

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CANTON
PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS
March 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, March 1, 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 Craig Engel teleconferencing from Bonita Springs, Lee County Florida
Absent: none

STAFF PRESENT: Patrick Sloan

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF February 1, 2021

Motion by Zuber, supported by Weber, to move to approve the Minutes of February 1, 2021, as presented. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

Mr. Sloan stated there is one modification to the agenda. The Public Hearing for Barbat has been re-scheduled for March 8th 2021.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Acharya, to move to approve the agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. 129-SLU-6338 **CANTON CROSSINGS** – Consider Special Land Use for parcel no. 129-99-0002-710. Property is located north of Michigan Avenue and east of Canton Center Road.

Mr. Sloan stated the project sponsor proposes to construct an automobile wash establishment (a.k.a., carwash) on the east side of the vacant portion of the subject parcel. The parcel is located between Canton Center Road and Old Canton Center Road, just north of Michigan Ave. (i.e., north of 7-Eleven and Comerica Bank). The site is zoned C-3, Regional Commercial, and automobile wash establishments are special land uses in the C-3 zoning district.

Although the Special Land Use plan shows multiple commercial buildings on the site, this Special Land Use application is for the car wash use only; therefore, the other buildings shown on the plan are illustrative and the proposed site development will be considered on a future Site Plan Review application, which will come to the Planning Commission if the SLU is approved. Mr. Sloan stated the project sponsor is in the process of preparing an application for Site Plan Review, and this special land use plan includes far more detail than are typically required on a special land use plan. Currently, Township staff is working with the applicants on site plan revisions, so the Planning Commission will review the site plan application at a future meeting if the Special Land Use is approved.

Mr. Sloan explained the carwash is located close to Old Canton Center Road. There is an existing east-west drive coming off of Old Canton Center Road that will primarily service the carwash development. There is also a curb cut farther north on Old Canton Center that is proposed to service the carwash, and in addition, on the west side there is a proposed curb cut aligned across the road from Kroger. So there are two curb cuts proposed, one on Canton Center Road and one of Old Canton Center Road, and there is existing points of access from both roads (east and west), as well as through to Michigan Avenue with a north-south drive that goes to the 7-Eleven and the Comerica Bank building,

Mr. Sloan stated the proposed use of a carwash establishment is a Special Land Use in the C-3 zoning district. The proposed use is compatible to commercial uses to the south (7-Eleven and Comerica Bank), east (multi-tenant commercial center), and west (Kroger). The nearest residential development is Kimberly Meadows subdivision, which is about 500 feet to the north

Schedule of Regulations: The plans submitted illustrate that the proposed development is designed to comply with the dimensional requirements for a carwash establishment. It has the minimum site size (15,000 sq. ft.) and maximum building height (3 stories/35 feet). The proposed building and vacuum structures are located within the required 85-foot front yard setback from the right-of-way of Old Canton Center Road on the east side. Mr. Sloan stated that at its meeting on December 21, 2020, the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) granted an 18-foot front yard setback variance to allow the building to have a 67-foot front yard setback from the right-of-way of Old Canton Center Road to the east. The ZBA also granted a 40.5-foot front yard setback variance to allow the vacuums to have a 44.5-foot front yard setback from the right-of-way of Old Canton Center Road to the east. Some of the practical difficulties noted were that Old Canton Center is a secondary frontage and not as heavily traveled as Canton Center Road. The triangular configuration of the parcel puts front yards on the west and east sides which are very long, so to do the vacuum structures and do the carwash there was a practical difficulty in terms of both the setback and the location of those vacuum structures on the east side.

Mr. Sloan stated that in addition, the Zoning Board of Appeals granted a variance to allow the vacuum facilities to be located in a front yard facing Old Canton Center Road to the east. The Zoning Ordinance does not allow for vacuum facilities to be in a front yard, but because of the orientation of the lot, the front yards, and the way traffic could flow, the ZBA approved the vacuum structures on the east side of the building which is in the front yard facing Old Canton Center Road

Parking: Mr. Sloan stated that the parking calculations are proposed to comply with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, which will be addressed at the time of site plan review. The Ordinance requires 25 stacking spaces per wash lane. The site most likely complies but that would have to be illustrated on the site plan.

Loading: The Zoning Ordinance requires loading areas to be located in the side or rear yards. The northernmost loading area on the plan shows a loading area encroaching into the front yard along Canton Center Road. Mr. Sloan stated that if the upcoming site plan proposal keeps this loading area, the applicant must apply to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance. Also, the northernmost dumpster is technically in a front yard, dumpsters are not allowed in a front yard. If this loading area and dumpster area are proposed to remain on a future site plan, the ZBA would have to consider a variance application.

Architecture: Mr. Sloan stated that the carwash building is proposed to have 50% masonry. The applicant proposes a half high concrete masonry unit as the predominant building material, which can have the appearance of brick. At the time of site plan review, Staff can consider the architecture in more detail.

