

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF CANTON
PLANNING COMMISSION PROCEEDINGS
June 7, 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, June 7, 2021. Chairman Greene called the meeting to order at 7:05 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.
Absent: none

STAFF PRESENT: Patrick Sloan

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF MAY 3, 2021

Motion by Zuber, supported by Weber, to move to approve the Minutes of May 3, 2021, as presented. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 9-0.

ACCEPTANCE OF AGENDA

Motion by Zuber, supported by Foster, to move to accept the agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 9-0.

PUBLIC HEARING

1. 050-RZ-6654 **JS3 INVESTMENTS, LLC** – Consider Rezoning for parcel no. 050-99-0009-003. Property is located east of Haggerty Road, between Ford Road and Cherry Hill Road.

Mr. Patrick Sloan stated the applicant proposes to rezone a single parcel located east of Haggerty Road between Ford Road and Cherry Hill Road from C-4, Interchange Service District to C-3, Regional Commercial District. Currently on the site is a vacant structure previously used as a restaurant and parking Lot. Since then the restaurant has been vacant and the site is pretty run down.

The applicant states in their application that they propose to do a retail establishment, and in the C-4 District, standalone retail establishments are not permitted unless they are part of a larger shopping center. The C-4 District is an intense interchange service district that typically involves gas stations, restaurants, and large shopping centers. The site is about 1.71 acres. The proposal is to rezone to C-3 because the C-3 has more permitted uses. So, if someone wanted to do a standalone retail store, they could do that in the C-3 District whereas the C-4 District requires it to be part of a shopping center. In essence, the applicant proposes to down-zone the property.

Mr. Sloan stated that the review considerations for rezoning are in Section 27.06.D.4 of the Zoning Ordinance. There are several standards that apply to rezoning, Mr. Sloan went through a few of the standards:

The first is compliance with the Master Plan, and the Master Plan classified the site as a General Commercial which can apply to both the C-3 and C-4 Districts. Therefore, the C-3 Zoning would be consistent with the Master Plan. In looking at the comprehensive plan, the policy in General Commercial

calls for regional and highway-oriented types of commercial uses, which is consistent with the location of the site.

Mr. Sloan stated that conditions have changed since the Zoning Ordinance was adopted. The C-4 District doesn't include the standalone retail uses that are envisioned for the site, so the C-4 parcels if they don't develop as an intense shopping center or gas station or similar types of intense uses, are hard to develop unless developed intensely for uses like that.

The amendment doesn't result in any kind of exclusionary zoning, it doesn't set an inappropriate precedent, and it doesn't promote spot zoning. There is a C-3 District west of Haggerty across the road, so it would not result in an isolated C-3 Zone parcel. The site, being 1.71 acres, could comply with the C-3 Zoning regulation of the Ordinance in terms of setbacks and locations. The site is also served by an adequate road system and adequate utilities. It is consistent with the land development trends in the area.

Mr. Sloan stated Staff's recommendation is to recommend approval of the request to re-zone the parcel from C-4 to C-3. Finally, this is also in the Central Business District Overlay so the District Overlay would include those uses as well.

Chairman Greene stated that in the narrative, it proposes to put the property to retail and storage use. Is that storage a "storage locker" type of use?

Mr. Sloan stated if it's storage locker or mini warehouse, that is only allowed in industrial districts. A mini warehouse would not be allowed in a commercial district. It would have to be a storage accessory to a retail, so if they have some storage that's ancillary to a permitted retail use, they could do that.

Chairman Greene stated there is storage across Haggerty, so he was wondering if this would be a similar type of venture for them in their intent. This is not an industrial area.

Mr. Sloan stated he is not sure if that use predates the current zoning as a nonconforming use.

Chairman Greene said it probably does. That storage facility has been there for quite some time.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Weber, to move to open the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 9-0. (7:16pm)

Mr. Imad Sitto, JS3 Investments (property owner). Mr. Sitto stated they purchased the property a year ago before COVID. They planned on putting a hotel (Hilton) there. They paid for the approvals for the license and then after COVID, plans changed and they were not able to obtain a bank loan. They are still willing to do this project if they can obtain the loan. They wanted to test the market. Mr. Sitto said they noticed there was a lot of demand and listed this for sale and for rent just to feel the market and got a lot of feedback for supermarkets or retail. Mr. Sitto said that is why they thought that resorting to C-3 would give them more flexibility to decide what is the best fit in that area.

Chairman Greene asked to confirm they plan to put in a hotel?

Mr. Sitto stated that was their original plan as was discussed with Mr. Sloan before.

Andy Andre, Avanti Development Group located at 330 Enterprise Ct, Bloomfield Hills Michigan. Mr. Andre stated Patrick Sloan did a good job summarizing the zoning for the current zoning in the C-4. Some of the challenges that you are seeing on a current basis as well as what's being projected into the future as retail continues to morph and change on a very high paced basis. The C-4 Zoning is an intensive use that is restrictive, and when looking at this parcel in particular, there is C-3 Zoning that is in and around the property across the street down to the south, and really at a 1.71 acre, he thinks the C-3 Zoning is more appropriate. The C-3 Zoning offers those same less intensive uses probably in a better setting than the C-4. They feel that the C-3 is an appropriate zoning based on the surrounding properties. It is in line with everything that Mr. Sloan talked about in his letter, and also how retail looks now and probably will in the future as well.

Mr. Bob Mac (Canton resident, no address or other name information provided) stated his question has already been asked in regard to the storage portion. Mr. Mac is not sure there was a clear answer. With the storage facility across the street, would this rezoning allow for an indoor storage facility?

Mr. Sloan stated he does not believe this would. In looking at the table of land uses for the use that is being talked about in terms of storage, is commonly referred to as a mini warehouse. Mini warehouses are special land uses in Light Industrial, and permitted land uses in General Industrial. So, something like that would not be a C-3 use.

Mr. Mac asked, when Mr. Sloan mentions the word “storage”, in any type of zoning it almost becomes a given at that point, so if you are going to rezone on a C-3 and allow storage, it opens the door to different uses.

Mr. Weber asked if the term “retail and storage” in Mr. Sloan’s review letter, is that out of the Zoning Ordinance or is that in the applicant’s application?

Mr. Sloan stated it was in the application.

Mr. Weber asked then can the applicant expand on what they are referring to by “storage”.

Mr. Andre stated they would not be proposing anything that is not a permitted or special use within the C-3 Zoning. It wouldn’t be outside of that, it would be ancillary to the uses that are permitted within the district. It’s nothing outside of that.

Chairman Greene asked if that answer’s Mr. Mac’s question.

Mr. Mac stated no, because it’s C-3 and then there’s ordinance that speaks to outdoor storage. So, it’s going to be either be outdoor storage, indoor storage, or no storage at all.

Mr. Weber asked is there is a definition in that section of the ordinance on what is met by storage?

Mr. Sloan stated that storage in general may be a use that’s envisioned by the applicant, but the applicant can’t propose just one land use in the zoning. The rezoning application would allow for all the uses in the district, not just one. Mr. Sloan explained storage comes in a number of different forms in the Zoning Ordinance. If it’s a storage in the C-3 District typically it’s an indoor storage where they might be a retail and they have a storage room. Sometimes its outdoor, such as a garden center, which would be considered an open-air business. A garden center would be considered a Special Land Use in the C-3 District, which means that if someone proposed that, they would have to apply for a Special Land Use and come for a Public Hearing for that particular use.

