

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CANTON  
PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS  
February 1, 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, February 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, Foster, Singh, Weber, Zuber, Greene.  
Each member noted that they were video conferencing from Canton Township, Wayne County, Michigan.  
Absent: Engel, Okon

**STAFF PRESENT:** Patrick Sloan

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 4, 2021**

Motion by Zuber, supported by Weber, to accept the Minutes of January 4, 2021, as presented. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

**ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA**

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

**PUBLIC HEARING**

1. 127-SLU-6435 **PURE DEVELOPMENT** – Consider 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.

Mr. Sloan stated that the project sponsor proposes to construct a warehouse and distribution center on seven (7) contiguous parcels located on the north side of Michigan Ave. between Denton Road and Beck Road. The proposed warehouse and distribution center will be 183,130 sq. ft and the property is currently in the LI-R, Light Industrial Research zoning district. Six of the seven parcels were recently rezoned to LI-R. The warehouse and distribution facility use is a Special Land Use in that district, so a Public Hearing is required

In 2018, three (3) large buildings for light research/industrial use were approved by the Township on the eastern parcel. This approval in 2018 included an exterior material modification approved by the Planning Commission. However, these buildings were never constructed and the project sponsor for Pure Development proposes to occupy that parcel plus the six (6) LI-R parcels to the

west.

Mr. Sloan explained that the project sponsor has also applied for site plan review. Tonight, the Planning Commission will be reviewing the Special Land Use plans. The Planning Commission will review the Site Plan Application at a future meeting if the Special Land Use is approved.

The size of the site is about 73 acres and surrounding the site is mostly industrial property for both Use and Zoning district; however, to the north is residential. This project is proposed to be south of the drain so it will be fairly far away from the residential to the north. There is some adjacent residential to the west, and the Zoning Ordinance will require a 100-foot minimum setback from the property to the west for separation distance. Based on the plans it looks like that separation distance is almost 200 feet on the west. Many areas within this boundary are preserved wooded areas.

The Special Land Use is designed to meet the Schedule of Regulations in terms of setbacks, lot width, and area. There are a couple areas of the Zoning Ordinance where the applicants will be required to apply for variances. And there are some parts of the site that encroach into the 25 foot setback for wetland and drain setbacks. If the Special Land Use is recommended for approval, the applicants will be advised to apply for variances, and then the Zoning Board of Appeals would review those setback encroachments.

Mr. Sloan stated that one of the first things they look at for the Special Land Use is the Traffic Impact and Access Management. There are four (4) points of access proposed: one (1) point of access is from an existing boulevard between Repair Clinic and Kingfa; and there are three (3) points of access proposed on Michigan Ave. Of the three (3) curb cuts proposed on Michigan Avenue, one (1) of these curb cuts is existing and two (2) curb cuts are new. Because Michigan Ave. is under the jurisdiction of the Michigan Department of Transportation, MDOT must review and approve any access points and may require additional conditions.

The applicants have submitted a Traffic Impact Study (TIS). The TIS mostly recommends having some dedicated turn lanes and tapering along Michigan Ave. There is an existing lane on the north side of Michigan Ave. for those lanes and tapers, and it would require some repainting. The Township's traffic engineering consultant (WadeTrim) has reviewed the TIS and has recommended approval of the plans and acceptance of the study subject to the review and approval by MDOT of both the study and the plans.

**Parking:** Based on the floor area and estimated number of employees, there are 195 parking spaces required. The Zoning Ordinance allows for a 10% increase above the maximum parking spaces required, which brings the maximum number of spaces permitted is 215. There are 265 proposed associate parking spaces and 90 proposed personal van spaces. The Zoning Ordinance allows the Planning Commission to increase the parking requirement based on the level of current or future traffic. Based on the proposed warehousing and distribution center use for an online retailer (which is the proposed use), the nature of the use will require more parking spaces based on the use of the site. In addition, there are 966 delivery van spaces proposed that are 11' wide and 27' deep. Because these vans are fleet vehicles, they are not subject to the maximum parking space requirements. Many of the van parking spaces will have access to an electric vehicle charging station.