Landscaping, Screening, and Tree Preservation: There is not a landscape plan required at the time of

Special Land Use plan review although there is one included with the plan. That will be verified for compliance at the time of Site Plan Review, but it is designed to comply with the Ordinance.

Sidewalks: Mr. Sloan stated there is existing sidewalk along Old Canton Center Road that terminates south of the proposed development. Right now on the Special Land Use plans there sidewalks proposed along Old Canton Center Road to connect to where Old Canton Center meets Canton Center. Township Staff recommends that sidewalk be installed along the entire frontage of Old Canton Center Road.

Mr. Sloan said that the lighting and signage will be addressed at the time of Site Plan review.

Mr. Sloan stated that Page 4 of the review letter goes through several findings of Section 27.03(C) of the Zoning Ordinance to determine whether the proposed use meets the criteria established in the Zoning Ordinance. Without going through each of the bullet points on Pages 4 & 5, Staff finds that the proposed development meets the standards of the Zoning Ordinance for Special Land Use approval subject to the conditions noted in the review letter. Therefore, it is the Township Staff's recommendation for the approval of the Special Land Use for a carwash on the subject parcel as illustrated on the Special Land Use Plan 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 including any required variances.

Lastly, Mr. Sloan mentioned there are two drive-thru facilities (proposed restaurants with drive-thru windows) that are illustrated on the plans. The Special Land Use meeting tonight is not regarding those restaurants or drive-thru, so if there is a future proposal by a drive-thru tenant or use, that would be a separate SLU that will have another Public Hearing at that time should it be proposed.

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

Mr. Dan LaClair stated they are currently submitting plans to Planning for site plan approval. They will also be coming back for Special Land Use for the drive-thru's. They still need to go back to ZBA for the dumpster enclosure as well as the additional loading/unloading area. However, those are not part of their request tonight. Mr. LaClair stated that Jamie Burke currently has another carwash in town, Quick Pass Car Wash on Canton Center between Ford and Warren Road. Mr. LaClair is happy to answer any questions.

Ms. Eggenberger did not have any questions, stated it looks pretty straightforward.

Mr. Weber also had no questions or comments.

Mr. Engel had no comments.

Mr. Acharya asked why they are considering a phased approach toward the Special Land Use.

Mr. LaClair stated they had one user they were looking at who was going to bring in his own Special Land Use for one of the restaurants. That is not moving quite as quickly as the carwash so they made the decision to just go ahead with the carwash at this point. Mr. LaClaire said they will be submitting for Special Land Use for probably both of the drive-thru's at the same time, and probably submitting in the next week. For a little more insight, this property was very difficult to plan because of the shape. It has a lot of frontage, which made it difficult. They have a proposed retail building in the middle along the Canton Center frontage. That building is not your typical retail building, it's very small, but they did what they could to get a little bit of retail in to support and complement the other uses that are proposed.

Mr. Singh had no comments.

Ms. Foster had no comments.

Mr. Okon stated he has no problem with the land use, he just hopes they can figure out a better way of laying it out during the next meetings. He is concerned for the layout of the entrances and direction of traffic.

Ms. Zuber had no comments.

Chairman Greene mentioned that this property had a project that was approved many years ago and asked if the same company was involved.

Mr. Sloan stated there was a proposed project previously before the economic crash in the late 2000s. When that project was approved, there had been a variance granted on that east side for a dumpster enclosure. That variance has since expired. Mr. Sloan said they had investigated the prior approvals of that project when they were looking at the variance case for this carwash in that front yard in terms of how that east side has historically been treated.

Chairman Greene asked about the proportion of space usage of the buildings and the parking lot, as opposed to open space. It does not look like this design complies with the 25% open space.

Mr. Sloan stated the applicants will have to figure out their retention area with the County and they would also have to look at how much of their site is dedicated to the different landscaping areas. If there was a requirement to meet a certain percentage for open space, they would have to increase it or do something else. Mr. Sloan stated he knows there is a 25% open space for Planned Developments and also in the Central Business District. For a C-3 District, Staff will have to look at those standards to see if there is a specific open space requirement.

Chairman Greene stated that, according to the drawings, it looks as though they had to go to underground detention in lieu of the loss of the detention area already there.

Mr. LaClair stated that is correct. They are proposing to convert some of the detention to underground.

Chairman Greene stated, it appears that cars are primarily to come in from the south side drive right behind the bank, although people are going to take the shortest distance which could include that drive that's on the northern side of the site. Was that flow calculated in terms of coming in from both directions?

Mr. LaClair stated they have not done specific calculations at this point. He stated they looked at this from all aspects- people coming in and off of Michigan Avenue would most likely come into the carwash area from Old Canton Center from the south. Anyone coming in off of Canton Center, depending on which way they are coming, would most likely come in at Old Canton Center, and there's also the high probability of people coming in and multi-using, (go into the bank or 7-Eleven and then get a carwash).