Chairman Greene stated that in any case, we are talking indoor storage, but not storage units as across the street.

Mr. Sloan stated that is correct.

Mr. Mac stated that clarifies things. He just wanted to be fair for the applicant because that way, they will know going in what they can and cannot do.

Chairman Greene said that, as Mr. Andre stated earlier, they are not planning on doing anything outside of the zoning permissions.

Mr. Mac said it’s like anything else, when you offer a property for lease and the owner said they want to test the market, you get a lot of inquiries. If somebody says they want to build something with outdoor storage, its already permitted. He just wanted to clarify things, that’s all he is asking.

Mr. Andre stated just as a reminder, anything that is proposed would have to come before the Planning

Commission for Site Plan review anyway. While it is nice to talk about use, we are more or less talking about the zoning of the property and the overall larger picture of it. And anything would come back to the Planning Commission.

Karen Krot, 42250 Greenwood Dr, Canton Michigan. Ms. Krot stated she is a little confused. One of the gentlemen said something about a Hotel, and then she is hearing retail and storage. What do they want to do with this property?

Mr. Sitto stated that at this point it looks like their main focus will be on retail, most likely a supermarket and maybe some small retails. That is what they are finding through the marketing. The other option about storage was just one of the things they considered but probably not going to go that route.

Ms. Krot stated that Ford and Haggerty has the highest accidents of any place in Michigan. She is aware of the boulevard coming, but the traffic there is horrendous and this will just be another problem. What do you propose to do about that?

Chairman Greene stated they are dealing with two governmental entities; Wayne County on the Haggerty Road side and Ford Road is under the dictates of MDOT. This is something that they would have to get involved in. That's why the MDOT planned boulevard of Ford Road is going on. As you know, these kinds of things really get fixed after they are needed. The Commission has little to do with those kinds of things. The Commission can invoke some traffic planning in terms of the project physicality, driveways, curb cuts, extra lanes and the like, but that's about it. And that's after the recommendation of experts that would see that as a need. But we are not at that point. These area merely rezoning considerations tonight and the rest of it would come with a more "site plan review" type of scenario.

Ms. Krot said she understands what Chairman Greene is saying, but it's kind of like closing the barn door after the horse is out.

Chairman Greene stated that unfortunately that is the way it has always been.

Ms. Krot disapproves of the current process. Further discussion ensued between Ms. Krot and the Commission members.

Mr. Sloan wanted to note that a traffic study is typically not something that is done with a rezoning like this where we are down-zoning a piece of property from a C-4 to a C-3. It's already an intense commercial district so to rezone it from an interchange service to a general commercial district, we typically don't require a traffic study. However, if there is a land use proposal and they have something that's on the table for a site plan or special land use, the Township may require a traffic study depending on its evaluation of the traffic on the adjacent roads at that time.

Gina Giannuzzi, 6733 Brookshire, Canton Michigan: Ms. Gianuzzi had a question for Mr. Sitto that may be relevant to the discussion about the proposed hotels on Lilley and Ford. Mr. Sitto had stated that their studies found that it would be better for him to do retail in that corridor than hotels. Ms. Giannuzzi is wondering what they found that might be relevant. Ms. Giannuzzi stated she is a commercial realtor and a residential realtor and she thinks it would be nice to know since we are going to be getting into a discussion about a hotel just a little bit further down the road near residential areas.

Chairman Greene stated that unfortunately this isn't that kind of a forum where all the avenues are expressed throughout this. The Commission has to deal with this particular site in this particular project.

Ms. Giannuzzi said her question to Mr. Sitto would be, what was it that Mr. Sitto found that caused him to change his mind from putting a hotel in the area when that was what he initially wanted to do?

Mr. Sitto said they noticed that after COVID hit, the hotel occupancies went down. So that's something that banks look at regarding any loans. Hotel occupancies are not in the range that they used to be, so they don't think adding more hotels to the market is the right thing now.

Ms. Giannuzzi asked if they did any specific studies of the area as far as how profitable or how needed hotels are in that area?

Mr. Andre stated that as part of any evaluation when it comes to hotels, usually a preliminary market study is done. One of the things that is a bit of a challenge here, as Mr. Sitto may have mentioned, was the industry in itself is one of those things that was hit very hard by the pandemic. So, when looking at hotels now, you used to see over the past several year hotels popping up in just about every location. That really had to do with the latent demand that was created coming out of the recession. That has exhausted itself and so the hotel brands are looking at more premium locations and being a little bit more selective. Mr. Andre stated that while they feel that Mr. Sitto's background in developing hotels is a great thing, this particular use for this property in particular is a bit more structured toward a retail use, and that's why they are asking for the rezoning from the C-4 to C-3 to offer that flexibility in the retail use. As mentioned before, they are not asking for a use right now, they are asking for a rezoning from one commercial district to another commercial district. Any land use would have to come back to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Giannuzzi asked of Mr. Andre, was part of your research made you decide to no longer pursue a hotel, did it have anything to do with the fact that there are so many hotels in the area already?

Mr. Andre stated all of that is taken into consideration when the market research is done.

No additional members of the public requested to speak.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Foster, to move to close the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 9-0. (7:36pm)

There were no additional comments from the Commission members regarding this project. Ms. Foster just wanted to mention that these are good opportunities to educate the public and the folks who are paying attention to Planning Commission meetings for the first time, on the processes that the Commission members go through and what they are and are not legally allowed to consider when making these decisions.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Foster, to move to of the request to rezone parcel no. 71-050-99-0009-003 from C-4, Interchange Service – Central Business District Overlay to C-3, Regional Commercial – Central Business District Overlay, for the reasons stated in this staff report.

Commissioner Zuber called the vote:

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

Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 9-0.

Chairman Greene stated that this will now go to the Trustees. Chairman Greene also reiterated for the audience that the Commission is a recommending body. These types of issues don't end with the Commission. We go through the review process but then so do the Trustees. You, as the public, are invited to contact the Trustees at the appropriate time for this project when it gets to the Board of Trustees.

Mr. Sloan stated the next available Township Board Meeting will be June 22, 2021. Because this is a Zoning Ordinance amendment, there are two readings of the Township Board, so there will be two upcoming meetings for this project.

2. 043-PDP-5867 **RESIDENCE INN & HILTON GARDEN INN** – Consider Preliminary PDD for parcel nos. 043-99-0004-000, 043-99-0017-000 & 043-99-0029-000. Property is located north of Ford Road and west of Lilley Road.

Chairman Greene asked that before Mr. Sloan begins his discussion, if he could give a summary of what a PDD involves.