Loading: The loading area for large trucks/trailers is located on the east side of the building as illustrated on the plans. In front of the front building wall and underneath a canopy on the south side of the building is “Van Loading” where packages being sent out for delivery are transported from the building into the delivery van. Because these spaces are dedicated to delivery vans, the requirements for trucks and trailers don’t apply and the van spaces are smaller than a typical loading space. Additionally, because the “Van Loading” is under a canopy and a canopy is classified under the definition of “building”, this “Van Loading” area is not located within a yard area.

Architecture: As noted in Sloan’s staff report, at its meeting on March 5, 2018 the Planning Commission approved exterior building modifications for a previously proposed research building on the site to allow for more pre-formed concrete panels on the industrial part of the building than the Zoning Ordinance allowed. At the time of site plan review, the applicants will propose a modification to the building material standards of the Zoning Ordinance, and this standard specifically requires at least 75% brick on the office portion of an industrial building and a maximum of 50% concrete panels on the entire building. Mr. Sloan stated they have requested additional material details from the applicant regarding specific materials and the percentages proposed. There may be some comments tonight regarding the architecture, but this is something that the applicants will be asking for a modification on when it comes time for site plan review.

Mr. Sloan stated that for the rest of the items in the review letter, they have noted areas where there is some compliance and areas where they will have to revise when they come back for site plan review. These deal with Landscaping and Tree Preservation, Sidewalks, Lighting, Signage, the Dumpster Enclosure, and Fencing. These are all Site Plan design elements that can be addressed at Site Plan Review.

The last item Mr. Sloan wished to mention (on Page 4 of his review letter) addresses the Special Land Use Review Standards. Based on the site design, the elements of the use, and what is proposed on the plan, the Planning Division finds that the application meets the Special Land Use Standards of Section 27.03(C) of the Zoning Ordinance. Because of this, this recommendation is for approval of the Special Land Use for the reasons stated in the analysis, subject to the items noted in the review letter being addressed and corrected at the time of Site Plan Review and that the Special Land use plans and Traffic Impact Study are subject to approval by Canton Township’s transportation engineering consultant and MDOT, including any upgrades to the site or Michigan Avenue.

Mr. Weber wished to state for the record that Mr. Rattner’s law firm used to work for him when he formerly worked for Verizon. Two of Mr. Rattner’s partners used to work very closely with him. Mr. Rattner was representing Verizon and not Mr. Weber personally, and Mr. Weber left Verizon over two years ago. Mr. Sloan has already reviewed this with the Township attorney, and Mr. Weber’s past relationship with the firm of the applicant is not a conflict of interest.

Chairman Greene asked Mr. Sloan if the Commission needed to may a formal motion to accept Mr. Weber’s participation in this proceeding, or is it covered?

Mr. Sloan stated that Mr. Weber's disclosure is sufficient as there is no ongoing professional relationship, and that the professional relationship was more than two years ago and Verizon was the client. Mr. Sloan feels the explanation will suffice.

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

Prior to the public hearing, the Planning Commissioners received a letter from Art Low at 5641 Denton Road dated 1/17/21. Mr. Low's letter requested that the property stay the same.

Richard Rattner, Project Representative, commended Mr. Sloan on his report of this Special Land Use and criteria. Mr. Rattner said that much of what was stated is site plan related and he would ask the Board's indulgence if their architect could address some of the things that Mr. Sloan talked about to make sure that the Commission members understand how the site works.

Josh Mannion, Civil Engineer on the project (not the architect), stated he would be able to speak regarding the site plan related components of the project and how the site will function. The architect may be joining the meeting a little later.

Mr. Mannion reviewed the drawings with the Commission. The site has access from four different drives – the business park on the east by the repair clinic, then there are three drives on Michigan Ave, one on the east by the truck dock side of the building, one in the center that's existing, and then a new drive on the far west side. Mr. Mannion ran through a typical day in the life of the operations: Overnight, typically between 10pm and 8am, is when semi-trucks will come drop off packages. They will come to the truck dock on the far east side, typically 20 to 30 trailers will come in during that overnight period. Employees inside the building will sort the packages into individual delivery routes during those overnight hours. Come morning, delivery drivers will come to the site and park their personal vehicles and pick up a delivery van, which would be parked in the parking area shaded in blue on the rendering. The drivers will drive through (along the green lines on rendering) and park underneath the canopy to get their packages loaded, about 20-30 minutes. Vans will begin leaving the site about 9:50am through 11:30am. This facility is a 24/7 operation. Mr. Mannion further explained the timing and loading process.

