

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CANTON
PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS
January 4, 2021**

A Regular meeting of the Planning Commission of the Charter Township of Canton was held by video teleconference (Zoom) in accordance with Michigan law on Monday, January 4, 2021. Chairman Greene called the meeting to order at 7:00 P.M. and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

ROLL CALL:

Members Present: Acharya, Eggenberger, Engel, Foster, Okon, Singh, Weber, Zuber, Greene

Each member noted that they were video teleconferencing from Canton Township Wayne County, Michigan, with the exception of Commissioner Engel from Bonita Springs, Lee County, Florida.

Absent: None

Chairman Greene welcomed the new members to the Planning Commission: Sommer Foster, Harpreet Sachdeva (Singh), and Doug Weber.

Each of the new commission members gave a brief explanation of their past experience and their expectations for the Planning Commission.

STAFF PRESENT: Patrick Sloan

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 7, 2020

Motion by Zuber, supported by Okon, to accept the Minutes of December 7, 2020, as presented. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

Motion by Zuber, supported by Okon, to accept the agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. 049-PDDA-6317 **TREMONT PLACE (FORMERLY WELLINGTON ON THE WILLOW)** – Consider Amended PDD for parcel nos. 049-99-0001-712, 049-99-0001-713, 049-99-0001-714 & 049-99-0001-716. Property is located south of Ford Road and on the east side of Lotz Rd.
2. 049-SPB-6145 **TREMONT PLACE (FORMERLY WELLINGTON ON THE WILLOW)** – Consider Site Plan approval for parcel nos. 049-99-

0001-712, 049-99-0001-713, 049-99-0001-714 & 049-99-0001-716. Property is located south of Ford Rd. and on the east side of Lotz Rd.

Mr. Sloan recommended doing both Item #1 (PDD) and Item #2 (Site Plan) for Tremont Place at the same time as they both go hand-in-hand, and as there is one staff report in the packet this evening prepared for both items.

Mr. Sloan explained that this is an older project originally named Wellington on the Willow, recently re-named "Tremont Place." The project goes back to 2016 when the property was rezoned from Light Industrial to R6 Single Family Attached Residential, and also removed the land from the Corporate Overlay District.

Part of that rezoning, which was a Conditional Rezoning, included a conceptual plan for a maximum of 282 attached residential units on the 40 acres of land. After the conditional rezoning in 2016, the property went through the Planned Development process and a Final PDD for Wellington on the Willow was approved in October of 2018. The Amended PD approved by the Township Board on July 14, 2020 reduced the total number of units from 282 to 268. Other changes were to eliminate the 4-story buildings, making them 3-story, as well as some modified architectural design of the buildings. Also, the Amended PDD that was approved last summer converted the project to condominiums instead of rental apartments.

Mr. Sloan stated that at the time that the amended PD was approved last summer, there was not a change to the approval period for the Planned Development. Planned Developments have an approval period of 6 years and so the original approval period for the Wellington on the Willow is set to expire in 2024, as it was originally approved in 2018. Mr. Sloan explained that one of the reasons we are here tonight for an amended PDD is that the applicant would like to restart the approval period for a 6-year approval period. Another proposal is to increase the number of phases from 3 to 4 to reduce the amount of construction happening at one time. There are also some changes to the layout of the plan. During the course of Site Plan Review, it was discovered that some of the Fire Code separation distances didn't comply, so some buildings needed to be shifted back to meet the Fire Code. In doing so, it created some other issues with separation distances. The applicants are requesting modifications for two areas through the PDD process: 1) Reduce the side separations of Buildings 20 & 21 and Buildings 6 & 8; 2) Reduce the separation between the parking lot and Buildings 10, 15, & 16.

Mr. Sloan stated that it is not only the amended PDD that is being proposed, but also the site plan of the project. At the time the amended PDD was before the Planning Commission over the summer, many of the details on that amended PDD were also site plan related details, so some of the items do carry forward.

Mr. Sloan summarized some of the elements of the project:

Traffic will enter and exit the site through a boulevard access Road onto Lotz Road. A secondary access from Lotz Road is proposed on the south side for emergency vehicles.

For the architecture of the buildings, the proposed percentage of brick is less than the 50% required. The proposed percentage of brick ranges from 15% to 30%, which was a modification granted by the previous PDD Amendment.

Mr. Sloan did not go through the Schedule of Modifications, but stated they are in the Planned Development agreement as well as summarized in the review letter.