Patrick Sloan explained that a PDD is a Planned Development District. It is an optional way for a property

to be developed outside of the regular zoning requirements. For example, sometimes there's a PDD where houses can be clustered closer together and more open space proposed. PDD's can also be used to allow mixed land uses that may not be allowed in conventional zoning where you may have residential districts and commercial districts. A PDD does allow for options for mixed uses and it can also allow for certain modifications to dimensional standards of the Zoning Ordinance itself. Rather than go through the regular appeals process through the ZBA, the Planned Development process is a way for instead of a variance for an applicant to propose what called a modification, and when they propose a modification they have to state so on the application and in the materials so that they are upfront about exactly those standards in the Zoning Ordinance that they are seeking to modify.

Mr. Sloan stated another element of a Planned Development District is that they have to include what are called definite benefits. Definite benefits are defined in the Zoning Ordinance. There are several options, but two that typically stand out are the architectural quality of the proposed buildings, and open space. In a Planned Development, the minimum open space is 25% and a definite benefit can be not just the quantity of open space beyond the 25%, but also the quality of open space that is being preserved. There are also a number of other definite benefits that are available in Section 27.04 of the Zoning Ordinance. So, it is not a matter necessarily of having the modifications that are requested by the applicant exactly commensurate with the definite benefit, but it's to look at the modifications and the definite benefits in the greater context of the project and ask ourselves if what's being proposed is something that is better than allowed under conventional zoning. When looking at a Planned Development, oftentimes we focus on what are the modifications and what are the definite benefits proposed but we also look at things like land use, the underlying zoning, and we look at the placement of elements on-site because with a Planned Development plan is also required, so the plan that's in front of the Planning Commission this evening is proposed by the applicant.

Mr. Sloan stated that with a Planned Development, the application is classified as a Major Planned Development because of the number of units proposed. In a Major Planned Development, there are three different processes: First is the Preliminary PD review which is where we are at right now, and a Public Hearing is required. The second step is Final Planned Development review, and then the third step is the actual Site Plan Review. Finally, for a Planned Development, the Planning Commission is a recommending body. At every step of the way, the Planning Commission will make a recommendation and the Township Board will make a final decision on whether or not to approve the Planned Development.

Ms. Foster had a question. She saw this thread in a number of emails that the Commission members received, this was something that came up when the Commission evaluated car washes that we recommended for approval for a few weeks ago. Is the Planning Commission or the Township Board of Trustees is allowed to deny something because there are already a number of those types of businesses in the area?

Mr. Sloan stated that one of the criteria in a Planned Development is market feasibility. There has to be market demand for the use and that type of development. As we get into the proposed development, there were two market studies that were conducted. One for each of the two hotels proposed.

Mr. Sloan began his report. He stated the applicant proposes to construct two (2) hotels on the subject property. They are both proposed to be 4-story hotels. The site is located on the west side of Lilley Road, north of Ford Road, and the two hotels will have a total of 229 rooms. The proposed Residence Inn Hotel will have 111 rooms and the proposed Hilton Garden Hotel will have 118 rooms. There are two driveways at Lilley Rod proposed for the site. There is also a reciprocal access agreement proposed for the property to the south for north-south access between the proposed hotels and the commercial center to the south.

The site consists of three (3) parcels that are currently zoned C-2 and C-3, and located in the Central Business District (CBD) Overlay. The CBD Overlay states that any use in the C-3 district shall also be a permitted or Special Land Use in the C-2 district. Hotels are special land uses in the C-3 district, so all three parcels are eligible for the proposal for the request this evening.

Mr. Sloan stated that each Planned Development District is required to demonstrate definite benefits to the community. While the project sponsor notes several benefits in the application materials, the following definite benefits are the most consistent with Section 27.04 of the Zoning Ordinance: The first is the architectural design of the buildings. The Buildings exceed the minimum requirement for 50% masonry; the site maintains over 25% of open space; the project sponsor proposes to install 12 electric vehicle charging parking spaces, at least half of which will be available for non-guest vehicles; the applicant proposes to preserve natural features on the west side of the site near the adjacent residential neighborhood a distance of about 195 feet from the western lot line to the parking lot; additional definite benefits are that the applicant proposes to allow local non-profit and neighborhood association groups free use of the conference/meeting rooms with prior reservation; the applicant is proposing a voluntary contribution to the Township of \$20,000 for use as the Township determines for improvements along or near Ford Road. That one in particular is something the Township did not ask for or negotiate. In terms of the proposed \$20,000, this is not really something that is one of those tangible definite benefits that can be reviewed as a definite benefit. However, usually those benefits are related to development on the site itself, preservation of nature features, etc.

Schedule of Regulations and Modifications. With the Planned Development District, the applicant proposes modifications to the Zoning Ordinance as follows:

- The applicant proposes a maximum building height of four (4) stories. In the Central Business District Overlay the maximum story height is three (3) stories. The maximum building height of 50 feet is maintained. There is some additional architectural height on top of the building of 11.33 feet. Because these are architectural features, those are permitted by the Zoning Ordinance if there are enhanced setbacks which are proposed. The architectural features themselves are not modifications, but they are included here just to indicate that there are architectural features that exceed 50 feet and they have increased setbacks along the lot lines to account for those.
- Maximum driveway spacing distance: There is 230 feet minimum required between driveways, and they are proposing a separation distance of 224 feet. So even though it is a six-foot difference, it is a modification nevertheless. This is something the CBD overlay allows the Planning Commission discretion to modify.
- Minimum number of loading spaces proposed: They are proposing two loading spaces instead of the 11 that are required by the Zoning Ordinance. Fewer loading spaces for a use like this is usually not out of the question. The floor area pushes the number of required loading spaces up where in actuality one loading space per building is usually sufficient.
- Parking in the front yard area: Parking in the CBD is prohibited in a front yard area, but the Planning Commission may modify that requirement. That requirement has frequently been modified for many developments along Ford Road and elsewhere in the Central Business District Overlay.
- Width of the minimum access drive: The proposal is to allow a 26-foot minimum access drive width to be permitted in lieu of any requirement for a greater width. Sometimes the Ordinance calls for 30 feet, but 26 feet is typically okay for delivery vehicles, emergency services, and things of that nature.

Traffic Impact. The site will be accessed by two (2) driveways at Lilley Road and reciprocal cross-access drive to the commercial center to the south. The project sponsor has submitted a Traffic Impact Study (TIS), which has been reviewed by Canton Township's transportation engineering consultant (Wade Trim). The TIA is dated July 15, 2020, with a supplement dated March 27, 2021, and Wade Trim's letter is dated January 15, 2021. Wade Trim's traffic engineering consultant states that the TIS was prepared according to standard procedures and guidelines required by Canton Township, and the consultant recommends approval of the proposed development based on the traffic study, subject to the

applicant considering using separate left-turn and right-turn lanes at the two (2) driveways connecting to Lilley Road.

Market Analysis and Fiscal Impact. The applicant's market analysis was prepared by Cushman & Wakefield in July 2020, which indicates that both hotels are economically feasible at this location based on the conclusion of those analyses.

Sidewalks and Pedestrian Access. The required sidewalks will be included along the frontage of Lilley Road. There are two sidewalk connections connecting Lilley Road to the hotels as well as internal sidewalks.

Architecture. The hotels consist of more than 50% masonry with the remaining materials including a mix of glazing and windows, metal panel and EIFS.

Landscaping and Natural Features. The proposal is to comply, but a landscape plan is not required at the time of Planned Development Review. A landscape plan is typically required at Site Plan Review. There will be requirements for frontage landscaping, parking lot landscaping, and a number of other requirements.