Mr. Mannion explained the parking area on the west side is for the employees, associates, and managers working inside the facility.

Architecturally, the building has canopies on both sides at about 14 feet tall and the building is constructed of tilt-up concrete painted panels. The building is about 42 feet high to the parapet and that canopy is 14 feet tall and runs almost the entire length on both sides of the building. The west side is where the employee entrance is and has some metal paneling, and is the office side of the building. The east side is the truck dock.

Mr. Mannion stated that they continue to work with Mr. Sloan and staff to work through the site plan review comments, and look forward to getting those finalized and submitted back to Planning.

Chairman Greene asked about the van parking area to the west. He is assuming this is mainly only

overnight storage-type parking where the vans are not being used, but just waiting for the next day's deliveries.

Mr. Mannion stated that is correct. The blue parking area to the west is overnight van storage. That is also where van drivers will park their personal vehicles.

Chairman Greene asked if any buffering, landscaping has been taken into consideration to shield that from view from Michigan Avenue?

Mr. Mannion stated that it may be a little hard to see on the drawing, but they do have a four-foot berm planned along Michigan Avenue with screening. And on the west side, they plan on maintaining as much of the wooded area as possible. At the narrowest point, there are 195 feet between the proposed van parking lot and residential parcel line. Mr. Mannion stated they are maintaining most of the woods there and still adding more landscape screening with trees and shrubs.

Chairman Greene stated this is a large building. What will be the overall height?

Mr. Mannion said that the overall height of the building is 42 feet to the top of the parapet.

Chairman Greene asked if the parapets are sufficient enough to screen all the rooftop mechanical units.

Mr. Mannion responded that their architect did an analysis on that to confirm, and yes the parapets will be high enough to screen the rooftop mechanical equipment.

Regarding the placement of the three driveways along Michigan Avenue, Mr. Greene stated that one looks to be directly across from a turnaround. He assumes that MDOT's analysis will determine whether that's a feasible location.

Mr. Mannion stated that that location specifically is one where there is currently a curb cut. It is actually a little bit larger a curb cut as if it was master planned at some point to have that be a primary entrance.

Ms. Zuber asked if this is a facility where, if something needs to be returned to a major retailer, the package could be dropped off here.

Mr. Mannion said he cannot confirm with certainty at this point. If that is part of the program here, there would be specific spaces with specific signage for customers.

Ms. Zuber had some concerns regarding the traffic on Michigan Avenue and did not find the Traffic Study easy reading. She is glad that Wayne County might consider putting in dedicated right-turn lanes. Ms. Zuber believes this will be a really nice facility for Canton.

Mr. Acharya wondered if there was any variances with the 100 foot setback to the residential area.

Mr. Sloan stated there will not be a setback variance application for that one. Mr. Sloan displayed the plans showing the west side of the site, showing 206 feet from the lot line to the west parking lot, which is just under 200 feet from the closest points. The only item where there may be a modification is that within the 100-foot setback there is a 50-foot requirement for a berm, and that berm has to be landscaped. Mr. Sloan stated that the area west of the parking lot is heavily wooded. The applicants propose a number of trees along that perimeter, but they may ask for relief from the berm requirement.

Mr. Acharya asked what the purpose of the berms is.

Mr. Sloan explained that the reason for the berm is to have an embankment to give a visual buffer. In this case, with the required 100-foot separation distance, there is an existing wooded area there and with what they add there, it should perform better than a berm with no trees existing. Also, if the required berm is installed, it would require the removal of many trees.

Mr. Acharya stated he is fine with that. He was just concerned as this a 24/7 business and the truck traffic could be disturbing to nearby residents.

Mr. Sloan explained that the heavy truck traffic is focused on the east side of the site, far south of the drain where there are no residents. The van delivery vehicles will be using the west side of the site, and most of that traffic will be during the peak hours of the day. There should be very little activity at night on the west side of the site.

Ms. Eggenberger stated she had some of the same concerns, her questions were answered. She is pleased they will be keeping some of the current forested area.

Mr. Weber wanted to confirm that the truck traffic will be coming in mostly during the overnight hours. How far away is the residential area to the north from where the truck traffic will coming in?

