

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CANTON
PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS
August 2, 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, August 2, 2021. Chairman Greene called the meeting to order at 7:06 P.M. and led the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

ROLL CALL:

Members Present: Acharya, Eggenberger, Foster, Okon, Weber, Zuber, Greene.

Commissioner Singh joined the meeting at 8:33pm.

Each member noted that they were video teleconferencing from Canton Township, Wayne County Michigan, with the exception of Alan Okon in Columbus, Ohio.

Absent: Engel

STAFF PRESENT: Patrick Sloan

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JULY 12, 2021

Motion by Okon supported by Foster, to move to approve the Minutes of July 12, 2021, as presented. Motion passed by those present by roll call vote, 6-0 (Acharya, Eggenberger, Foster, Okon, Weber, and Greene). Commissioner Zuber abstained as she was not in attendance for the July 12th meeting.

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

Mr. Sloan stated he wished to clarify a couple items:

Originally there was a Public Hearing scheduled for Ridge Creek Planned Development proposing a PD Amendment to keep the same layout of the 22-unit single family residential development on the south side of Warren Road, west of Ridge. The applicants for Ridge Creek have requested to be taken off the agenda. Mr. Sloan does not know why they made the request, but he expects them back soon on a future Planning Commission agenda. So, for anyone who is in the audience for Ridge Creek, it has been pulled from the agenda and when it is rescheduled, Staff will re-mail notices and re-advertise in the newspaper accordingly.

Mr. Sloan wanted to clarify Item #3 under New Business Staff Referral for Anand Village. Anand Village was approved a couple years ago for Preliminary Site Plan, and that expired. The applicants are proposing to come back with the same 42-unit development at the southeast corner of Geddes and Denton. So, the Staff Referral for Anand Village tonight is mostly a formality to refer the application for Staff Referral review which has no deliberation or votes by the Planning Commission this evening. That will come later once Staff has reviewed it and deemed it complete, then it will be on a formal agenda as a New Business action item.

Motion by Weber, supported by Zuber, to move to accept the agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously by those present by roll call vote, 7-0.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. 062-PDDF-6757 **MONARK GROVE CANTON** – Consider Final PDD on parcel nos. 062-99-0004-000, 062-99-0005-000, 036-01-0003-003, 036-01-0003-005, 036-01-0003-

006, 036-01-0004-001, 036-01-0004-002 & 036-01-0005-000. Property is located south of Ford Road, between Canton Center Road and Beck Road.

Mr. Sloan stated the applicant proposes to construct a housing for the elderly land use at the southwest corner of Ford Rd. and Gorman Rd., located between Beck Rd. and Canton Center. The proposed housing for the elderly use consists of 225 units on 17.25 acres, which is proposed as follows: 53 units for independent living, 102 units for assisted living 32 units of memory care, and 38 attached elderly cottages. At the Preliminary Planned Development there were 224 units approved, so the proposal this evening is for one more unit than was proposed at Preliminary PDD. The breakdown is 10 fewer independent living units, 7 more assisted living units, and 4 more elderly cottage units on the west and south sides.

The site consists of eight (8) parcels that are currently zoned R-1 and R-3. The housing for the elderly is a Special Land Use in both of those zoning districts and the proposed Planned Development application is consistent with the requirements for housing for the elderly with the exception of the modifications that are proposed.

Mr. Sloan explained that every Planned Development District is required to demonstrate definite benefits to the community. There are several benefits noted by the project sponsor, but some of the ones that are most consistent with Section 27.04 are: architectural design of the buildings; paving of Gorman Road to the site's entrance from Ford Road, including reconstruction of the approach to 3 lanes with dedicated right- and left-turn lanes from Gorman Rd. onto Ford Rd; extending the sidewalk along the south side of Ford Rd. eastward about 620 feet to connect to the existing sidewalk in front of Belle Tire which would fill a gap along Ford Road; the addition of northbound and southbound right turn lights at the intersection of Canton Center Rd. and Ford Rd. to permit overlapping phases if permitted by MDOT.