Mr. Sloan stated that on the west side of the site the applicant is proposing to preserve a wooded area. On a previous version of the plan, the applicant had proposed a storm water pond in the western area, and would have required removal of that dense wooded area. They have since modified the plan to put the storm water system underground and preserve the wooded area on the west side of the site.

Parking. The number of parking spaces required by the Zoning Ordinance is 239 spaces and there are 239 spaces proposed. Based on our observations in the district and similar uses as the Parking Generation Manual published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, a lower parking threshold could be justified. The 239 spaces do meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, but if the applicant were to reduce the number of parking spaces, that could be justified based on studies and parking spaces for similar hotel uses in the area.

Planned Development Agreement. The PD Agreement is consistent with the Township's template Agreement. The Township Attorney has reviewed the Agreement, and some minor modifications are required which we recommend making prior to Township Board action on the Preliminary PDD. Mr. Sloan explained that the PD Agreement is basically a legal document with fairly boilerplate language. The real meaningful things of the plan take place within the plan itself.

Mr. Sloan stated that based on the standards of the Ordinance, Staff's recommendation is a recommendation of approval of the Preliminary Planned Development District, subject to modifications to the PD Agreement pursuant to comments from the Township Attorney, and compliance with Article 5A of the Zoning Ordinance with regard to tree preservation and the recommendations of the Township's traffic engineering consultant regarding driveway width. Mr. Sloan stated that since the report was issued, staff has received thirty-one (31) public comments via email, all of which have been forwarded to the Planning Commissioners for review prior to this evening's meeting. Many of the comments touch upon some of the subject matter that we are discussing, and some of it is in addition to that. The next step would be for the Planning Commission to hold the public hearing, and then the Planning Commission will be making a recommendation to the Township Board of Trustees. So, there won't be a final action by the Planning Commission, the Commission will just be a recommending body.

Mr. Weber asked a question of Patrick Sloan regarding the specific item regarding the feasibility study

submitted by the petitioner. It is dated July 23, 2020, but when you get into the body of the report, it says the study is based upon market conditions observed as of the date of our market analyses of March 1, 2019. So, over a full year before the report was actually generated. Mr. Weber just wants to be sure they are looking at correct data here. In that time period, a lot happened in the world that could affect the report.

Mr. Sloan stated that if the dates are in fact correct, the applicant can reply to that inquiry. Mr. Sloan said this is a valid question in terms of data taken before COVID and then used later, using old data pre-pandemic. Mr. Sloan stated the pandemic also made traffic studies very difficult, not just for this project but for many other projects.

Commissioner Zuber asked is it possible and/or legal for us to turn off the “chat” feature in this webinar. It is very distracting for the Commission Members to see chats coming in from members of the audience, commenting on what is being talked about. This is a Public Hearing, so everything really should be said out loud, and viewers will have their opportunity to speak during the Public Hearing once opened. Sloan subsequently turned off the “chat” feature in Zoom.

Commissioner Acharya stated that in terms of the data put together in this package, there is a chart which depicts the Canton Township population. Mr. Acharya thought it was very confusing because it shows the population dropping from 110,000 to about 22,000 in 2025. He does not understand the logic of this population drop and where they got this information from.

Mr. Sloan stated that would be a question for the applicant.

Mr. Weber asked, since there are a lot of people who want to speak tonight based on the chats and emails received, should the Commission remind the audience of the rules of the Public Hearing, how long they have to speak and such?

Chairman Greene agreed this is a good suggestion. He also wanted to remind the audience to try to avoid redundancy. Chairman Greene also stated, to Commissioner Zuber’s comment regarding the chats, he concurs to an extent. He does not want to cut off anyone’s ability to speak. But the chat can sometimes be a very demeaning use. There was a comment made by one of the audience participants in terms of one of the Commissioner’s demeanor which Chairman Greene finds very offensive. The Commission members are all volunteers doing a job, and that kind of comment is not warranted from the participant. Chairman Greene asked to please be respectful on both sides.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Weber, to move to open the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 9-0. (8:06pm)

Mr. Bryan Amann, Project Representative, stated that to help answer any particular questions, Susan Bowers is in attendance tonight as part of the architect team, Mitchell Harvey as the Engineer and then Chris Abbo as representative to the owner can speak more on the market study. Mr. Amann thanked Patrick Sloan for his in-depth explanation of the project. Mr. Amann stated they had started meeting with the neighbors around this site almost three years ago, about a year before COVID started, and discussed the hard but surprising issues about the nature of the potential uses that could be on this site versus hotels and how we could best accommodate their desires and needs in terms of physically locating everything as far away from them as possible. Mr. Amann said they ended up with setbacks that are 11 times what they could have been. Mr. Amann stated the Commission is going to hear a lot of concerns about traffic etc., but the fact is a hotel use like this is the quietest possible use of this type of a zoned area. There could be restaurants and stores, things that could operate from 8 in the morning until late at night with people coming

and going non-stop. The traffic study supports that. These hotel uses are non-rush hour uses, they have limited arrival and departure, and are very quiet as it relates not only with traffic, but also as it relates to just the use on the site. Mr. Amann explained they have designed the site in such a way to keep the buildings as far away from the residents and also leave the natural features in place and add buffering to that. Mr. Amann wanted to assure everyone that they have been moving forward in the process. They have been keeping very close contact with the brands and they are talking about putting their top hotels (Residence Inn & Hilton Gardens) here. What they are seeing post-COVID is actually causing greater concern. Despite comments that there are many hotels in the area, the market study shows that Canton is effectively under-hoteled. In Canton, 60% of the hotel use is by those people who have been traveling on business or returning to travel now, and 40% of the use are people visiting in the area for events or visiting family. The travel demand is coming back stronger than ever.

Mr. Aman stated they have also worked very hard to make sure in terms of parking spots as to whether we could potentially reduce spots. He stated they are open to a conversation. They have also added 12 electrical vehicle charging spots, half of which are for non-guests. Mr. Amann stated the Planning Commission has seen the conceptual elevations. These are the high-end brands, so this would be an improvement over this site. What they are running into is they are still going at a height of 50 feet of the building which is allowed under the Zoning Ordinance, they just are wanting to do four stories as opposed to three. That is just an element that is kind of an outdated element of the Central Business District Overlay. Mr. Amann stated he knows the Township has been looking to update that. Mr. Amann stated they have been working hard to make sure they design a project that is acceptable. They also read the comments from the Township Traffic Engineer as to the drive directions and egress, and will be happy to accommodate those comments. Mr. Amann explained that they have observed other commercial uses at intersections in the surrounding area, and this is potentially the best outcome to have the quietest potential commercial use on this commercially-zoned piece of property.

There was a brief discussion on how to handle the multiple participants attending tonight. Mr. Weber stated the rule in the bylaws is three minutes for an individual and five minutes for a representative speaking for a group.

Mr. Saurabh Thakur, 5860 Branch Dr, lives in the neighborhood right beside the proposed development. Mr. Thakur wanted to say he is not really keen with this development project, and wanted to register his objection for that. One of the major concerns would be the privacy and safety of the neighborhood with the traffic and everybody coming into the new development. Another concern is that the traffic analysis and business analysis seem to have been done during a really unusual time. So that data would need to be re-evaluated before a decision is made.