Mr. Sloan displayed an aerial photo of the area and explained the layout of the site. North of the site is the drain, and the trucks will be coming & going into the site south of the drain. The primary residential to the north would be a future phase for Woodbridge, and there is approximately 1,000 feet from the Woodbridge property line to the drain.

Mr. Weber assumes that the drive the trucks will be using is built for the heavy trucks and the volume of the trucks, or will that have to be upgraded?

Mr. Mannion explained that the existing boulevard for the business park is going to be used for the vans. The trucks will be accessing the site from one of the new curb cuts on Michigan Avenue.

Mr. Weber stated the right turn lanes will be imperative then if the trucks are going to come in directly off of Michigan Avenue.

Mr. Weber thought he read in the paperwork that there would be charging stations for the vans, is that correct?

Mr. Mannion stated that right now the infrastructure as planned is going to be installed. Essentially conduits running to the van parking spots around the perimeter for delivery vans (planned for in the future when those vehicles become available). At this point in time there are not enough electric vehicles for delivery use available on the market, but they are planning for the day when they are made available.

Mr. Weber asked approximately how many people will be working at this facility during peak hours.

Mr. Mannion stated there will be about 168 full-time employees working inside the building. In addition to that would be all the delivery van drivers.

Mr. Weber asked if the volume of people working fluctuate by season (during holidays) when shipments are more voluminous.

Mr. Mannion responded that they would expect the number of employees to increase during peak seasonal retail periods.

Mr. Weber asked of Mr. Sloan if the site plan would adequately accommodate the extra flow of traffic and volume of people coming in at that time.

Mr. Sloan stated that it would be expected to. In some cases it's hard to predict, especially with industrial use. But just like with retailers, they would look at what the parking would look like during peak seasons, and to some degree the traffic as well. For an online retailer or anyone who has their business based on shipments (FedEx, UPS), the Planning Division would try to look at what would be the peak traffic during peak delivery times around the holiday season.

Mr. Singh stated he is glad that they plan to keep a lot of the woods intact. A small portion of that is being taken for parking. Mr. Singh remembers hearing that the required maximum parking spots is 10% more than the minimum requirement, but in this case they are proposing a lot more parking spots. Mr. Singh asked if there is any way to keep the parking spots to the maximum allowed, thereby keeping those woods intact.

Mr. Sloan stated that would be a question more so for the applicant regarding what their proposal is.

Mr. Mannion stated the parking as shown is needed for business operations. There is a significant amount of wetlands on this site and it's really a constraint for how this site was laid out. Mr. Mannion stated they are working with EGLE right now with getting the permitting process going. They are impacting the wetlands, but are trying to minimize the impact.

Ms. Foster wanted to note that she shares Commissioner Zuber's concern regarding traffic along Michigan Avenue. She will be interested to see what comes out of that once they have the conversations with MDOT and Wayne County. Ms. Foster also has concerns about the number of trees being removed and wanted to know how many trees will be replaced.

Mr. Sloan reviewed the landscape plan that the applicants submitted. According to the Zoning Ordinance, of the regulated trees on a site, an applicant can remove 25% non-landmark regulated trees without replacement, and then once they go above 25% the Ordinance has the mitigation requirements. The plan shows the required replacement trees are 96 regulated trees and then with the landmark trees being cut down, they would have mitigation for 210 trees. So they would be replanting 306 trees. Mr. Sloan stated that they are still working with the applicant on fine tuning the tree survey to identify the species and sizes that would be subject to those requirements.

Chairman Greene ask about the open area. The Commission requires a minimum of 25%. Does this preliminary plan meet that requirement?

Mr. Sloan said it does. There are several areas of the site that are undeveloped. The large open area on the west will remain undeveloped plus there are several pockets of open areas on the site.

Mr. Weber asked where the wetland area is on the site.

Mr. Sloan explained that on the west side of the site to the north of the parking lot, there are some wetlands and floodplain. A wetland area to the east is proposed to remain. Also in the middle of the site, and EGLE permit will be required where the building is proposed and where there will be some wetland filling.

Mr. Weber asked if the proposed detention area will be adequate for the runoff from this very large parking lot.

Mr. Sloan stated that when the Site Plan is reviewed, the Township Engineer reviews the storm water plans and provided preliminary comments in terms of calculations, feasibility, as well as our understanding of the County requirements. But the storm water system will be under the jurisdiction of Wayne County, so the applicants will be required to get County approval of the plans and the storm water system.