Special Land Use in the R-1 and R-3 districts includes housing for the elderly. Section 6.03(E) and Section 6.03(A) of the Zoning Ordinance apply to housing for the Elderly uses. The use is eligible for both those zoning districts, and as a Special Land Use, Staff goes straight to the subsections in Article 6 to look at the development standards for the housing for the elderly uses. In reviewing those standards, the application meets most of the standards except where there are modifications proposed. The modifications can be summarized in the following six proposed modifications

- The first modification is maximum building length. The maximum building length of 464 ft. is proposed for the main building, 150 ft. is permitted by Sec. 6.03(A). There is a maximum length of 350 ft. for housing for the elderly uses permitted by Sec. 6.03(E). Although 464 ft. is the longest dimension between any two ends, the longest uninterrupted building wall is under 200 ft. long due to the variations in the wall angles. At Preliminary PDD review, a building length of 461 feet was approved, so the building length on the Final PDD Plan is 3 feet longer.
- The second modification is maximum building height. A maximum building height 42.50 feet is proposed for the 3-story portion of the main building; The Zoning Ordinance for housing for the elderly allows a maximum height of 3 stories capped at 35 feet, so there is a modification of 7.5 ft proposed. The building height is calculated by the average height between the eave and the ridge. The eave is about 34 ft. high, and the ridge is at its highest point is about 51 ft. The portion of the main building that is 3 stories and exceeding the height is located about 157.5 feet from the Ford Road right-of-way, 110 feet from the Gorman Road right-of-way, about 190 feet to the southern lot line, and about 170 feet from the western lot line. It will meet the setbacks and be far away from some of the lot lines in terms of that 3-story height. At Preliminary PDD review, a building height of 42.83 feet was approved, so the proposed building height is about 4 inches lower.
- The third modification is the percentage of brick on the building elevations. There is 33.1% brick

proposed for the main building and 30% brick proposed for the cottage buildings on the elevation plans labeled as Option 1. A minimum of 50% masonry required by the Zoning Ordinance. The remainder of the buildings, in addition to the brick, will consist of fiber-cement lap siding, windows, doors, and louvers. During Preliminary PDD review, the Planning Commission and Township Board recommended that the architectural plans include a minimum 50% brick; therefore, the applicant has included compliant elevations labeled Option 2. The architectural elevations labeled as Option 1 include more masonry than was proposed at Preliminary PDD review, and the applicant proposes those for consideration as an alternative to the 50% brick requirement. Mr. Sloan stated that for Option 2, the applicant has given an architectural rendering that does meet the 50% brick requirement, but is requesting a modification from that percentage.

- The fourth modification is a Wetland setback. There is a minimum 25-foot setback required from wetlands and the applicant is requesting less than 25 feet proposed from any wetland that will remain on the site.
- The fifth proposed modification is the minimum side-to-rear building spacing. There is a minimum of 60 feet required, and the distance between cottage units 9, 10, and 11 is 24.2 feet. Then there's a 30-foot separation between cottage units 4, 5 & 6. The minimum side-to-rear spacing is a distance of 60 feet, and that standard is based mostly on multi-family standards, but for 2- and 3-unit attached cottages, a closer spacing is not out of the question. It is a relatively minor modification.
- The sixth proposed modification is a minimum side-to-side building spacing. There is 27 feet proposed between cottage units 30-37, a minimum of 30 is required. The remaining units will meet the 30-foot side-to-side spacing requirements.

The main building does meet the minimum front yard setbacks for the Housing for the Elderly Use. The elderly cottage buildings will meet the minimum driveway length and the minimum rear yard setbacks for a 1-2-story housing for the elderly use.

Regarding traffic impact, Mr. Sloan stated that many of the comments were addressed at the Preliminary PDD review. The applicants had submitted a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) that was reviewed by the Township's traffic engineering consultant (Wade-Trim). The consultant concluded that the traffic generated by the proposed facility was relatively minor in comparison to a single-family development that would otherwise be permitted on that property. The Township's consultant concluded that the impact on the surrounding roadways was minimal and that the capacity deficiencies currently exist throughout Ford Road west of Canton Center Road and are considered regional beyond the scope in context of that study based on the localized development example.

The applicant has also submitted its plan materials to Wayne County and the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), and Staff recommends that any recommendation of Final PDD approval include a condition that all requirements of Wayne County and MDOT be satisfied.

Density: Mr. Sloan stated there is not necessarily a density called for in the housing for the elderly uses in the Zoning Ordinance, but it does require at least 2,500 sq. ft. of site area for each efficiency one-bedroom unit, and the Ordinance requires 3,000 square feet of site area for each 2-bedroom unit. Based on the unit calculations on the plans, the site area of 17.25 acres is larger than the required site area for the proposed 225 units. So, the allowable density for housing for the elderly use is greater than what is proposed. The residential density of Monark Grove is within the range of recently-approved housing for the elderly uses (Bickford on Canton Center Rd., Hampton Manor on Ford Rd., and Antioch on Sheldon Rd.).

Market Analysis: Mr. Sloan stated there is a Market Analysis included in the packet, which it is the same

as the one they had for Preliminary review.

Sidewalks and Pedestrian Access: They will have sidewalks on both sides of the street along Ford Road including an off-site connection 620 feet to the east to connect to the sidewalk termination in front of Bell Tire.