Gena Giannuzzi, 6733 Brookshire, stated she would like to ask the Planning Commission to reject the PDD modification proposed by Residence Inn and Hilton Inn. There are too many hotels in the area, there are seven. Canton may have events every year, but the thing is, these hotels are going to change the character of their residential area. It is going to attract transitory interstate travelers and draw potential crime to the area. It will have an effect on their property values. It will have an effect on traffic, and it is too tall. Ms. Gianuzzi stated she hopes the Planning Commission will reconsider this, and as Mr. Thakur said, the study is outdated and pre-COVID. She would like to see a new study done to see what the occupancy rate of the seven hotels that we have here.

Ashwini Kumar Gangele, 5928 Braymore Dr. stated his concern is on the traffic and safety. His wife just had an accident on Ford and Lilley Road two weeks back. By approving this, it is going to add more traffic as well as the security concerns. From a four-story building, someone would be able to see from the window

to his house directly. Mr. Gangele does not feel comfortable with this from a security point of view. With the potential for extra traffic coming in, it seems a little more unsafe. He asks the Planning Commission to please reject this request.

Aziz Lokhandwala, 5944 Braemore Dr, Willow Brook Village Sub, stated he has similar concerns. There are already seven hotels, and on top of that, now we a B&B which offers space to travelers. This will add more traffic and have security issues for our subdivision, property values could go down. Do we need two more hotels when we already have seven? Mr. Lokhandwala requests the Commission reject this proposal to preserve the safety of their subdivision and the residents in the area.

Lou Giannuzzi, 6733 Brookshire, mentioned that a comment was made by Mr. Amann that they had reached out to the six or seven neighborhoods that surround the area. Their neighborhood, Pickwick Village, is about 400 feet away. When did they reach out, Mr. Giannuzzi does not remember anyone reaching out.

Mr. Amann stated they had a series of meetings with the residents who are within the 300-foot area, but it was primarily those neighborhoods and associations that were north and west of this site. Several meetings were held in the Township Administration Building lower level, those meetings began in late 2018.

Mr. Gianuzzi said then that they did not reach out to their neighborhood, which is 450 feet away.

Mr. Amann asked is their neighborhood was south of Ford Road.

Mr. Gianuzzi stated the neighborhood is directly east and northeast of these proposed hotels, directly behind Dunham's.

Mr. Amann stated that typically they try to make sure to deal with those residents who are going to be most significantly impacted by the proximity of the project. He stated they did not reach out to Pickwick at that time. They worked through the Planning Services Division Office and the neighborhood association to reach the residents.

Mr. Gianuzzi stated that they reached out to Willow Brook, yet there are people here who seem to be completely blindsided. And four stories of 50 feet? That would be 12 feet per story?

Mr. Amann stated they are currently allowed to go 50 feet under the Zoning Ordinance, and have the architectural features of 11 feet on top of it. But the Central Business District Overlay portion of the Ordinance restricts everything to three stories. So, they are simply asking to do four stories within that 50 feet. Theoretically, they could do a building of the exact same height and design and have a two-story atrium, rooms on the first floor, and waste the entire space. But that is not what they are requesting. It is an anomaly that's in the CBD Overlay that the Township will probably look at over time.

Mr. Gianuzzi stated he feels this should be delayed for 30-90 days. Some residents who live 420 feet away just found out that they may have two four-story hotels out their back windows. He asked will the address be on Lilley?

Mr. Amann stated yes, they do not have Ford Road frontage, so it would be addressed to Lilley.

Mr. Amann stated that Patrick Sloan had described that there would be a reciprocal easement agreement to the south to allow efficiency and moving from one commercial site to another. The Township encourages and actually requires that adjacent sites where possible do reciprocal easement agreements so people would

not have to go out to Ford Road to get to the project and to the building or to the use next door. They would have a reciprocal easement agreement within them. Mr. Amann wanted to point out that the property they are dealing with is actually deeper than what they are taking, and it has been zoned commercial long before residents ever bought the property they are in now.

Mr. Gianuzzi asked if the land has been perked. Are there any wetlands that would be disturbed? The land was a farm at one point.

Mr. Amann stated normally when someone asks for a perc test is when they plan to operate a septic system on the site. We are not going to do that. But as it relates to the question about wetlands, part of the Township requirement is detailed delineation of any potential wetlands or any special kind of character plants, and of course they have done that and will continue to do that throughout the process.

Mr. Gianuzzi asked if there are any wetlands on the property.

Mr. Amann stated he is not aware of any. If there are, they are unregulated. He suggested Mitch Harvey may be answer that in more detail. The question normally would be “are there any regulated wetlands on the site?” Mr. Amann stated they have changed the site to make sure they are not going into the treed area to the west as opposed to putting a pond there.

Mitchell Harvey, Stonefield Engineering 607 Shelby St, stated they went out and surveyed the site and did not find any wetlands. Additionally, the EGLE Map does not have any wetlands identified that would be regulated on site.

Mr. Amann stated that under the law, they have to actively survey every element of this property, especially if there are any wetlands or regulated wetlands. He stated they did that, and did not find any. The State branch “EGLE” Department have maps across the entire state where they know there are wetlands, and their map is showing no wetlands on this site.

Mr. Gianuzzi asked if there are any plans to do a more recent survey that is less than two years old? “We all just went through a 15-month pandemic.” Mr. Gianuzzi reiterated Mr. Sitto’s comment from earlier that a market study was done for his project and it was found there is no real feasibility for more 3-4 story hotels.

Mr. Amann stated he is glad Mr. Gianuzzi asked this question. First off, Mr. Sitto did not say it wasn’t feasible, he said that he couldn’t get the hotel deal there. And that’s because Hilton is committed to trying to do the hotel on this site. The greatest test ultimately at feasibility is when you do the initial market study, the question is can you continue to have the brands themselves desire to think that there is a market here and specifically the brands have continued to pursue the site. The greater test beyond all that whether or not you can attain financing for this hotel. Mr. Amann stated they can provide more updated information from the respective brands as to their perception on the feasibility as we move forward on this process.

Mr. Gianuzzi responded, then the answer is “no.” They are going to go with a study that is over two years old.

Mr. Amann restated, not only do they have updated information as to the feasibility based on the brand information and the financing that they have been doing in their studies, but will continue to do that throughout this process and will provide it to the Township as it is obtained.

Mr. Gianuzzi stated, he really thinks this needs to be ultra-delayed. No one reached out to any of the

neighborhoods that are 423 feet away, and he finds that to be sad.

Mr. Sloan mentioned that the Zoom webinar is scheduled for 3 hours. He is trying to extend it. If he is not able to extend the meeting, we may have to end the meeting abruptly at 10:00 p.m. and wherever we are in the agenda we may have to postpone items to perhaps a special meeting. Mr. Sloan will continue to try to extend the Zoom meeting tonight.

Ms. Zuber suggested this may be a good time to remind the audience that if someone has already made the comment to not to keep making the same comments.