Chairman Greene stated they know the driveway coming across from the Kroger driveway works, however, there has not been a load coming from that driveway. Is that something that Wayne County would get involved with?

Mr. Sloan stated that both Canton Center and Old Canton Center Road are under the jurisdiction of Wayne County. Any curb cuts along those roads would have to go through the County permitting department.

Chairman Greene asked about the angled notches drawn in on the east side of the carwash. Are those

parking spaces?

Mr. Jamie Burke, applicant & owner of Quick Pass Carwash stated those are vacuum spaces. They build high volume carwashes. Regarding the traffic, there are three (3) stacking lanes that allow plenty of people (vehicles) stacked in there comfortably. There is only one entrance to the carwash, traffic flows all one-way. Vehicles will come in from the south to the stacking lanes, go through the carwash tunnel, use the free vacuums, then drive around and exit either via Old Canton Center or (New) Canton Center. As far as stacking, they run 167 cars an hour through the tunnel. Mr. Burke stated he does not anticipate any backing up.

Chairman Greene stated he is impressed with the layout and flow of the site. He just hopes the building designs meet the Canton standards. Chairman Greene asked to confirm that the Commission is not touching anything else but just the Special Land Use aspect of the carwash.

Mr. Sloan stated that is correct. When a Special Land Use is applied for, they have to submit a Preliminary Plan, and there are not too many details required on that compare to a formal site plan.

Chairman Greene also stated he is in favor of the sidewalks along the east and west sides of the project.

Mr. Weber stated that he frequents Mr. Burke's other location and feels they have very little problem moving the cars through. He has seen very few backups, even during busy times. Mr. Weber does not see traffic backup to be a concern for this facility.

There were no other comments received from the public.

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

Motion by Zuber, supported by Weber, to move to recommend approval of the special land use for an automobile wash establishment use on parcel no. 71-129-99-0002-710 as illustrated on the Special Land Use Plan, 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, including any required variances.

Commissioner Zuber called the vote:

Ayes: Acharya, Eggenberger, Engel, Foster, Okon, 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. Election of Officers.

Mr. Sloan stated the three positions for Officers are Chair, Vice Chair, and Secretary.

There were no nominations for these positions.

Motion by Eggenberger, supported by Singh, to continue with the current Officers: Greg Greene/Chair, Craig Engel/Vice Chair, and Dawn Zuber/Secretary.

Commissioner Zuber called the vote:

Ayes: Acharya, Eggenberger, Engel, Foster, Okon, Singh, Weber, Zuber, and Greene
Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

3. 127-SPI-6443 **PURE DEVELOPMENT** – Consider Site Plan approval 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 the project sponsor proposes to construct a 183,130 sq. ft. warehouse and material distribution center on seven (7) contiguous parcels located on the north side of Michigan Ave. between Denton Rd. and Beck Rd. The subject site is zoned LI-R, Light Industrial Research, which allows warehousing and material distribution centers via Special Land Use. At the Planning Commission's last meeting on February 1, 2021, the Commission recommended approval of that Special Land Use, and on February 23rd, the Township Board approved the Special Land Use for the site. The site was previously rezoned to the LI-R from R-3, R-1, and RR at the request of the applicant.

Prior to the subject site plan on this parcel, in 2018 there were three (3) large buildings for light research/industrial use that were approved by the Township on one of the parcels farther east and north. Those industrial buildings had included an exterior material modification approved by the Planning Commission on March 5, 2018. These three buildings were not constructed and the project sponsor for Pure Development proposes to occupy this parcel and the six (6) LI-R-zoned parcels to the west.

Mr. Sloan stated that the plans submitted comply with the LI-R zoning requirements for minimum lot size and lot width as well as the setbacks for the front, rear, and side yards as well as the minimum setback from a residential district. There is residential to the west and there is a minimum setback of 100 feet required. That required 100 feet is illustrated on the plans. There is also no grading or tree removal within that 100 foot area. There are some grading in portions of the parking lot and driveway on the north and west sides of the site that are located within the required 25-foot wetland and drain setbacks. Because of the location of the parking lot and driveway in these areas, the applicant has applied for variances from these setbacks to the Zoning Board of Appeals. The ZBA will hold a public hearing and review the variance requests on March 11, 2021.

Traffic Impact and Access Management: Mr. Sloan stated that there are four (4) points of access proposed and there are three (3) new curb cuts proposed along Michigan Avenue. There is also a drive proposed to connect to the existing boulevard located farther east. Of the three proposed curb cuts along Michigan Avenue, one of them is existing and two are new. Because Michigan Ave. is under the jurisdiction of the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), MDOT must review and approve any access points and may require additional conditions.

