland Press, and the developer would have to put up signs along both road frontages, saying PUD proposed, along with the phone number to call the Planning Department with any questions.

Mr. Kassab – What we also do is that we like to typically meet with the associations, if your subdivision has one.

Mr. Rasmussen laughed.

Mr. Kassab – I take it not, but I'm happy to give you my card as well. Reach out to me if we can answer any questions.

Dave Campbell – They've offered their contact information as part of this presentation. I know that the Shapiro group has done several projects in Commerce Township for a long period of time, and there's a reason that they've been around this area for as long as they have. They have proven their ability to deliver a quality project.

J: OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION:

None.

K: PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- **NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: MONDAY, MAY 3, 2021 @ 7PM - potentially electronic-only**

Dave Campbell – As we're kind of in the nebulous area of in-person meetings versus virtual meetings, shifting ground as they say, I do want to come back to a conversation that we've had before about how you as a Planning Commission receive your agenda packets. We're wondering if you are inclined to receive your packet electronically, and if so, would it be helpful to have the Township issue a laptop or tablet? Or, do some of

you prefer paper packets, and if so, based on the workload of our Maintenance crew, instead of having them deliver them, we might have them waiting for you here at Township Hall. We've talked about having some sort of lockbox out front so you can come after hours.

Vice Chairperson Parel – I prefer paper, but I'm capable of printing certain items out for myself.

Rebeck – I like paper. If you generate them, I can pick them up myself. I don't need any technology.

Winkler – One of the things I liked about the remote meetings is that I would put the Zoom meeting on my workbook, and then look at my computer to read through the electronic packet. For in-person meetings, I would like paper, but Paula should also forward the electronic copy.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Just to confirm, everyone still would get a digital packet, right?

Dave Campbell – Yes, we're still going to generate electronic packets.

McKeever – I'm fine receiving them electronically. The only drawback that I foresee is that some of the plans we do are full-size. Sometimes that's a bit tedious on a screen.

Dave Campbell – Could I write electronic, but when there's full-size plan sets, you might want those in hard copy?

McKeever – Yes, if possible.

Weber – I think we generate way too much paper. The Township Board receives no paper. If we have to look at plans, it is tedious, but maybe a hybrid discussion. I also do not think we should be using Maintenance personnel to be delivering packets. None of us live that far away from Township Hall. Also Dave, I would make a requirement that they need to be picked up by Thursday at 5pm by the Planning Commission members, because the Township Hall is not open on Friday.

Dave Campbell – That's where we talked about having a secure box out front.

Weber – Maybe another piece of the hybrid would be that anything that is 11x17 plans could be available in paper only, but 8x11 would be electronic, which would then cut down on a lot of your narratives and some of the other petitions.

Rebeck – If we're receiving the electronic version by Thursday, do you think it would still be okay to pickup the paper on Monday if we wanted it just to have it at the meeting?

Weber – Yes, good point.

Rebeck – I like it for the meeting, but I can review it on the computer.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Dave, when we leave these packets up here, and they're collected after, do we recycle them?

Dave Campbell – They go in the recycling bin.

Vice Chairperson Parel – Where does the recycling bin go afterwards?

Dave Campbell – In the recycling truck. Now, I've heard different stories of where the recycling truck goes and whether it actually gets recycled, but we do what we can.

Karim – I would like a paper packet and I will come and pick it up.

Rebeck – Sam and I can carpool to pickup our packets.

Dave Campbell – We are going to figure out the logistics of this. I don't know if we will get it hammered out by the May meeting. I don't even know if the May meeting will be in-person or virtual. I think the Township Board is going to talk about that tomorrow night. I don't think I've heard anyone asking for any technology. Okay, I think I've got the notes that I need.

Dave Campbell reviewed the Planning Director's Report:

- Speaking of the Township Board, at their May meeting, on the agenda will be the Reserve at Crystal Lake; that's the Brownfield property on the north side of Sleeth Road, the western most of the three Sleeth Road gravel pits. The Township Board will be presented with a resolution supporting the Brownfield plan, and the resolution authorizing the Oakland County Brownfield Redevelopment Authority to act on the Township's behalf.
- The Township Board, as mentioned earlier, is going to have a quarterly discussion meeting on April 27th. The focus of that meeting is going to be the Five & Main project and Mr. Aikens will join them to give an update on that project. Of specific focus will be the Library parcel. As I think most of you know, the Township retained ownership of the Library parcel, and the Township is in an option agreement with Mr. Aikens to purchase that Library parcel. I think he's on the fourth extension of that option agreement, and he is likely to ask for another extension. The current extension expires in July. The Township Board will have a discussion with Mr. Aikens of that extension, and what sort of assurances the Township might have of that project moving forward in the next year.
- The May Planning Commission meeting is likely to have the public hearing for the Midtown on Haggerty PUD as they move ahead with a formal submittal.
- The M-5 bridge, the blue wave panels that have been gone since late fall; I just had a conversation with MDOT and the contractor who is likely to re-coat those. They have to do some sort of a zinc-aluminum coating, and they have to do a salt test on that to make sure the coating withstands salt rust. Assuming it passes the test, then they will re-powder coat them and they will reinstall them. It might be early summer before we see those go up.
- In the meantime, some of the bridge lights had been stolen and we are expecting those replacements to arrive next week. As soon as they do, we have an electrician who will reinstall those lights.

- Then, if anyone noticed over Easter weekend, the color changing lights were flashing. We are trying to figure out why that is. The color changing lights are turned off in the meantime until we figure that out.

McKeever – Dave, on the bridge, has anyone brought up the fact that it's rusting?

Dave Campbell – The bridge itself is not rusting. Those blue metal wave panels were rusting and then it was streaking down across the concrete fascia. Yes, it doesn't look good at all. When the contractor replaces those wave panels, they are also obligated to power wash the rust stains and then sealcoat over top of them. By the time those metal panels go up and everything gets a fresh coat of white concrete sealer, hopefully it will look as good as new.

Vice Chairperson Parel discussed provisions with Dave Campbell for preventing future theft at the bridge and other locations throughout the Township.

Vice Chairperson Parel and Dave Campbell also discussed digital signs, revisiting the ordinance for sign regulations, and also discussing EIFS restrictions again in the near future.

L: ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Weber, supported by Rebeck, to adjourn the meeting at 8:15pm.

AYES: Weber, Rebeck, McKeever, Winkler, Karim, Parel

NAYS: None

ABSENT: Haber

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Brian Winkler, Secretary