Mr. Weber also asked to please keep comments to three minutes.

Mr. Rollin Fowlkes, 5899 Braemore Drive, stated he has a couple concerns. A lot of the residents are new homeowners to this particular region. He hates to reiterate, but there is concern about property value and traffic. Mr. Fowlkes is concerned about the zoning of the buildings that directly cut into a lot of their residential homes. From both charts he sees, his home is affected as well as some others. These homes are not that old. What is the plan with the zoning?

Chairman Greene stated that they are not discussing zoning on this project except the use of the zoning as it relates to a Planned Development District. They are not changing the zoning, the zoning is already there. The Commission is dealing with the proposal which is stipulating the use within that zone. Patrick Sloan had explained the zoning ramifications at the beginning of the meeting.

Mr. Fowlkes asked then when these homes were built, that particular zone was already in place even though they put those residential homes in the commercial zone?

Chairman Greene stated that when the homes were built, the area was probably still a farm and probably was still zoned as rural residential, or it might have been agricultural. So, at that time it was probably on the Master Plan as one day going either going residential or commercial. But at that time those subdivisions around it were built, it was still a farm.

Mr. Fowlkes stated that the Commission is going to have a lot of complaints with this particular situation. It was said earlier that there was a survey etc. But this is new to him and to a lot of his neighbors as well. They just got word of this recently. He asked who did they reach out to?

Chairman Greene asked what neighborhood Mr. Fowlkes lives in.

Mr. Fowlkes said he lives in the Willow Brook Subdivision, 5899 Braemore, which is directly impacted by this new development. Right behind Basement Burger and across the street from the dentistry. Mr. Fowlkes expressed that a lot of the residents are very upset about it, it is not a good look.

Chairman Greene asked Mr. Sloan regarding the notification letters generated by the Planning Services Division. Those notifications go directly to individual homes or businesses and not just to subdivision Boards, correct?

Mr. Sloan stated that is correct. The notifications go to property owners and to residents within 300 feet of the subject site pursuant to the Michigan Zoning Enabling Act.

Chairman Greene suggested that perhaps in the future they should look to notify subdivision Boards and

HOA's as well. Then they could also reach out to their residents.

Commissioner Weber stated he thinks the question from Mr. Fowlkes is not so much about the notice that went out from the Township, as it is the representation that the petitioners made that they met with the residents in that area. Who did they meet with? Mr. Amann states they met with people within 300 feet of the development.

Mr. Fowlkes stated he lives right in a part of the zoning that would be affected. No one came to him, he does not recall receiving a letter. He received the Public Hearing notice letter about a week or two ago, but nothing prior to that.

Mr. Amann wanted to reiterate they started their meetings toward the end of 2018 through 2019 between the two associations there and individual homeowners. Mr. Amann does not think the homes in question that Mr. Fowlkes is talking about were built, they were under construction at the time and people were not even living there at the time. And then COVID took 13 months out of the process. The gist of what they heard from the homeowners that were closest to the site at that time was that they wanted to make sure everything was as far from them as possible. Theoretically under the Ordinance right now if they were to put something in there they could put it 35 feet from residents' rear property line and 35 feet from the west property line. But instead, we have gone 11 times away from that.

Mr. Fowlkes stated there just seems to be a lot of untruths or miscommunication. This just doesn't sit well with him and a lot of his neighbors.

Mr. Sloan stated that the Zoning Enabling Act requires that the Township mail notices to everybody within 300 feet of the property. In terms of any communication the applicant may or may not have had with the residents, that's from the applicant, and not necessarily the Township.

Soumya Naidu, 42581 Laird Lane, Willow Brook Subdivision. Ms. Naidu wanted to bring up the fact that, the demographics of the subdivision is families with little babies. This is not a community where you have empty nesters or families with many teenage kids. Security is really a big issue here. It is not okay to have random transient traffic coming through the subdivision. Even the sidewalk is connected to their subdivision. If you were to walk into their subdivision, you would see the park and see children, elementary school and babies.

Pardhava Vourganti, 42565 Laird Lane, stated that he received a letter about a week ago about this new development from the Planning Services Division, but before that no one had tried to reach him. Mr. Vourganti asked that if the majority of the people say no, then there won't be hotels coming here?

Mr. Greene stated this is not how the vote takes place. The Commission takes the concerns, but still has to recommend to the Board of Trustees one way or the other. But we do listen to the Public Hearing comments. It is not a vote based upon popularity or positions on the matter. It is hearing your concerns.

Mr. Vourganti asked on what basis will the decisions be finalized?

Chairman Greene responded, on the basis of the Commissioners making a decision pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance and then sending that decision to the Board of Trustees.

Commissioner Weber stated there are a number of criteria listed in the Zoning Ordinance that the Commission Members must consider when doing these reviews. People's comments are just one of the

things that they have to consider. There are other legal standards that have to be considered before making a decision, but they do take into consideration the comments of the public.

Mr. Vourganti stated he also has the same concerns as his neighbors regarding security. There is nothing between the proposed hotels and their yards. He also feels this there are enough hotels. There are already seven hotels near the interchange, and one approved on Ford Road after Ridge. And now more coming on Lilley Road, there is already traffic congestion.

Ms. Zuber mentioned she is not aware of a new hotel at Ridge and Ford.

Chairman Greene stated, no that was not correct. There is no hotel at Ridge Rd. and Ford Rd.

Mr. Amann stated there is something that has been raised in the last three questions that he would like to address. Mr. Amann said he has been representing projects for 25 years in this community and always worked proactively with neighbors and residents as much as possible. That is why they initiated the meetings. Mr. Amann stated he has been getting emails from people out of the subdivision and continuously updating them. He stated they did not do any additional reach-outs during COVID obviously, no one was doing that. Regarding security, this site will be fully secured with cameras and the kinds of things you would expect. If they don't do the hotels on this site, they have the absolute right, other than just doing a site plan with the Planning Commission, of throwing a shopping center there and putting the buildings 35 feet from their property line with alleys and dumpsters etc. Mr. Amann stated that when they met with the neighbors, they did not want that. They wanted something where the buildings would be as far away from them as possible. There are still three residential long-strip properties between this property and the houses to the north, so there are still undeveloped residential properties, we are not backing up to a particular neighborhood per se. Regarding the sidewalk, they are required to connect to the sidewalk along Lilley Road as part of the frontage. They are not putting sidewalk into their neighborhood. The proposed sidewalk is strictly along the frontage of Lilley Road.

Angela Zaetta, 5838 Branch Drive in the Willow Brook neighborhood. Ms. Zaetta wanted to express her extreme displeasure with this proposal. She does not think this is in the best interest of Canton to have hotels near the residential areas. Ms. Zaetta stated she takes exception to the threatening language that is being presented by Mr. Amann that anybody could build anything else, and they were trying to do us a favor. This is not a favor, and she takes exception for not being communicated with ahead of time. Ms. Zaetta stated she has lived here since 2016, and no buildings were under construction. According to the Master Plan, this is supposed to be residential areas. She would like to see a Master Plan or a development that would have more residential type living space, such as elderly care, mixed residential. Hotels are not in the future.

Chairman Greene asked Mr. Sloan if and when the Commission revised the Master Plan to commercial.