Mr. Sloan explained that based on the size of the proposed development, a traffic impact study (TIS) has been submitted and reviewed by the Township. The TIS recommends the following four major items: (1) a full right-turn lane on Michigan Ave. at the west driveway; (2) a right-turn lane at the east driveway; (3) recommendation of a right-turn taper at the center driveway; and (4) signal timing adjustments by MDOT at the intersection of Michigan Ave. & Denton Road. To create the proposed right turnings and tapers, the TIS recommends converting the existing 12-foot wide paved shoulder/cross-hatched area along Michigan Avenue by including new pavement markings to delineate turn lanes within the existing cross-hatched area. (Mr. Sloan displayed the area on the screen for clarity). The TIS was reviewed by Canton Township's

transportation engineering consultant (WadeTrim). WadeTrim's report states that it appears the right-turn lanes can be accommodated by removing the existing striping and adding right-turn arrows, WTA also stated that this should be evaluated by MDOT to ensure the base of that concrete is sufficient to accommodate semi-trucks. Therefore, if the site plan is recommended for approval by the Planning Commission, there should be recommendation that a condition be included requiring that the TIS and site plan are subject to approval by MDOT, including any required upgrades to the site or Michigan Ave.

Mr. Sloan stated the applicant is still in the process of revising the plan design for emergency vehicle access pursuant to the Fire Marshal's review and comments. If the Planning Commission recommends approval of the site plan, the site plan must meet all of the requirements of the Fire Marshall prior to consideration of site plan approval by the Township Board. The applicants have been communicating with the Fire Marshall on some fire access items and an additional plan sheet was added to the end of the packet online.

Parking: Mr. Sloan stated that, based on the floor area and estimated number of employees, 195 parking spaces are required. The Zoning Ordinance allows a maximum number of parking spaces to be 10% greater than the minimum number of spaces required, which would put 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. Mr. Sloan said based on the applicant's description of the warehousing and distribution center for the online retailer, the nature of the use will require more parking spaces. Therefore, Staff recommends approval of a modification to the maximum parking space requirement. In addition, there are 966 delivery van spaces proposed that are 11' wide and 27' deep. Because these vans are fleet vehicles for the proposed use, they are not subject to the maximum parking space requirements.

Loading: Mr. Sloan stated the Site Plan shows the loading area on the east side of the site in the side yard for semi-trucks. There is a van loading area where vans will cycle through a queuing area and then go from west to east across the building, and there will be carts to load up the vans for personal deliveries. Because the Van Loading is under a canopy and a canopy is classified under the definition of "building" in the Zoning Ordinance, the "Van Loading" area is not located within a yard.

Architecture: Mr. Sloan stated that at its meeting on March 5, 2018 the Planning Commission approved exterior building modifications for the previously proposed research/industrial buildings on the site to allow for more pre-formed concrete panels on the industrial portion of the building than the Zoning Ordinance permitted. The applicants request a modification to the building material standards of Section 26.06 of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires at least 75% brick on the office portion of an industrial building and a maximum of 50% concrete panels on the entire building. Section 26.06, allows the Planning Commission to approve modifications to these standards to achieve a specific architectural objective as demonstrated by the project sponsor in meeting the overall development objectives of the community. The applicants propose 80% precast concrete panel coverage of the building walls, which includes a mix of unpainted gray, painted gray, and painted blue. The remainder of the building will be covered with metal panel, windows, and doors. The proposed office walls are composed of these materials with no masonry. Staff will defer this decision to the Planning Commission based on the evaluation of the architectural objectives.

Landscaping, Screening, and Tree Preservation: Mr. Sloan stated there are revisions required on the landscape plan, but it is designed to meet the standards of the Zoning Ordinance. The intent of the plan is to meet Articles 5 and 5(A) of the Zoning Ordinance for the landscaping requirements as well as the tree replacement requirements. Over half of the existing wooded area of the site is proposed to be preserved. Plan revisions are required for the front yard berm width, some plant species, replacement tree sizes, and some standard details, which can be made prior to the pre-construction meeting. The Zoning Ordinance requires a 4-foot high landscape berm wherever an industrial use abuts directly upon land zoned for residential use, which would apply to the west side of the site. However, Section 5.03(A)(2) of the Zoning

Ordinance allows the Planning Commission to approve an alternate method of screening based on specific site characteristics and compatibility with the character of the surrounding area. In lieu of the landscape berm required on the west side of the site, the applicants propose to preserve several existing trees in this area, including the 100 foot buffer to be kept with their existing trees, and no grading. The applicants also propose to install a 7-foot high solid privacy fence, and plant replacement trees west of the parking lot to provide additional vegetation. Because the distance between the west side of the parking lot and the nearest residential lot line to the west will be almost 200 feet, with over 100 feet on the western end consisting of preserved wooded area, Staff recommends approval of the proposed alternative screening.

Sidewalks: Mr. Sloan stated the staff review letter refers to some comments on the proposed sidewalks along the frontage of the building as well as interior sidewalks to the building.

Lighting: The Zoning Ordinance requires one (1) light structure to be installed on each side of each entrance/exit drive at Michigan Ave. The light structures at the intersections serve two purposes. First, having the light structures at the intersections makes it easier for drivers to identify the intersections at night. It also illuminates the intersection and will help make pedestrians visible. It is both a safety for the pedestrian and also traffic management.