Architecture and Lot Layout: Staff has noted the modification that is requested by the applicant. They have proposed an Option 1, which is 33.1% brick for the main building but they have also given an Option 2 which is 50% masonry. They have given a similar option for the elderly cottages.

Landscaping and Natural Features: A landscape plan is not required at the time of Planned Development review, but the applicants have included one. Some modification would be required should this move to Site Plan Review, but it is something that the applicant can attain compliance with or propose a modification at that time.

Parking. The proposed parking lots include 43 more spaces than the proposed minimum number of spaces required by the Zoning Ordinance. However, 40 of the proposed spaces are labeled as “landbank parking,” which are not permitted unless explicitly allowed by the Planning Commission. This was a condition at Preliminary PDD review that those additional 40 landbank spaces not be paved over unless explicitly approved by the Planning Commission.

The cottage buildings will have 2-car garages for each unit. There will be sufficient area in the driveways to allow parking, and there is on-street parking allowed where there is not a “no parking” sign.

The PDD Agreement is consistent with the Township’s template Agreement, and includes the definite benefits, proposed modifications and a requirement that all units be age-restricted. The Exhibits must be completed and PD Agreement must address how the definite benefits will be completed to the satisfaction of the Township Attorney and Township Engineer.

Mr. Sloan stated that if the proposed development, modifications, and definite benefits are acceptable to the Planning Commission, Staff recommends final approval of the Planned Development District, subject to the requirements of Wayne County and MDOT being satisfied, that the PD Agreement address how the definite benefits will be completed to the satisfaction of the Township Attorney and Township Engineer, and that the building architecture comply with the Planning Commission’s recommendation. That recommendation can either be Option 1 as proposed by the applicant, or Option 2 which was desired by both the Planning Commission and Board at Preliminary PDD.

Motion by Weber, supported by Zuber, to move to open the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously those present by roll call vote, 7-0 (7:29 pm)

David Endres, Vice President for Senior Living for Kirco Development, introduced some of his colleagues in attendance: Matt Coughenour with Kirco Development, Chip Heine with Kirco Development, Paul Lewsley with Environmental Engineers, and Scott Deisler with PH 7 Architects. Mr. Endres stated that Kirco Development has assembled all of the parcels for this project and currently has them under contract. They feel this will be a great project for the community. Their studies of the area indicate that Canton is greatly underserved. Mr. Endress said some of the items he’d like to point out are a result of the pandemic. They try to build 10-foot ceilings within their units which produces a bit of a higher end product. They are also installing larger ductwork because of the amount of air and ventilation is really crucial now, especially in a senior community. It also makes for a much quieter building. Mr. Endres stated that they do have a draft permit in place from EGLE for wetlands mitigation. They will be purchasing wetland mitigation

credits from the State of Michigan. Mr. Endres said, to quote EGLE, the site has poor quality regulated wetlands. A high-quality wetland will be located off-site and constructed through EGLE. Mr. Endres stated this project will have cash flow to the Township of Canton, according to their studies, approximately \$458,000 of positive cash flow per year. He feels that is an additional benefit that should be recognized. Mr. Endres stated they would like to commence construction as soon as the first of the year. They have offered two options for the exterior brick elevations. Mr. Endres recognizes the 50% requirement. This is a building they have built before, they have a project currently under construction with the same architecture in Clarkston on Sashabaw Road. The building in Canton will be a sister building to that project. They have an eight-story building in Troy that is 100% brick, but they feel that the architecture of this project is not hindered by using less brick. They are after the French country theme. Mr. Endres added that they are in a very dynamic market right now economically in terms of construction costs, and this is the cusp of viability, so would obviously advocate Option 1. Mr. Endres said they have been working on this particular site with Canton for a couple years now. One of the very clear things to him is the traffic issues that exist in Canton. This is a location on Ford Road that necks down to two lanes, so they feel this will provide a massive upgrade. Senior living communities do not put a lot of load on the surrounding infrastructure, particularly from a traffic perspective. Mr. Endres stated they feel this project, given its natural features and so forth, is just what the doctor ordered for this site. Mr. Endres said he is happy to answer any questions.

Mr. Sloan wanted to note that earlier this evening he had emailed a public comment from a neighbor, Chris Obudzinski, to the Planning Commission.

Mr. Paul Kowalczyk, 46475 Ford Road, thanked the Commissioners for working on this project. Mr. Kowalczyk stated there are a tremendous amount of seniors looking for homes. He stated Kirco has a great deal going on, and are also bringing a lot of things to the table. One being they will bring revenue, and they are going to bring in a lot of jobs to this community. There will be a lot of people working here, not just the construction but when the project is built. Mr. Kowalczyk say he has read everything about Kirco and this is an elaborate place, he believes this will be a great thing for the community. The Board Members in Canton are not just going to allow just anything, because there are rules. Mr. Kowalczyk said he is part of this project and he hopes it goes through smoothly. He thanked the Township, and thanked Kirco for bringing in this project.