Mr. Sloan stated that regarding the last time the Master Plan was revised for this particular area, he does not have that information at the moment. The site is classified as a Community Shopping classification on the Future Land Use Map of the Comprehensive Plan, which generally corresponds to the current C-3 and C-2 Zoning Districts, so the Master Plan classifies the subject site as a commercial area.

Naresh and Lekha, 5960 Braemore Drive, has the same concerns about privacy. Their back window can be directly looked through by the second, third, or fourth floor of the hotels, and with the existing seven hotels he does not think it would add any value. Apart from that, the traffic and accidents are already on the rise and this would definitely contribute to it further.

Chairman Greene reminded the audience that if an issue has already been stated, the Commission Members are listening so you do not need to repeat it again in the interest of time.

Ms. Viha Patel, 5816 Braemore Dr, Willow Brook Subdivision. Ms. Patel wanted to echo the same concerns as the rest of the people from Willow Brook Village that have spoken. Ms. Patel wanted to highlight that where she lives, it would be directly behind where this new hotel site would be. They are extremely concerned with the security and privacy for their children and families in this neighborhood. This is a neighborhood with young children. Basically, they do not want transient people who are not part of this community just walking through their neighborhood. The other concerns are something that Mr. Amann had raised that he had actually come to speak with people in the community who are within 300 feet of this development, but no one has actually reached out to anyone in this community. They would also like to understand what type of traffic studies were actually done. The studies that were done were probably pre-COVID and would need to be evaluated again.

Mr. Chris Labadini, 48015 Deer Trail Drive, asked if any sort of public safety study was done in regard to hotels in the community.

Chairman Greene stated he believes that would be a question for Mr. Amann.

Mr. Amann stated that actually that would be a question for Mr. Sloan as to whether the Ordinance requires public safety studies. A study was not done, but Mr. Amann does not think the Township has any requirement of public safety studies as it relates to hotel uses.

Mr. Sloan stated that the extent of the public safety that the Planning Staff look at when it comes to plan review (a site plan, special land use, or a planned development) is the Fire Department review of the plans and what they are looking for is emergency vehicle accessibility for first responders, and making sure they can get their equipment in and out of site and access the building for medical personnel or accessing for fire apparatus. So, from the standpoint of emergency vehicles and first responders, that's the evaluation and that takes place on all of our site plans, special land uses, and planned developments. If talking about the Police Department and crime, that is not something that Planning generally does studies for during the plan review evaluation.

Mr. Labadini asked if Canton Public Safety, whether it be the Fire Department or the Police Department, has any issues with the current hotels in Canton as far as safety?

Mr. Sloan stated that in terms of police and safety from a policing standpoint, that is not part of the evaluation that they look at. In terms of the fire safety standpoint, Mr. Sloan knows that the Fire Marshal actively does inspections as well as plan reviews for the life and safety factors of the building itself and the site.

Mr. Labadini stated he is curious if anyone from the Public Safety side of things would want two additional hotels in the community. Whether they are high-end hotels or not, they can attract a transient population. There is a considerable amount of drugs and human trafficking, underage parties, underage drinking. Hotels are a 24-7 operation so there are going to be comings and goings all day. At least a retail closes at some point. Mr. Labadini stated another concern is if these rooms are not filled would these hotels take money from the government to house displaced people, disadvantaged people, those in section 8 housing, or people who have been through natural disasters? Mr. Labadini stated he knows hotels have been taking in people who are displaced for a variety of things from around the country.

Mr. Amann stated he is a little offended at the notion that some people are less eligible for some housing in a hotel in a moment of need than others, so he prefers not to address that question.

Mr. Labadini state this is a legitimate concern where a lot of hotels have been used for housing, where a percentage of rooms have been allotted for governmental assistance. He does not feel that is very offensive, he would just like to know if those two hotels would be used for such.

Mr. Amann asked, when Mr. Labadini refers to government assistance, is he referring to checks people would get during COVID because they didn't have wages? Mr. Amann stated he is going to leave this question alone.

Chairman Greene stated this really is an issue that is not before the Commission in terms of making this kind of decision. Whether they did or did not is not going to weigh in on what the Commission does.

Mr. Labadini stated he does not think this is a good plan and hopes the Commission does not move this plan forward. Again, the hotel would be a 24-7 operation, both hotels would produce trash, there will be dumpsters there just like retail. Mr. Labadini would suggest that this not go forward.

Commissioner Zuber stated for the record that the dumpster locations are shown on the site plan.

Ms. Kajal Gangele, 5928 Braemore Drive, has all the same concerns as everybody else, like security and traffic. Ms. Gangele had an accident two weeks before and is suffering a lot. Like everybody else, they have children that freely play. No one wants to check all the time. This is not good for their community. Ms. Gangele asked the Commission to please consider those concerns.

Randy and Leeann Kowalski, (42262 Wickfield), Mr. Kowalski thanked the Commission Members for their time this evening. He knows they all have very difficult jobs and appreciates what they are trying to do here. Mr. Kowalski asks that the Commissioners do not vote for approval for this at this time. He thinks all the variances and modifications to current ordinances, to what Mr. Amann says to Township ordinances, are outdated are a concern. The Commission right now does not have the most recent studies that Mr. Amann says are ongoing. The traffic study was done prior pre-COVID and during COVID. Mr. Kowalski is interested about the feasibility studies. He is interested to know if there is a study currently about the occupancy rate for these seven hotels that are currently in the area of the Ford Road interchange at I-275. Lastly, the discussions taking place with the people adjacent to this proposed development, a lot of questions have come up about who was involved and who was not involved. Mr. Kowalski said to the Commissioners that they do not have a proposal to approve this at this time, there are too many unanswered questions for the citizens in the area.

Mr. Mitesh Thakkar, 5750 Branch Ct, stated he has the same concerns as the other participants regarding safety, privacy, and traffic. His back window will probably be visible from the fourth floor of the hotels. Mr. Thakkar also wanted to mention that he has lived here since 2016 and has never been contacted before the letter he received a couple weeks back. Mr. Thakkar would like to place his objection.

Mr. Nikhil Shah, 5797 Branch Ct, Willow Brook Subdivision. Mr. Shah stated, as his neighbors have said, nobody has talked to them. He has lived here since 2015 and nobody has talked to him about the project, and has received nothing from the Township also. Lilley Road is the primary entrance for the subdivision. Mr. Shah does not know what kind of traffic study they are talking about, Lilley is technically a single lane road. When these hotels come, the traffic will definitely go up. On Ford Road he sees one accident almost

every day. Mr. Shah said that if you want to increase accidents, please approve this, but he is against this project.

Mr. Bill Lorelli, 1524 Copeland Cir., stated he lives on the other side of Ford Road from this development proposal. Mr. Lorelli stated he would like to know from the applicant what are the anticipated occupancy dates are for these hotels. How far into the future, assuming approvals happen in the normal scheme of things.

Mr. Amann stated Chris Abbo would be the best source to answer that question.