Mr. Sloan stated the last comments are regarding Signage, Dumpster Enclosure, and Fencing: The signage will be reviewed by the Building Department at the time the permit is applied for. For the Dumpster Enclosure, there are some discrepancies in the wall details that have to be corrected. Staff recommends that the dumpster walls be integrally colored split faced block. For the privacy fence on the west and north side of the site, Staff recommends that this fence be colored in an earth tone that is subtle if visible to a neighboring residence.

Mr. Sloan stated that if the proposed development and modifications are acceptable to the Planning Commission, Staff recommends approval of the site plan for the Pure Development warehousing and materials distribution center use on the subject parcels, subject to the recommendations noted in the review letter

Mr. Weber wanted to renew what he stated at the last meeting about his previous working relationship with Mr. Rattner's law firm.

Chairman Greene thanked Mr. Weber for reiterating that potential conflict. He does not see any problem with that.

Mr. Richard Rattner, Project Representative, stated that Josh Manion, the engineer for this project is also available to answer any questions. Mr. Rattner stated he believes this is a terrific use for this area and also a great advantage to the Township.

Chairman Greene asked who will be occupying the building.

Mr. Rattner stated they have not been authorized yet to release the name as of yet.

Chairman Greene stated he usually likes to avoid walls where natural buffering, trees, can be used. Is there enough room to do landscaping as opposed to a wall/fence?

Mr. Sloan displayed the plans showing the northwest parking lot. Along the buffer there is a mix of deciduous and evergreen trees. Along the dash line (on the plans) it says 7-foot high privacy fence which goes along the north side of the parking lot and then angles and goes south up to the line of the front yard

setback. A perimeter fence is proposed as solid. The applicants had something like a vinyl fence in mind as something to be a barrier between the adjacent residential areas and the facility. A fence is not required, the requirement is a landscape berm. Given the trees and some of the topography there, it might be better not to grade and just to plant it. But alternative methods of screening are permitted by the Planning Commission. Mr. Sloan would like to leave it up to the applicants to explain how a fence is justified.

Mr. Josh Manion stated the intent is to save as much of that natural wooded buffer as they can between the parking lot and the adjacent residential property. They are doing minimal amount of grading in order to put the parking lot in and then a row of trees adjacent to the parking lot, and then installing that fence for added privacy. Mr. Manion stated that if they were to install a berm, they would need to take out quite a bit more of the existing trees in order to get a 4-foot high berm. That is why they took the approach of putting in a fence, infilling with trees along the parking lot and then more trees with a lower growth to fill gaps that may exist in the woods. The fence is 7 feet high.

Chairman Greene asked the other Commissioners how they felt about the fence.

All Commission members voiced they were in agreement with the fence.

Chairman Greene stated he does not want to see rooftop units from Michigan Avenue. Does the design include sufficient parapet screening?

Mr. Manion stated their architects have looked at the height of the parapet as well as the height of the rooftop mechanical units to ensure there would not be any visibility.

Chairman Greene asked to confirm the overall colors, blue and gray.

Mr. Manion stated yes, blue and gray are the colors of the building. Also in attendance tonight is Matt Riegler who can speak in more detail to the architectural design.

Mr. Matt Riegler, Architect, stated the intent is a mixture of gray, blue, and buff colored concrete panel to try to break up the mass from just a single long mass of plain gray concrete. The blue strip midway up the building and running the length of the building is actually the canopy that projects out some 40 feet away from the building. (Mr. Sloan displayed the 3D renderings showing the building from various angles).

Mr. Okon asked how many jobs are associated with this building.

Mr. Rattner stated they do not have the final figures on the number of employees to be in the building, but there are several jobs.

Mr. Manion stated he believes the number of employees inside the building to be in the 200s. That does not include the van delivery drivers, which could be a few hundred.

Chairman Greene stated the vans are slated to be electric, so electrification is planned to be in the parking lots.

Mr. Manion stated that is correct. The fleet of EV vehicles isn't available today, but the infrastructure is being installed right now for when the EV fleet is available.

Ms. Eggenberger stated that once the electric vans are available, hopefully that, along with the berm and

everything else, will make it a little quieter for the residential neighbors.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Acharya, to move to recommend approval of the site plan for the Pure Development 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 pursuant to the information and plans provided, including approved modifications to the required number of parking spaces, architecture, and buffer landscaping on the west side of the site, subject to the following conditions: ZBA approval of the proposed variances to the drain setbacks and wetland setbacks; MDOT review and approval of the proposed plans, including any improvements required by MDOT; compliance with requirements of the Township Engineer and Fire Marshal; and plan corrections for the proposed lighting, landscaping, tree replacement, dumpster enclosure, and fencing as specified in the Community Planner's report.