Commissioner Weber asked that, as the letter Mr. Sloan mentioned is opposing the project, should it be read into the record?

Chairman Greene stated they do not usually read the letters. As Mr. Sloan noted that the Commission did receive it, that is usually sufficient.

Mr. Sloan stated typically they will forward on emails.

Chairman Greene said that if Commissioner Weber felt comfortable reading the letter into the record, to please do so.

Commissioner Weber read the email into the record from Chris Obudzinski, a Canton resident at 1852 Crosswick Court which abuts the property in question. The letter was specifically addressed to the Township Supervisor and Community Planner.

Chairman Greene stated the letter does bring up a couple things that maybe Patrick Sloan could explain to the audience. One being the difference between a PDD approach to a development as opposed to the normal zoning changes etc. Then also the question regarding drainage. That is always a concern when developing

a relatively undeveloped area, as to what happens to the water runoff and how is that controlled.

Commissioner Zuber requested to close the Public Hearing before proceeding further.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Acharya, to move to close the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously by those present by roll call vote, 7-0.

Commissioner Weber mentioned regarding the water runoff/wetlands area. He feels that should be addressed to the gentleman who wrote this letter on that specific point because their properties do back up directly to this property. The water runoff situation might be the most important point he made in his letter, especially given all the issues we've seen in the area this summer with flooding.

Chairman Greene stated that is a good point, and is why he highlighted those to talk about. That always seems to be an issue with people who live adjacent to a project.

Mr. Sloan explained that the Township Engineering Division reviews the development application at the point of PDD review and even site plan review. The Township Engineering Division reviews the plan mostly for feasibility of whether the way it is laid out can work. If a site plan is approved, the Township Engineering Division does a much more thorough review of not just grading and drainage, but also utilities, water and sewer, grade, things of that nature. In addition to that, the stormwater will have to be reviewed by Wayne County, and Wayne County has stormwater standards for new development that are over a certain threshold of size. Probably most of the applications that come before the Planning Commission, if approved, then afterward go through the Engineering Review with both the Township and Wayne County, and a big part of that is for stormwater and meeting the County Stormwater Ordinance. So, by the time they are ready for pre-construction, they have had Engineering Review and they have had what they need to have in place for the stormwater to work according to the County's ordinance. In terms of answering any questions regarding the engineering, Mr. Sloan said he usually recommends people talk to the Township Engineering Division, or sometimes refer them to the County if the County has jurisdiction. Mr. Sloan said these projects do get reviewed for engineering, it's mostly pursuant to the County ordinance, but flooding can happen for a number of reasons. If there is rain event that exceeds the capacity of pond, there can be back-ups. Sometimes it is a maintenance issue in terms of keeping the drains clean and the forebay of the pond clean. There are a number of things that could cause flooding and water backups, and what Staff tries to do on the front end, especially the Engineering Division and the County, is to make sure that the stormwater ordinance requirements are met, and that it's engineered according to that ordinance.

Mr. Sloan stated he replied to Mr. Obudzinski with a few other background items in terms of what a Planned Development is versus a rezoning. The reason that the property is not subject to a rezoning is, first, that the R-1 and R-3 districts allow housing for the elderly as Special Land Uses, so a rezoning wouldn't be necessary even if it did meet all the standards and they wanted to apply just for a Special Land Use and not a Planned Development. There is not a necessity for rezoning in that sense.

Mr. Sloan addressed the concerns about the building footprint and building length and height. Those were items where if it was not a PDD, then that is something that somebody would go to the Zoning Board of Appeals for to seek a variance. But with a Planned Development District, the Planning Commission and the Board can grant modifications which, like variances, someone can be granted a type of development that doesn't meet the Ordinance standards but those modifications have to be enumerated in the Planned Development Agreement. Staff also has to look at the definite benefits to see if the project including the modifications is commensurate with the definite benefit and the development as a whole.

Mr. Sloan spoke on the masonry percentages and the concern about the 50%. The 50% was recommended

by the Planning Commission and the Township Board at Preliminary PDD, and the applicants have submitted a drawing elevation that includes the 50% requirement. There is also an alternate drawing with less than 50% that the Planning Commission and Board may consider.

Regarding the traffic concerns, Mr. Sloan stated that Ford Road is under the jurisdiction of MDOT and Gorman Road is under the jurisdiction of Wayne County. There was a previous traffic impact assessment submitted by the applicants, as well as the peer review by the Township's traffic engineering consultant (WadeTrim). Mr. Sloan referenced those documents in his reply to Mr. Obudzinski to answer those questions as best he could.