Natural Features. There are many areas where wetlands and trees are still being preserved, so there hasn't been any changes since the amended PDD. A tree survey is included, and the landscaping plans propose replacing eight (8) trees that will be removed.

Landscaping. The landscape plan is designed in accordance with the landscaping and tree replacement standards of the Zoning Ordinance. The required landscaping is shown along the Lotz Road frontage, in the entrance median, along the eastern boundary of the site, around the multi-family residential buildings, and also around mechanical equipment and the detention pond. Some minor landscape revisions may be necessary, which are mostly to correct minor discrepancies.

Mr. Sloan stated that their recommendation is for the approval of Amendment #2 to the Tremont Place PDD subject to the Township Attorney's approval of the PD Agreement, Master Deed, and Bylaws. Mr. Sloan stated they also recommend approval of the Site Plan subject to any necessary revisions to the landscape plans in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Sloan explained that if recommended for approval, the next step would be for the Amended PDD as well as the Site Plan to go before the Township Board of Trustees for a final vote.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Engel to open the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Mr. David Stollman briefly went over a couple of minor changes, as outlined by Mr. Sloan. The first being, they ran into a couple problems as they worked through the site plan details with the Fire Marshal. Those issues have been resolved. The second item is that they did change the phasing a little. With working through last year with COVID, they decided to make the first phase smaller, so now instead of it being 3 phases, it has been converted to 4 phases. To accomplish this, it required a little bit of temporary road and temporary water main to be built. Beyond these changes, the slight deviations and minor modifications, and the timing for the phasing, the project is essentially unchanged. The architecture which the Commission saw in the summer is exactly the same, and the site plan is identical except for these slight tweaks that have been worked out. Mr. Stollman mentioned that Rick Hirth, Civil Engineer with Warner Cantrell & Padmos, and Wayne Chubb from Hobbs & Black are both available tonight to answer any questions.

There were no comments from any other meeting participants.

Ms. Eggenberger stated she has no problem with the changes. She just wanted to express that she is excited to see modern looking buildings, the project looks great.

Mr. Weber asked if there is a need for setback variances from wetlands in this project, given the sizable wetland area?

Mr. Sloan stated that when a Planned Development goes through the process, they are required to have public hearings, and its separate than the conventional site plan process. Instead of variances, when someone applies for a Planned Development they can obtain modifications which are very much like variances. An applicant can apply for a modification (i.e. a setback modification or a height modification) and in doing so would not have to meet the variance standards of the Zoning Ordinance or the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act. But what they would have to do is show a definite benefit, both for the project and the community. Such definite benefits could be superior architecture, superior site design, preservation of natural areas, pedestrian connectivity, or upgrades to either on-site or adjacent nearby facilities that may not necessarily be required in a conventional site plan. It's a way for the applicants to propose something that is a more cohesive design. In this case where there are some areas where some wetlands will be required to be filled, they will need to get EGLE permits. And in areas where there are setback encroachments, the plan notes the modifications being within those setbacks.

Mr. Weber asked what percentage of wetlands will be disturbed here?

Mr. Sloan stated that may be a question for the applicant when they go through their EGLE permits. Mr. Stollman or anyone on his team could to speak to that.

Mr. Stollman responded he does not have the exact percentage offhand. The wetlands and the woodland issues have been worked on for about 5 years with the DEQ. There was a previous developer about 20 years ago that cleared the whole site, filled some wetlands and did a lot of stuff that was not allowed. So the previous developer, the subsequent buyer of this project in 2014-15, began the process of working on the wetlands and the conservation areas. It took close to 4 years working with EGLE to resolve the wetlands and the woodlands areas, but that has now been fully permitted by EGLE. Mr. Stollman stated that if Mr. Sloan does not currently have the permit, he will be sure to get it to him.

Mr. Weber expressed he appreciates their attempt to retain as much open space as possible.

Mr. Engel had no comments.

Mr. Singh had no comments.

Mr. Okon had no comments.

Ms. Foster commented she also likes the modern design of the project.

Mr. Acharya asked regarding the expiration period, the applicant is asking for about 2.5 years additional time. Is there any precedent when looking at such a situation? Mr. Acharya stated in COVID times we perhaps can create an exception, but isn't 2.5 years too much? There is some thought and purpose to the 6-year period to give pressure to the developer to make sure that the construction happens soon.