Commissioner Zuber called the vote:

Ayes: Acharya, Eggenberger, Engel, Foster, Okon, Singh, Weber, Zuber, and Greene
Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

Patrick explained the next steps for the project moving forward.

Mr. Engel asked if this is a 24 hour operation.

Mr. Sloan responded yes, he believes it is.

4. 124-SFP-6346 **GRANDVIEW SOUTH** – Consider Final Site Plan approval for parcel nos. 124-99-0001-701, 124-99-0002-000, 124-99-0003-005, 124-99-0004-000, 124- 99-0010-000. Property is located east of Barr Road, between Geddes Road and Mott Road.

Mr. Sloan stated the proposal for Grandview South is for approval of the Grandview South Final Site Plan. Back in 2019 Grandview South came in with their Preliminary Site Plan and also their Planned Development Plan. Farther north of the property is Grandview Estates. The portion known as Grandview South was always envisioned as a continuation of that development going south. The only material difference between the two developments is that Grandview Estates units are on individual lots (site condominiums), whereas Grandview South is a detached condominium, so there is more common area.

Mr. Sloan stated the Planned Development District Amendment and Preliminary Site Plan for Grandview South were approved by the Township Board of Trustees on September 24, 2019, and were previously recommended for approval by the Planning Commission on September 9, 2019. The slowdown was based on the pandemic and some of the delays with County permitting. The applicant has continued to move forward in every other respect from preliminary to final. But with a condominium and a site condominium, to get from preliminary to final they have to have all the permits and all their securities in line, so there is usually a bit of lag. The lag here was a bit longer because of the pandemic and slowdowns.

Since the Preliminary Site Plan was approved, there have been some changes to the development. Mr. Sloan stated the layout is very much the same as what was approved back in 2019, but there are some differences:

Mr. Sloan stated an entrance road was added to Barr Road, which was not included on the Preliminary Site Plan. This road was requested by the Planning Commission and Township Board back in 2019 as a way to disperse some of the traffic. As a result of adding this road, the number of units as decreased by one (1). Therefore, the number of proposed units has been reduced from 222 to 221.

Mr. Sloan noted the following three (3) intersections that have been realigned to slow traffic: Cranston Road & Fowler Rd.; Cranston Rd. & Bingham Rd.; and Cranston Road & Ogden Road. Mr. Sloan displayed the plan and explained the realignment of the roads. These alignments are proposed to address traffic speed concerns that were raised during consideration of the Preliminary Site Plan

Mr. Sloan stated that when the Planned Development District was approved for Grandview Estates, it included several definite benefits. Those same definite benefits carried forward to Grandview South. In addition, Grandview South has a few other definite benefits that will stand on their own. One of those definite benefits proposed is to pave approximately 1,100 feet of Mott Road from the development entrance to Denton Road. The site will have 31.6% open space, which exceeds the 25% open space minimum. There will be about 400 trees preserved that are either protected or landmark trees. In addition, the applicants propose providing two (2) 1-year memberships to the Summit for each of the proposed units.

Schedule of Regulations and Modifications. Mr. Sloan stated that the proposed development is proposed to comply with the zoning standards with the exception of the modifications granted at the time of planned development review. Those modification are: front yard setbacks were reduced from 25 ft. to 20 ft.; the rear yard setbacks were reduced from 35 ft. to 30 ft. for Units 278 and 390-394 only; there were also modification to the wetland setbacks of Units 356-360 and 387-392. The plans include the Schedule of Regulations and Modifications as approved. Mr. Sloan stated Grandview South is consistent with the development guidelines of Grandview Estates, except for those modifications that were granted to the front yard setbacks in and some of the rear yard setbacks. With the front yard setbacks going from 25 feet to 20 feet, 20 feet is enough space in the vast majority of cases where you can fit a car but still have room on the sidewalk as well. Typically anything less than 20 feet would not be allowed.

Mr. Sloan stated that sidewalks are proposed along all interior frontages, including the adjacent frontages of Barr Road and Mott Road. There will be pedestrian access throughout the development.

Mr. Sloan stated there will be decorative light poles on each side of the entrances. Additionally, 5 light poles are located within the development where street meets the sidewalks that intersect with open space sidewalks. Staff's recommendation is that all of the fixtures be decorative throughout the development and at a height of 10'-12'.

Mr. Sloan stated there is a landscape Plan submitted that is intended to meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. There are only a few minor discrepancies which Staff is working with the applicant on, but nothing major.

Mr. Sloan stated the architecture is consistent with what was approved in Grandview Estates. Most models have less than 50% brick masonry a required by the Zoning Ordinance. However, each model has at least 35% masonry and the corner unit side elevations which face the street must be bricked to the top of the first floor and include windows on the street side so there is not a blank wall to the street. A minimum horizontal offset of at least 4 feet is required in the rear of each unit according to the Zoning Ordinance.