Chairman Greene said the bottom line has always been that development is engineered to not be detrimental as to water runoff to what's already there. There is nothing perfect in this world, but the project is going to be designed to contain and control water, not necessarily away, but in a controlled fashion away from the project or the homes that are already there. Chairman Greene wants to assure the audience and the residents near there, that the intent is to control the water and not be detrimental to their properties.

Commissioner Okon asked Patrick Sloan what the difference is between independent living and assisted living.

Mr. Sloan said his understanding of independent living is that those are residents that can basically come and go as they please and have full use of the building and grounds, whereas the assisted living residents would need to be accompanied to leave the facility. Mr. Sloan would defer to the applicant for the specific definitions.

Commissioner Weber stated he can speak on this. Independent living is essentially like a senior going to live in a new home. They have all the ability to move around, cook meals and take care of themselves. Assisted living is for the senior who may need some level of assistance to get around, medical, help with meals or personal hygiene, etc.

Commissioner Okon asked about the future bank of parking. There is quite a bit on this site. On the proposed landscaping, there is landscaping where the land bank of parking is going to be. He asked Mr. Sloan to explain what the land bank parking is.

Mr. Sloan stated that the land bank parking was parking that the applicant wanted to have as parking that could easily be developed if the facility had a demand such that the existing parking lot couldn't handle it. In many ordinances, land bank parking is sometimes either requested by an applicant or required by a community where it's not thought at the time that there's justification for future parking, so they don't build it. But they may set aside an area for an easy-to-develop parking lot should the demand arise. Sometimes it is determined by the applicant. In this particular case, Staff requested that the PD Agreement state that the land bank parking is not allowed to be built without explicit authorization by the Planning Commission. So, at some point in the future if the applicants thought they had a demand for 40 additional spaces and wanted to develop more parking in that land bank, they would have to come to the Planning Commission for permission to do that rather than just implementing it by right.

Commissioner Okon asked if the Commission would modify the affected landscaping at that time.

Mr. Sloan stated the applicant would be required to meet the landscape requirements. The landscape requirements are that the more parking spaces you have, the more trees you have to plant and the more landscape area you must have. They would have to account for those additional spaces. If they were removing trees or shrubs, they would have to either relocate those on site or they would have to replace

them someplace on the site.

Commissioner Okon stated he would like to see them meet the 50% brick on their elevations. Other than that, he is good with the project.

Commissioner Zuber stated she thinks this project will be very nice. She actually does not mind the elevations that don't have the 50% brick.

Commissioner Weber stated that other than the water runoff issue, which was addressed, he likes the project. On the site plan that shows the proposed future building, does any approval done tonight mean that that building is approved, or will they need to come back through the process to amend the PDD, etc.?

Mr. Sloan stated that the Planned Development Districts in general are good for six years, so they would have a period of six years in which to get approval and build that other phase. If they were to get PD approval and they were to move ahead with construction on the first phase, they would have a window on which to build that second phase. If they were to build it, they would have to submit a site plan for it at the time they want to build it for review by the Planning Commission and Township Board.

Commissioner Weber asked the petitioner if whether they build that building or not, is that demand driven?

Mr. Endres responded yes, it is entirely demand driven.

Commissioner Eggenberger stated there is talk of filling a lot of the wetlands and the petitioner made some comment about how they are going to create a better wetland. Her understanding is that it hasn't been approved yet, regarding what they plan to do with the wetlands. They say they are going to be less than 25 feet from whatever is left.

Mr. Sloan addressed the 25-foot wetland setback. On the south side of the site there are some wetlands that are being filled for the grading and development of the elderly cottages. Mr. Sloan explained the plan displayed on screen. South of the cottage buildings is a preserved area and many of which include preserved wetlands that are proposed not to be disturbed. The setbacks from the remaining wetlands to the units will be less than 25 feet.

Commissioner Eggenberger asked if they are just waiting for approval from EGLE?

Mr. Sloan stated that is correct. The wetland permitting is through Michigan Department of EGLE (formerly DEQ).

Commissioner Eggenberger stated she does not have a problem with the look of the 50% brick. If that is what the Commission is expecting other places to do, then we need to be consistent and expect that of this applicant.

Commissioner Foster stated she is supportive of this project. She agrees with the 50% brick, especially since the adjacent single-family homes also have 50% brick.

Commissioner Acharya stated he is also in favor of the 50% brick. He had a question regarding the wetland mitigation credit that the project applicant mentioned. What percentage of ecological losses are going to be offset by the mitigation credit?