Mr. Sloan explained the differences in the process for a conventional site plan and a planned development. In some cases, Planned Developments are quite big, and they are done in multiple phases, so that 6-year window is to allow all that phasing to happen within that time. Mr. Sloan stated that in this case, what the applicant is asking for is to restart the clock and set the 6-year period at Amendment #2, and then within that 6-year period they would have to do the site plan approval and all the associated permits and the phases. The Zoning Ordinance does allow for an extension of the Planned Development by the Planning Commission and the Township Board. It is a little less formal than amending the planned Development Agreement, but it can be extended for a showing of good cause. Mr. Sloan feels the applicant is looking ahead and trying to anticipate what could happen over the next few years, and basically start at the beginning as if this were a new PD. Mr. Sloan thinks that if the applicant would have asked for the 6 years a few months ago, there would have been a high likelihood of getting it. At that time there were a lot of positive comments about the project and a lot of favorable comments with respect to the preservation of the open space and the architecture. Mr. Sloan stated the applicant is starting much further ahead with the plan and is including an additional phase just to give a bit of a buffer in terms of the feasibility of the project. He feels the 6 years gives enough time for that process to be completed in a satisfactory manner.

Mr. Acharya asked about the reduction in the side separations, making it a little tighter. What impact will that have on the overall development?

Mr. Sloan stated that the impact on the overall development is quite minimal. The reduction in the side separation for buildings 20 & 21 goes from 24'9" down to 20'. Then Buildings 6 & 8 go from 25'2" down to 21'6". The reductions in the separations are fairly subtle. There are also some reductions in the separation between parking lots and some of the buildings, where it is at least 10' for building 10 and closer to 20' for some of the other buildings. It's just a matter of shifting buildings around.

Mr. Stollman wanted to add that there is much more involved with the construction process for a "for sale" project as opposed to a rental project. Their concern is if they don't start the project until 2022 and start building units, they will then need to build and sell 262 units in two years' time. This is very tight. So, since they were amending the PDD because of the minor deviations, they decided to approach the Planning Commission about the 6-year window.

Ms. Zuber stated she likes the aesthetics of the project and feels this is something different for Canton, more modern and appealing to a different demographic than other existing structures.

Chairman Greene agrees with the comments from the other Commission members, and would like to see this project move forward.

There were no other comments from the public.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Eggenberger to close the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Weber, to move to recommend approval of Amendment No. 2 to the Tremont Place PDD (formerly named Wellington on the Willow) on tax parcel nos. 049-99-0001-712, 049-99-0001-713, 049-99-0001-714, and 049-99-0001-716, as proposed, subject to the Township Attorney’s approval of the PD Agreement, Master Deed, and Bylaws.

Further, motion to move to recommend approval the Site Plan for Tremont Place, which includes 268 units (townhomes and stacked flats) on 41 acres as proposed, subject to approval of Amendment No. 2 to the PDD by the Township Board and any necessary revisions to the landscape plans in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Zuber called the vote:

Ayes: Acharya, Eggenberger, Engel, Foster, Okon, Singh, Weber, Zuber, and Greene

Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

NEW BUSINESS-SITE PLANS

- 3. 041-SPX-6432 **CANTON FIRE STATION NO. 2** – Consider Site Plan Modification (landscaping) approval for parcel nos. 041-99-0006-000, 041-99-0008-701 & 041-99-0003-000. Property is located north of Warren Road, between Lilley Road and Haggerty Road.

Mr. Sloan stated that back in 2019, The Township Board of Trustees approved the site plan for Canton Fire Station #2, which is located on the north side of Warren Road between Haggerty Road and Lilley Road. Prior to approval of the site plan, the Township Board approved the Special Land Us. Also, the Zoning Board of Appeals approved variances for encroachments into the 25-foot wetland setback and front yard setback of the hose tower.

At this time the fire station is nearly complete. The Fire Department proposes to modify the landscape plan of the approved site plan in accordance with Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance. Some landscape plan modifications can be reviewed administratively by Planning Staff, but anything that requires any discretionary decisions is reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Landscaping Standards of the Zoning Ordinance: Mr. Sloan explained the revised landscape plans for Fire Station #2 are designed to meet the intent of the landscaping requirements of Article 5 of the Zoning Ordinance. This is classified as a non-residential use in a residential district. There is a particular section in the landscape standards that addresses these types of uses. The goal of the landscape revisions is to try to reduce some of the long-term maintenance costs and to think ahead several years, minimizing long-term maintenance costs for the upkeep of the facility. The revised landscape plans meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for general site landscaping, parking lot landscaping, tree replacement, right-of-way landscaping, and frontage landscaping for nonresidential uses in residential districts. There is a modification requested for the eastern landscape buffer and also a modification to allow the distribution of some frontage landscaping in other areas of the site. Major changes to the landscape plans consist of the following:

- Removal of the 37 Dwarf Juniper shrubs along the east side of the site located in a landscape strip between the lower and upper tiered retaining wall. Mr. Sloan referred to the landscaping and retaining wall as shown on the plans in the packet. Instead of the junipers, the applicant proposes to put in a washed cobblestone. The purpose of replacing these juniper shrubs with decorative washed cobblestone is due to the limited accessibility to maintain the shrubs. This buffer on the east side will still have the 2-tiered boulder retaining wall and the row of spruce trees along the top to provide screening from the east.
- Removal of most of the foundation landscaping: The Zoning Ordinance does not require foundation landscaping for nonresidential uses in a residential district, so the removal of the foundation landscaping does not put the site into non-compliance.
- Relocation of some required frontage landscaping to other areas of the site.
- Removal and/or substitution of some shrubs and perennials, which is relatively minor.
- Addition of some irrigated sod in the right-of-way instead of hydroseed. This is an improvement over the previously-approved plans.

Mr. Sloan stated their recommendation is for the approval of the site plan landscaping revisions and modifications for Canton Fire Station #2, including the revised buffer treatment along the eastern property line.

Ms. Foster asked if the Commission approves this this evening, does it go back before the Township Board for approval or can they move forward with the changes.

Mr. Sloan responded that the fire station and the applicant can move forward with the changes. The landscape revisions is something that the Planning Commission can do.

Mr. Okon had no comments.

Mr. Singh had no comments.

Mr. Acharya had no comments.

Ms. Eggenberger had no comments.

Mr. Weber asked regarding the site plan detail for the retaining wall, as shown on the plans that Mr. Sloan just shared with the Commission--The plan says "western" boundary tiered retaining wall, should that actually be the eastern boundary?

Mr. Sloan responded yes, the title on that should be the eastern boundary.

Mr. Weber asked that given the severity of the grade along the eastern boundary, is Mr. Sloan satisfied that erosion won't damage that wall and flow into the neighboring property.

Mr. Sloan explained that plans are reviewed by the Planning Division, the Building Division, Fire Department, and the Engineering Division. Each division looks at the plans as they pertain to that division's specific codes and specifications. The Engineering and Building Divisions would

review the plans for the wall design. The review of the wall and specifications goes through those divisions to ensure that the wall will be stable.

Mr. Engel had no comments.

Ms. Zuber had no comments.

Mr. Greene stated this is a very nice upgrade for the Township.

Motion by Zuber supported by Acharya, to move to approve the site plan landscaping revisions and modifications for Canton Fire Station #2 on tax parcel nos. 041-99-0003-000, 041-99-0006-000, and 041-99-0008-701, including the revised buffer treatment along the east property line.

Commissioner Zuber called the vote:

Ayes: Acharya, Eggenberger, Engel, Foster, Okon, Singh, Weber, Zuber, and Greene

Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

4. 058-ADS-6318 **MEIJER ADDITION** - Consider Site Plan Addition approval for parcel no. 058-99-0003-720. Property is located south of Ford Road, between Canton Center Road and Sheldon Road.

Mr. Sloan stated that Meijer proposes internal and external renovations to the store and site, including relocating the pharmacy pickup window to the west side of the store (currently on the north side) by removing the pharmacy pickup lane and moving it westward. This displacement will require reducing the size of the outdoor garden center to allow for pickup window circulation. There are also some architectural upgrades and entrance additions to the front of the store. Some of the entrance additions are to put in larger enclosed areas to include shopping carts, so the indoor area would be increased. And there area some improvements to the driveway, parking lot, and landscape islands directly in front of the store.

Traffic Circulation. With the exception of the proposed changes to the pick-up window lane, traffic circulation will function mostly the same. Some of the pedestrian crossings are proposed to have detectable groove asphalt, and Sloan recommends that stamped concrete be used instead for those pedestrian crossings shown on the plans.

Architecture. The major architectural changes include construction of two (2) new glass tower entry vestibules at the front of the building, adding new brick and metal panel canopy to the front façade, and constructing a 345-sq. ft. pharmacy pickup addition to the west side of the building. The total percentage of brick on the façade will increase to 37%, which will make it more conforming with the 50% brick requirement of the Zoning Ordinance. However, because the proposed percentage of brick is less than 50%, Sloan does not recommend painting any of the unpainted brick, which is proposed on the plans in the middle of the front façade.