The only other item Mr. Sloan wanted to mention is that the applicants were concerned about the setback requirements if there was a deck proposed in any of the rear units. Sometimes on a detached condo, the deck is delineated by dashed line (on the plan). In this case the unit is just a rectangular box and there is no specific dash line for a deck. What Staff recommends is that if the applicant makes any modifications to the plan to delineate a dash deck line or a line that is otherwise allowed for deck, that that be done only in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance (Section 2.09(A)(3)(b)) prior to Board review. The Zoning Ordinance does allow decks to encroach into rear yards in some cases, and most cases require at least a 25 foot setback from the rear lot line to the deck and the deck cannot exceed a certain height (4 feet). So, if there are any plan revisions to illustrate any deck encroachment into a rear yard, that would have to be done

in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance, and no modification would be allowed from the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Sloan has spoken with the applicant about this and is only concerned about a handful of lots (Unit 278 and Units 390-394), these lots have 30-foot setbacks.

Mr. Sloan stated that Staff's recommendation is for the approval of the Final Site Plan, subject to the applicant revising the plans in accordance to the recommendations above.

Mr. Joe Skore, Pulte Homes of Michigan, stated Mr. Sloan did a nice summary so he does not have a lot to add. This is effectively a continuation of Grandview Estates, which has been a very successful well-received community and they expect Grandview South to continue that success. Mr. Skore wanted to mention a significant community benefit that is not directly or formally associated with Grandview or Grandview South. This has to do with the slaughterhouse meat processing facility on Barr Road (Boyer Property). This is a non-conforming use within the Township and what Pulte has done is they have come to an agreement (a financial arrangement) with the owner/operator to essentially cease operations, shut down the business, and relocate the facility. Mr. Skore stated again, this is not an obligation associated with the PD. It was voluntary on their own initiative. Pulte thought that just given the proximity of the slaughterhouse to the existing residents and taking into account future residential development trends in this particular area, Pulte thought it was the right thing to do. This is a nice benefit for the surrounding area. Mr. Skore said he will be happy to answer any questions.

Chairman Greene asked if that was a done deal.

Mr. Skore responded that it is. The owner is in the process of winding down and is expected to cease operations and relocate sometime this summer. The deal was worked out with the current operator and Mr. Boyer.

Ms. Foster asked about the little roundabouts in the neighborhood. Will there be signage directing traffic?

Mr. Skore stated he does not believe there will be signage.

Mr. Bill Anderson, Atwell, also stated he does not believe there will be signage. It's a mini roundabout just to slow internal traffic.

Chairman Greene asked about the sides of the homes facing the streets not being plain. That is a lot of houses, so basically they are going to end up with a different design in the package?

Mr. Sloan stated the house models in the development are called out in the PD agreement that they have those architectural requirements. Mr. Sloan believes that also applies to Grandview Estates.

Chairman Greene asked, depending on which house it is, its either going to be the left side of the house or the right side of the house that may have windows or a different treatment of materials, is that correct?

Mr. Skore stated its essentially the brick level changes. The houses with sides that face the street will have first floor brick. Actually on both sides of the house, not just the side facing the street, and another window added. Essentially it's the same plans and elevations, they are just changing the brick level on the home.

Chairman Greene asked if they are adding just one window on the side.

Mr. Skore stated he will have to take a look, but it is consistent with what they did in Grandview.

Mr. Greene mention Bluebell Street cutting to the east between two houses and then coming to an end with

the idea that maybe another additional subdivision would be to the east. Is that the intent of the stub road?

Mr. Skore stated that is correct. Pulte doesn't control that property, but it is stubbing into vacant land.

Chairman Greene said there's no definite requirement on anybody that comes to the east. If they decide to develop they don't have to comply with that, so that stub road could end up just out there. Is there a way in which that can just become like a little mini park or become just part of the common area, grass. It would still be there in the event it can be connected later.

Mr. Skore stated if they are looking for just some enhanced landscaping or just some sod in that particular area, they would not have a problem with that.

Mr. Anderson stated they can certainly leave that stub area unpaved if that is the desire of the Commission. They have done that in other communities.

Chairman Greene stated that would be his recommendation. The same thing would go for the sidewalks there. They seem a bit useless until another development goes in. Mr. Greene's opinion is to not put the sidewalk it at this time, leave as a grassy area until the time comes that another development comes in and we need the connection.

Mr. Skore stated that works for them.

Mrs. Sandra Miller, resident of Grandview Estates wished to comment that many Grandview Estates residents previously appeared before the Commission to address their concerns regarding the development of Grandview South. At that time one of their major concerns was about the impact of traffic flow through their subdivision. Subsequently they had meetings with Mr. Skore and were able to reach an acceptable compromise which led to the mini roundabouts that are being placed on the south end of both Bingham and Cranston. They are very hopeful that that will slow traffic coming through the subdivision. At that time it was also indicated that the plans did not reflect a designated entrance to Grandview South off of Barr Road, which would have directed many construction vehicles through Grandview Estates to get to Grandview South. Mrs. Miller wanted to compliment Mr. Skore because he has been very attentive to the residents of Grandview Estates and she complements the Township Staff for agreeing to those changes. The last thing they were concerned about is the construction traffic. The Mott Road entrance will not be open for quite some time, which will direct most everybody down through Grandview Estates. They hope that construction traffic will be regulated and not allowed to go through their subdivision.