Mr. Endres stated that there is a pretty involved process that they have gone through in applying to MDEQ/EGLE for a permit. This site contains a regulated wetland at the westernmost portion of the site, and what that means is that they are required to get approval from EGLE in order to construct the project, also EGLE is required to go to the Environmental Protection Agency and are also required to get approval from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Department. All those approvals have been obtained and there is a draft permit in place. Michigan has a regulation which allows for what are called wetlands mitigation credits to be purchased. Mr. Endres said they are spending over \$300,000 to purchase wetland mitigation credits through a wetlands bank that is under the governance of MDEQ/EGLE. Basically, the same area of wetland will be constructed on another site and those wetlands will be constructed of very high-quality wetlands as part of a larger wetland. Mr. Endres said that regarding the question of percentage, the best he can say is that it will be more than 100% replaced. It will be equal area and much higher quality than what exists there now.

Chairman Greene asked if that replacement is required to be on the same site or some other site locally.

Mr. Endres said it will not be on the same site, it will be somewhere else at the State's discretion.

Chairman Greene asked if there will be an upgrade of the wetland area on this project.

Mr. Endres stated they are providing a concept here that involves ponds, they are trying to create a resort feel. On the western side of the site, the regulated wetlands are being filled in as part of the construction and mitigation credits are being purchased to allow those wetlands to be reconstructed off-site.

Chairman Greene stated his position on this is it is a really good project. Looking at the elevations and the layout, and with Kirco's experience, that this would be good. He is concerned with some of the details. Since we are dealing with the wetland areas and the extremities of the project, he noticed on one of the drawings some trees on the very western part of the project, but he does not see any trees indicated that would be planted. Looking at the actual satellite photo of the area, there is a lot of wooded area. Could someone explain the buffering and how this will look when it's finished between the southern and western boundaries of the project. Are they leaving trees in some areas, are trees being added?

Mr. Sloan stated there is a proposed landscape plan (Sheet L1) that gives a broad overview of all the trees proposed to be planted. There are a number of evergreen trees along the western boundary, and then along the southern boundary that are proposed to be kept there in the area, they are not proposed to be disturbed. Staff has reviewed the landscape plans on a preliminary basis. There are a few standards in the Ordinance that would apply to housing for the elderly uses that would result in more trees. There will also be some preliminary recommendations along that south side of those preserved trees. Based on the tree survey, some trees are in poor condition and some are exempt species. During Site Plan review, Staff will recommend that some of those exempt trees, especially the ones that are poor, be removed to create more area for healthy trees

Chairman Greene stated then that the review of this area is not complete. Chairman Greene asked about Mr. Sloan's comment about both sides of Ford Road having sidewalk. The northern side does not have an existing sidewalk, and that's not part of this project.

Mr. Sloan said that he may have misspoken, and wanted to clarify. Both the Ford Road frontage (south side) and the Gorman Road frontage will have sidewalks.

Chairman Greene stated this is a definite benefit in terms of mobility for those walking to the shopping center. He mentioned a discussion from the December 7th meeting regarding a proposed access farther

south along Gorman going behind Kroger. Was that just talk or something that was coming to fruition?

Mr. Sloan stated that where Gorman Road terminates at the south side, just past that termination is Waterside Drive which is in The Glens at Cambridge. When Waterside was built, there was a decision made at that time not to connect to Gorman, to not send more traffic up to Ford Road through Gorman. So as part of this project, there is no change there as far as any kind of connection. The primary connection will be through Gorman into the site, and the secondary connection along Ford Road on the west side of the site will be for emergency vehicles only. Mr. Sloan is not aware of any sidewalk connection on Gorman Road to The Traditions. The plans illustrate the sidewalk along the west side of Gorman going all the way to the project's southern lot line.

Chairman Greene stated that he really likes Option 2 with the 50% brick. Not just because it is 50% brick, he just thinks the elevations look better. He would definitely prefer Option 2. Chairman Greene stated he is not too concerned with the extra building height. The additional height won't be very noticeable, and in a PDD situation like this, that's a sacrifice well made. Chairman Greene states he is okay with this project as long as they go with the 50% brick and some of the modifications already discussed.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Foster, to move to recommend final approval of the Monark Grove Planned Development District on tax parcel nos. : 062-99-0004-000, 062-99-0005-000, 036-01-0003-003, 036-01-0003-005, 036-01-0003-006, 036-01-0004-001, 036-01-0004-002, and 036-01-0005-000, as provided in the Planned Development Agreement and plan documents, subject to the requirements of Wayne County and MDOT being satisfied, that the PD Agreement addresses how the definite benefits will be completed to the satisfaction of the Township Attorney and Township Engineer, and that the building architecture meet the requirements of Option 2 with 50% brick.