Parking. The proposed number of parking spaces will be 795 based on the proposed floor area of

249,018 sq. ft. The standards of the Zoning Ordinance requires 826 spaces; however, the parking standards of the Zoning Ordinance allow the Planning Commission to approve modifications to the minimum number of parking spaces. We recommend that the proposed number of spaces of 795 be approved. Our review of 18 aerial photographs taken at various times from 2014-2020 indicate that parking levels are far less than the parking lot's capacity. Mr. Sloan stated they also looked at the Parking Generation Manual, 5th Edition, published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, which indicates the average peak parking demand for a Free-Standing Discount Store of this size is between 549 spaces and 703 spaces based on the average peak. Mr. Sloan stated that based on the information obtained in this manual, and the 18 aerial photographs taken at various times, we believe that 795 spaces are sufficient for Meijer and recommend approval of this number for the site.

Landscaping. The landscape changes are shown on the plans (Sheet C601) which consist of:

- Replacing 6 parking islands with 7 parking islands so the parking lot landscaping will increase in size as well as increasing the number of trees.
- Replacing 2 planting areas on the northwest side of the building and increasing to 4 planting areas. That will increase the square footage as well as the number of trees and shrubs.

Mr. Sloan stated their recommendation is to approve the modifications to the plans subject to revising the plans to show the stamped concrete for the pedestrian crossings, and also to modify the building elevation designs to remove the proposed painting of existing unpainted brick.

Ms. Zuber said that people are still going to pull up in the front of the store on the north side and then turn right into the little driveway there. It looks like there still isn't a whole lot of space for stacking cars, so cars will still end up being out on the main driveway. However, there is a dedicated right-turn lane. Ms. Zuber asked Mr. Sloan if he knows how many cars they figure could fit there.

Mr. Sloan stated he does not know how many cars they are expecting and that's something that he would defer to the applicants on. Two representatives of the applicant are in attendance this evening, Steve Achram and Steven Douglas.

Mr. Steve Douglas, Architectural Project Manager, stated that Meijer's prototype requirement would have a minimum of 5 cars to be stacked behind the car that is engaged at the window. There is a dedicated de-acceleration lane that maintains cars to be able to be in the regular flow of traffic, but off to the side where they will stack up as they face toward the east. Then they will turn to the south to have the face-to-face at the window. So a minimum of 5 cars plus one car at the window is the capability before there would be any cars extending out into the cross-traffic.

Ms. Zuber stated she noticed the lane widens after you get past the pick-up window. Is that just so somebody can pull over to check that they got everything, and traffic can still get through?

Mr. Douglas stated it is more so just for the turning patterns of different vehicles, such as a large pickup or a Prius. Also, the lane widens to leave room for potentially distracted individuals.

Ms. Eggenberger wanted to make sure she is reading the plans correctly. The pull-through is in

the front of the building and then they would pull out right where part of the Culver's area is going to be. So what is she seeing on the west side of the building, is that some sort of overhang?

Mr. Douglas explained there is a small canopy/sheltering overhang that extends off the façade of the building to keep rainwater off the transaction area.

Ms. Eggenberger said she may not be looking at the same thing. On Page 101, what is the little overhang just to the west of the building?

Mr. Douglas said that is the demolition plan showing what will be removed. The entire existing pharmacy drive on the north side of the building is going to be completely removed for the new west arrangement.

Mr. Engel had no comments.

Mr. Weber wanted to clarify where exactly the drive-up window is.

Mr. Douglas referenced the plans and explained the location of the window as shown on the plans.

Mr. Acharya asked if they have considered the increased traffic and parking once Culver's comes in?

Mr. Sloan stated when Culver's was approved last year, Culver's was required to have their own parking lot. There is a sufficient number of spaces within the Culver's site that are above and beyond what is already in the Meijer site so the Culver's site will more or less stand on its own in terms of parking.

Mr. Okon stated this new configuration will really help compared to what is there now.

Mr. Singh had no comments.

Ms. Foster had no comments.

Mr. Douglas wanted to speak specifically regarding the painted brick. In this case the original building was built in 1974, but a remodel done in 2006 introduced a new brick color that is in the center sign element. The color there is problematic in the overall design of the building. The current building has about 29% brick along the front. 4% of that is this reddish/pinkish hue that was added in 2006. That does not work well aesthetically with the new tan and warm gray tone scheme of the larger façade. They would still like to propose the ability to maintain the color scheme as the overall as presented.

Chairman Greene referred to the rendering of the front façade shopping cart area. Currently there is a 4' wall which shields the carts. What is the reasoning for getting rid of that wall?