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

Motion by Zuber, supported by Foster to move to recommend approval of the special land use for a warehousing and materials distribution center use 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, and 127-99-0009-000, as the request meets the Special Land Use criteria of the Canton Township Zoning Ordinance pursuant to the information and plans provided, subject to specific design criteria to be addressed and corrected at the time of site plan review, and that the special land use plans and traffic impact study are subject to approval by Canton Township's transportation engineering consultant and MDOT, including any required upgrades to the site or Michigan Ave.

Mr. Weber asked if any conditions about getting the EGLE permits or any necessary permits from Wayne County should be associated with this motion, or should that go when we do site plan?

Mr. Sloan stated that would go with the site plan, and by that time the engineer may have some specifics in terms of any requirements that may need to be addressed.

Commissioner Zuber called the vote:

Ayes: Acharya, Eggenberger, Foster, Singh, Weber, Zuber, and Greene.

Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Sloan explained the next steps for the project moving forward.

**NEW BUSINESS**

- 2. 2020 Annual Report

Motion by Zuber, supported by Acharya, to send 2020 Annual Report to the Township Board.

Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

- 3. Election of Officers.

Chairman Greene suggested that the Commission put this off for a month, since two commissioners are not in attendance. All Commission members currently in attendance agreed.

Mr. Sloan stated the Planning Commission can take action to defer the election of officers for a month.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Singh, to table the Election of Officers to next month.

Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

**NEW BUSINESS – STAFF REFERRAL**

- 4. 010-SPC-6485      **HAVENS ORTHODONTICS** – Refer review of Site Plan to staff for approval on parcel nos. 010-99-0013-000 & 010-99-0014-000. Property is located east of Canton Center Road, between Sheldon Road and Joy Road.
  
- 049-COND-5823      **CLOVER COMMUNITIES/SRB SERVICING** – Refer review of Conditional Rezoning to staff for approval on parcel nos. 049-99-0004-000, 049-99-0007-000, 049-99-0008-000 & 049-99-0009-000. Property is located west of Lotz Road, between Ford Road and Lotzford Road.
  
- 038-SLU-6497      **SHANNON FRANKE DAYCARE** – Refer review of Special Land Use for Group Child Care Home to staff for approval on parcel no. 038-07-0039-000. Property is located north of Hanford Road, between Canton Center Road and Sheldon Road.

Motion Zuber supported by Weber to refer Item #4 to Staff. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

**NEW BUSINESS – SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR MARCH 1, 2021**

- 5. 129-SLU-6338 **CANTON CROSSINGS** – Set public hearing for review of Special Land Use for parcel and east of Canton Center Road.
- 047-SLU-6342 **BARBAT (41350 FORD ROAD)** – Set public hearing for review of Special Land Use for parcel no. 047-99-0006-001. Property is located north of Ford Road, between Haggerty Road and I-275.
- 049-COND-5823 **CLOVER COMMUNITIES/SRB SERVICING** – Set public hearing for review of Conditional Rezoning for parcel nos. 049-99-0004-000, 049-99-0007-000, 049-99-0008-000 & 049-99-0009-000. Property is located west of Lotz Road, between Ford Road and Lotzford Road
- 038-SLU-6497 **SHANNON FRANKE DAYCARE** – Set public hearing for review of Special Land Use for Group Child Care Home for parcel no. 038-07-0039-000. Property is located north of Hanford Road, between Canton Center Road and Sheldon Road.

Motion Zuber, Supported by Weber to set the Public Hearing for March 1, 2021. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Chairman Greene asked Patrick Sloan what the status is with Chick-Fil-A. Mr. Sloan stated that the site plan review process is still with internal staff due to some incomplete site plan items. Mr. Sloan stated that there was a meeting a couple weeks ago between some of the Chick-Fil-A project representatives and Township Staff representatives from Planning, Engineering, Fire, Police Dept, and the Building Division. Primarily, the Township’s major concern is the circulation and traffic impact on Ford Road and adjacent internal access areas between sites. Further discussion ensued amongst the Planning Commission Members and Mr. Sloan regarding Township staff comments and concerns.

**ADJOURN**

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

Melanie A. Sherwood  
Recording Secretary