Commissioner Zuber called the vote:

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

Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 7-0.

Chairman Greene said this will now move forward to the Trustees.

2. 132-PDDA-6616 **PANDA EXPRESS RESTAURANT** – Consider PDD Amendment and Site Plan
132-SPC-6608 on 132-SPC-6608 parcel no. 132-99-0003-701 (part of). Property is located at 45555 Michigan Ave., which is on the south side of Michigan Avenue, west of Belleville Road.

Mr. Sloan stated the applicant is proposing to split 1.31 acres from the Walmart site (Mr. Sloan displayed the location illustration on screen). Right now, the site is mostly an underused parking lot, and the applicant intends to split that property and construct a fast food drive-thru restaurant for a Panda Express. This would require an amendment to the Walmart PDD. The amendment would allow for the fast-food restaurant use on that subject site and it would allow for the associated reduction in the number of parking spaces for that PDD. The site would function mostly like the Panera site to the west with the drive-thru use, and a building in front of Walmart

The site is zoned C-3, and fast-food restaurants are special land uses in the C-3 district. Therefore, there is not a use modification required in the PD agreement.

Mr. Sloan stated that the proposed Planned Development and the proposed Site Plan are being reviewed in tandem. The applicant has submitted applications for both the Planned Development District amendment and Site Plan review. Staff's letter is a little more comprehensive than a normal PD review just because it includes Site Plan related comments.

Traffic Impact: The proposed Panda Express site will have one (1) entry point from the existing access drive, and it will have two (2) exit points. Mr. Sloan displayed the plan and explained the one entry point on the far east side of the site, and then the exit points are a one-way exit onto the service drive to the south, and an exit onto an existing drive that outlets onto Michigan Avenue. The applicant has submitted a Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA), which indicates that the northbound approach on the West Site Drive will have a Level of Service "E." Additionally, the TIA states that the eastbound-to-westbound crossover on Michigan Ave. has the potential to queue back past the West Site Drive, causing additional queuing on the northbound approach at the West Site Drive. So, if this drive starts to stack up west of Panda Express, that could cause some additional backups onto Michigan Avenue. The Township's traffic engineering consultant (Wade-Trim) has concluded the following in its review letter of Panda's TIA, and reads as follows:

"Based on the information presented in the study report, the new traffic at the existing and proposed driveways will add to the capacity limitations on eastbound US-12 (Michigan Avenue). The proposed driveway on the north end of the Panda Express facility with the West Site driveway will be frequently blocked by traffic and should be removed from the plans; traffic exiting the facility can use either of the two southern driveways. This development will not have a major negative impact on the capacity of US-12 (Michigan Avenue)."

Mr. Sloan stated that essentially what's being recommended is that in the northwest this "exit only" being removed from the site and the exits only be on the south side. This would have the effect of putting all exiting traffic on the access drive south of the site and that exiting traffic can be dispersed. Some of that traffic will probably go to the west and be in that West Site drive anyway, but exiting traffic will also have the option to go east, and then farther east they can access the traffic light.

Schedule of Regulations and Modifications. The Panda Express plan meets the Zoning Ordinance requirements of the C-3 district for: front yard setback; side and rear yard setback, and building height.

Mr. Sloan noted that Commissioner Singh has joined the meeting at 8:33pm.

Mr. Sloan stated that Staff's recommendation is to postpone action on the application subject to four different plan revisions. The most impactful revision is the removal of that West Site driveway access based on the traffic engineering consultant's recommendation.

Mr. Eric Lord, stated that with him tonight is Dina Mekawy with Noor, and also Brandon Hayes with Rowe Professional Services.

Dina Mekawy from Noor Architects stated she is the architect consultant working with the client on this project.

Brandon Hayes from Rowe Professional Services stated he is the traffic consultant for the project.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Acharya, to move to open the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 7-0. (Zuber did not call on Mr. Singh)

There were no comments from the public, and Mr. Sloan mentioned he did not receive any comments through email for this application.

Motion by Zuber supported by Eggenberger, to move to close the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 8-0.

Chairman Greene asked Mr. Sloan if the Commission can go ahead and approve a project with the stipulations or does further study and analysis have to take place concerning that driveway. What is the status of the project?

Mr. Sloan stated Staff had the Traffic Impact Assessment reviewed by the Township's traffic engineering consultant, and they have the traffic engineering consultant's letter which was published last week. Mr. Sloan is not sure if the applicants have had a chance to digest the traffic consultant's letter yet. Mr. Sloan stated it is worthwhile to have the Public Hearing, even if the application is postponed, just to talk about the plan layout and any major issues that are yet to be resolved. Mr. Sloan said the reason he recommends postponing is that the site driveway is a major sticking point. If they were to remove that, there is another item of the traffic engineering consultant's letter where they wanted some additional data to verify some of the modeling. So, from Mr. Sloan's standpoint, that TIA is not yet complete to the satisfaction of the Township transportation engineer.