Mr. Douglas explained that with the new vestibule towers, they are having large interior enclosed cart storage rooms that the carts will be stored in. They will not be stored on the outside of the

building in the manner they are right now. With the two vestibules in the new plan, almost 300 carts can be stored inside the building and kept out of the elements.

Chairman Greene said he is glad to see the pharmacy pick-up being redesigned. This rectifies a bad situation. He also mentioned he hopes this will not prove a detriment to the garden center with their area being reduced.

Mr. Douglas stated the garden center will maintain all the same product, just in a more condensed, efficient layout.

Chairman Greene stated, just as speculation, he would imagine that at some point in time there could be another pad that may be sold on the southwest side. That parking area is not utilized much. Was there some consideration for the drive-thru window being interfered with if there was another business to the west of Meijer.

Mr. Douglas stated they cannot speak specifically to any future plans that Meijer could have there. However, given the outlot that was already set aside for Culver's and the reduction of parking that still fits within their retail needs, at this point he thinks it would be difficult (yet not impossible) for them to entertain another outlot in the future.

Mr. Singh asked Mr. Sloan & Mr. Douglas if they know the maximum parking of cars on any given day and on the busiest day.

Mr. Douglas stated the data that Meijer has for this specific store was about 750 cars looking at video surveillance footage taken of the parking lot at the busiest time of the day of their busiest days.

Chairman Greene asked for more detail on the stamped concrete.

Mr. Sloan displayed an aerial of the site from 2017 which shows some pink areas, indicating a walkway. The stamped concrete is a way to visually delineate a walkway. The stamped concrete will be visible. Even if it snows, it will show through once plowed. Mr. Sloan stated the plans show a groove type of asphalt. He recommends requiring that stamped concrete be put in as walkways.

Ms. Zuber asked what Chairman Greens's opinion is regarding painting the brick on the building.

Chairman Greene stated he is comfortable with the rendering, the beige look.

Mr. Douglas stated the current green metal roofing is all going to be painted the new gray color (Sherwin Williams "Anonymous"). Previously the building had a red base to it and that was changed years ago due to corporate changes. Blue is now their new primary corporate color.

Chairman Greene stated he likes that the blue is used just as an accent color and not a dominating color.

Ms. Zuber asked if they want to keep the model motion as is, or remove the part about removing the proposed painting of the unpainted brick.

The Commission members were in agreement to allow painting the brick as stated on the plans.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Foster, to move to approve the site plan for Meijer on tax parcel nos. 058-99-0003-720, subject to revising the plans to show stamped concrete for the pedestrian crossings.

Commissioner Zuber called the vote:

Ayes: Acharya, Eggenberger, Engel, Foster, Okon, Singh, Weber, Zuber, and Greene

Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

NEW BUSINESS – STAFF REFERRAL

5. 141-SPC-6430 **WAYNE LAWN AND GARDEN CENTER** – Refer review of Site Plan Addition with Modifications to staff for approval on parcel nos. 141-99-0033-000, 141-99-0032-000, 141-99-0007-001 & 141-99-0008-000. Property is located south of Michigan Avenue, between Hannon Road and I-275.

127-SLU-6435 **PURE DEVELOPMENT** – Refer review of Special Land Use to staff for approval on parcel nos. 127-99-0020-000, 127-99-0019-000, 127-99-0018-002, 125-99-0002-706, 127-99-0017-000, 127-99-0016-000 & 127-99-0009-000. Property is located north of Michigan Avenue, between Denton Road and Beck Road.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Foster, to refer Item #5 to Staff. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

NEW BUSINESS – SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR FEBRUARY 1, 2021

6. 129-SLU-6338 **CANTON CROSSINGS** – Set public hearing for review of Special Land Use for parcel no. 129-99-0002-710. Property is located north of Michigan Avenue and east of Canton Center Road.

127-SLU-6435 **PURE DEVELOPMENT** – Set public hearing for review of Special Land Use for parcel nos. 127-99-0020-000, 127-99-0019-000, 127-99-0018-002, 125-99-0002-706, 127-99-0017-000, 127-99-0016-000 & 127-99-0009-000. Property is located north of Michigan Avenue, between Denton Road and Beck Road.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Singh, to set the Public Hearing for February 1, 2021. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Mr. Greene mentioned that they will be choosing officers during the next meeting.

ADJOURN

Motion by Zuber, supported by Eggenberger, to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Melanie A. Sherwood
Recording Secretary