Chairman Greene asked if there is a way to direct construction traffic to just use Barr Road to alleviate that concern on the north side.

Mr. Skore stated they plan to bring all construction traffic in/out through the south entrance on Barr Road. It will be strictly enforced. Mott Road will not be available until that phase is completed, but the southern entrance on Barr will be the only entrance for construction traffic.

Mrs. Miller also wanted to thank Mr. Skore. On the first plans they did not see any landscaping between Grandview Estates and Grandview South. She sees now on the plans that there are trees planned there.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Foster, to recommend approval of the Final Site Plan for Grandview-South, on tax parcel nos. 124-99-0001-701, 124-99-0002-000, 124-99-0003-005, 124-99-0004-000, and 124-99-0010-000, which includes 221 single-family residential condominium units on 76.59 net acres, subject to landscaping and lighting revisions noted above, obtaining all outside agency permits, and submitting the financial securities to the Township prior to review by

the Board of Trustees.

Commissioner Zuber called the vote:

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

Acharya was unavailable

Motion passed unanimously by those available by roll call vote.

Sloan explained the next steps for the project moving forward.

- 5. 039-ZCSS-6518 **MICHIGAN FIREWORKS COMPANY II, LLC** – Consider Seasonal Sales Permit for Parcel no. 039-99-0025-001. Property is located north of Ford Road and west of Sheldon Road.

Mr. Sloan stated this is a seasonal fireworks permit similar to years past, the layout is the same as last year. Michigan Fireworks Company has applied for one (1) 30-day seasonal sales permit for a tent in the same lot with the same layout. The review shows that since there is no change from last year and the applicant basically knows the procedure, Staff’s recommendation would be for approval. Their permit application is to start on June 16th and be finished on July 6th 2021.

Based on the materials submitted and prior years’ findings, Staff recommends approval.

Chairman Greene stated that they have done this for several years in this location and he does not recall any difficulties or problems.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Foster, to move to approve one 30-day seasonal sales permit for the Michigan Fireworks Company, (parcel no. 039-99-0025-001) commencing on June 16, 2021, subject to obtaining appropriate permits from the Building Services Division for erection of the tent, and compliance with all sign regulations.

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

- 6. 052-SPB-6508 **CHERRY HILL PRESERVE CONDOMINIUMS** – Refer review of Site Plan to staff for approval on parcel nos. 052-99-0042-000, 052-99-0044-001 & 052-99-0044-002. Property is located north of Cherry Hill Road, between Lotz Road and John Hix Road.
- 049-SPC-6513 **HOME DEPOT OUTLOT** – Refer review of Site Plan to staff for approval on parcel no. 049-99-0001-719. Property is located south of Ford Road and east of Lotz Road.
- 064-DIR-6517 **LIFETIME DENTAL, PARKING LOT MODIFICATIONS** – Refer review of Site Plan Modifications to staff for approval on parcel no. 064-99-0015-701. Property is located west of Canton Center Road, between Cherry Hill Road and Saltz Road.

129-ZCSS-6520 **HOME DEPOT-MICHIGAN AVENUE** – Refer review of Seasonal Sales Permit to staff for approval on parcel no.129-99-0001-701. Property is located north of Michigan Avenue and west of Canton Center Road

Motion Zuber supported by Engel to refer Item #6 to Staff. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote.

NEW BUSINESS – SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR MARH 8, 2021 (PREVIOUSLY NOTICED)

7. 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.

Mr. Sloan explained this is the gas station at the northeast corner of Ford and Haggerty Roads. They are proposing to rebuild it. It is a Valero right now. It is on for Special Land use because they are proposing a multi-use station, a gas station that includes a proposed convenience store and fast food restaurant.

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

Mr. Weber asked for an update on Chick-Fil-A.

Mr. Sloan stated that since last month’s meeting, they haven’t had any updates. Mr. Sloan does not know if the applicants are in the process of working on addressing some of the comments. Most of Staff’s comments were about access management and the expected back-ups from the drive-thru. Staff does has a meeting with MDOT later this week to discuss a number of projects along Ford Road and Michigan Avenue. MDOT is aware of the proposal, so the access management concerns are something they will be talking to MDOT about. Further discussion ensued among the Commission members and Mr. Sloan.

Mr. Weber asked, given the status of the former Art Van building on Ford Road, is there any talk about what can go in there now?

Mr. Sloan stated he does not know what the future proposal is for that building at this time.

Chairman Greene stated that LA Fitness was at one time interested in coming to Canton. He could see them in the Art Van building. Further discussion ensued.

ADJOURN

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

Melanie A. Sherwood
Recording Secretary