Mr. Sloan stated the Planning Commission could move this on with conditions, but it would be doing so without knowing what that final layout and final traffic information would be until that is resolved between the Planning Commission and the Board of Trustees.

Chairman Greene asked the Commission members if they want to go ahead with the discussion about this project knowing that it will be tabled anyway or just wait for the other processes to go through and then have it come back to the Commission?

Commissioner Eggenberger stated she would prefer to postpone it and discuss it when it comes again.

Commissioner Weber stated he would rather act on an entire/complete project, especially as it concerns a traffic issue. He would rather see the whole picture on this.

All other Commission members were in agreement to postpone the project.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Weber, to move to table this project and postpone action.

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

Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 8-0.

Chairman Greene stated that this will be in the hands of the engineers and the project sponsors, and they could come back to the Commission within the next month or so.

Mr. Sloan stated he would expect them to come back as early as the next meeting. The Public Hearing has been held, so there is no need for another Public Hearing. Based on Staff comments, many of the items of Site Plan review look good. Mr. Sloan said Staff cited four things, three of which can be handled easily other than the traffic issues yet to be resolved.

NEW BUSINESS-SITE PLANS

There was no new business.

NEW BUSINESS-STAFF REFERRAL

- 3. 126-SPP-6651 **ANAND VILLAGE** – Refer review of Preliminary Site Plan on parcel no. 126-99-0008-701. Property is located at the southeast corner of Geddes Road and Denton Road.

- 5. 131-SPI-6827 **LOOMIS ARMORED US FACILITY** – Refer review of Site Plan on parcel nos. 131-02-0002-000, 131-02-0003-000, and 131-02-0004-000. Property is located on the west side of Research Drive, which is south of Michigan Ave. between Beck Rd. and Belleville Rd.

- 6. 040-PDDA-6831 **BJ’S WHOLESALE CLUB** – Refer review of PDD Amendment on parcel nos. 040-99-0006-709. Property is located on the north side of Ford Road between Sheldon Rd. and Morton Taylor Rd. at the former JC Penney site.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Weber, to refer Items #3, #5, and #6 to Staff. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 8-0.

NEW BUSINESS-SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR SEPTEMBER 13, 2021

- 7. 040-PDDA-6831 **BJ’S WHOLESALE CLUB** – Set public hearing for review of PDD Amendment on parcel nos. 040-99-0006-709. Property is located on the north side of Ford Road between Sheldon Rd. and Morton Taylor Rd. at the former JC Penney site.

Motion Zuber, supported by Singh, to set the Public Hearing for September 13, 2021. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 8-0.

MISCELLANEOUS – DISCUSSION

Mr. Sloan stated in the future he will eventually start doing a monthly Staff report, just a one-pager to go over a synopsis of what’s new. Mr. Sloan does not have anything ready to issue for this month, so left this on the agenda as a placeholder. There are a couple items he can go over though.

A couple months ago the Commission reviewed the Canton Hotel Group on the west side of Lilley Rd., north of Ford Road. The applicants have withdrawn that application, so that will not proceed to the Board of Trustees.

In the coming months, the Board of Trustees is going to be interested in an update process of the Master Plan, and the Planning Commission will play a critical role in that process. In the coming weeks and months, the Commissioners will start receiving some communications in terms of what the upcoming process might look like. Mr. Sloan said they are not yet ready to have a kickoff meeting to start the project, but it is being discussed. There will be more on that to come in the future.

Commissioner Zuber asked about Chick-Fil-A.

Mr. Sloan said he has not heard anything from the applicants, but will follow up with them just to see where they are with the application if they are planning to proceed or waiting on anything else.

Chairman Greene asked if our engineers were proceeding with an analysis of stacking for them within that shopping center? Wasn’t that the next step?

Mr. Sloan said they had a meeting back in January or February about the stacking. They discussed the

possibilities for where a number of cars can fit based on what was observed in Novi, to try to not have cars stacked on Ford Road. It would weave quite a bit through the parking lot to the north, potentially going to the east onto Ikea. That is about where they left it. They advised the applicant to come up with a way to stack cars based on what they have seen in other Chick-Fil-A's in southeast Michigan. Mr. Sloan said Staff has not heard anything since.

Commissioner Weber mentioned he is glad to see Gardner White move into the former Art Van Store.

ADJOURN

Motion by Zuber, supported by Okon, to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 8-0. Meeting adjourned at. 8:50pm.

Melanie A. Sherwood
Recording Secretary