Mr. Chris Abbo stated that there were approvals and obviously they still have a process to go through. They would have the remainder of this year to finish the completion of the design of the building and then hope to start and break ground in 2022. Mr. Abbo thinks that from this point forward, the earliest start date would possibly be the first quarter of 2022. Completion with two hotel projects opening up simultaneously would probably take about two years from start to finish. So that would be a 2024 opening. Possibly sooner, but Mr. Abbo would anticipate a 2024 opening. So, in relation to feasibility studies done in 2019 or today and as we continue to move forward, that is something that will be ongoing as well.

Mr. Lorelli stated to give a little bit of context to things, he hears a lot for the comments and he has been a resident of Canton since 1986. The year he moved here was the year Ford Road was widening from one lane each way to its present two lanes each way. A lot of development has come in since that time. They were building the development across Ford Road where the current CVS is. When that first opened, it was a very large grocery store, Great Scott Grocery Store. Mr. Lorelli stated that tenants change in these developments. His question to the applicant is these two hotels are going to be going on simultaneously. Will they continue if one, either Hilton or Marriott, decides to back out and think it's not feasible anymore. How does the developer handle something like that, with two major tenants in one development?

Mr. Abbo explained that they are the franchisees so they are the owner/operator of the hotels. He stated they have a license with Marriott and a license with Hilton who very much want to have their product there. The hotels wouldn't back out and neither would they.

Mr. Prashant Kharche, 5826 Braemore Drive, lives directly adjacent to the C-2 property in question. Mr. Kharche stated first of all he is asking the Commission not to vote yes for this. The Commission has already heard of many reasons, so he is not going to repeat those. Mr. Kharche had a couple questions. Someone mentioned the preservation of natural spaces on the west side which would affect all of our properties, especially the adjacent properties. What is the area of space (length, width, square footage) that will be left as a wooded area?

Mr. Harvey stated it looks like it is about 0.77 acres, 149 feet wide.

Mr. Kharche asked if it is going to run the length of that adjacency and going to be 149 feet wide.

Mr. Harvey stated that is correct.

Mr. Kharche asked what is the full length of that C-2 property from Lilley to Ford? Is there a sense on that, he cannot tell from the drawing.

Mr. Amann asked if Mr. Kharche means from the north property line they have?

Mr. Kharche stated from the east to the west.

Mr. Amann clarified, from Lilley to the west boundary.

Mr. Harvey stated that its roughly 658 feet.

Mr. Kharche said so if he understands correctly, they are proposing leaving 149 feet in that width of wooded area?

Mr. Harvey explained that along that dimension he gave, 658 feet, 149 feet of that would be the wooded portion that we are discussing.

Mr. Kharche had a couple more things. This proposal sounds very flawed, not necessarily economically flawed, but for an exogenous event called COVID, all the data is flawed at this point because it occurred before a major occurrence. So, what happens now in behavioral science and what happens in traffic patterns and what happens with occupancy rates is completely different. They need to see more data. Mr. Kharche also had a question for Bryan Amann or Chris the owner, what is the break-even you are looking for in occupancy rates at these hotels, just out of curiosity, in terms of rooms occupied.

Mr. Abbo stated that question is too difficult to answer, that is different or every property in every location. They have not put a budget together for this property, but if going by a rule of thumb, they will generally need to be at about 40 to 50 percent occupancy. Mr. Abbo said he is just drawing from reference for the two properties on Ford Road - the Towne Place Suites and the Fairfield Inn Marriott – which are a part of their portfolio, and they are running above those numbers currently and are profitable right now. Mr. Abbo wanted to speak to the misconception he is hearing and a lot of assumptions about the hotel industry and how COVID has affected it. COVID has affected everybody personally, but business-wise professionally, and just this meeting here taking place on a Zoom meeting. They have seen travel pick up, they are seeing demand pick up. As they move forward they will update the studies on any new projects, not only this. Mr. Abbo discussed their portfolio and their projects. There is a demand in this market for this product within Canton. This is a location where the brands want to be, and a location where we as franchisees want to be in because there is a demand and a profitable market. The Residence Inn is an extended stay property and extended stay properties ended up actually doing better than they did before COVID.

Mr. Kharche asked regarding the C-2 property there directly adjacent to Willow Brook Subdivision, is that to be the Residence Inn or the Hilton.

Mr. Harvey stated that the northernmost hotel would be the Hilton Garden Inn.

Mr. Kharche stated, so that would be the one that is not extended stay so will have more traffic, more transit. He asked why not flip those around, that would be a lot easier frankly for the neighborhood. Mr. Kharche asked, not trying to be flippant, but there's emotions here, there are people significantly concerned about their children and families. He thinks everyone can appreciate that. How can you help for enhanced security? What would you do for a resident adjacent to these properties?

Mr. Abbo stated he has never really heard or had the assumption that hotels bring security nightmares unless they are a motel, an exterior corridor property, or something that is an economy brand hotel. But when talking about a Hilton Garden, it caters to a business traveler and then maybe on weekends leisure travel. There are going to be families just like yours enjoying a trip to Canton, whether it's to go to IKEA or to be in town for a hockey tournament. Mr. Abbo said he doesn't think hockey moms would need security guards

watching them. He does not mean to be flippant either, but he has been in the hotel industry for 25 years. Security concerns would be addressed on an evening where they have to tell people to keep quiet who are in town for a tournament. But they are not worried about people coming in and out. It's a rather low intensity use so the traffic study indicates that in relation to a shopping center, its going to have significantly less traffic on Lilley Road. Any other proposed use other than this will have more traffic.

Mr. Kharche stated he will leave it at that. He would just like to see more data because of the time frame that elapsed. Mr. Kharche asked what's the impact on residential property values when these sorts of residential properties are put in place next to residents. His concern and his neighbors' concern are that it will have a negative impact.

Chairman Greene stated he does not believe the Commission has access to information like that. That type of thing is not usually presented along with proposals.

Mr. Kharche stated it would be interesting to see something like that just because it does affect so many people here. He stated again he would like to see more data. He is significantly concerned for safety and the impact on residential values.

Chairman Greene stated if the audience has access to screen sharing, the earlier question of proximity to at least the one subdivision to the west can be illustrated by the drawing displayed.

Mr. Sloan displayed a colored rendering of the plan that was submitted by the applicant, Lilley Road is north-south. You can see on the south side that's adjacent to commercial districts to the south and then the residential district itself is to the west. You can see on the aerial some of the homes there further west. And on the west side of the site, particularly the northwest corner, that's the area where the applicant discusses preserving some of the trees in that area.

Chairman Greene asked if the size of those trees could possibly shield view from structures of this size?

Mr. Sloan stated that based on recent aerial photos in September of 2020, the leaves were on the trees, the area is quite dense (aerial displayed on screen). In March the leaves were off the trees. They are deciduous trees. It doesn't look like evergreens in this area. Mr. Sloan stated he does not know how it looks in the winter, but when the leaves are on the trees, it's a pretty dense vegetative buffer. A tree survey is not required with a PD Plan. We don't have an inventory of the trees so we don't know the sizes, the species, the quality and the quantity.

Mr. Sri Vallabhaneni, 5919 Braemore Drive, asked the Commissioners how good a job can they do to influence them in the right way. Not the \$20,000 that the builders gave you. He said he is talking about the impact on his family.

Chairman Greene asked to speak for a minute. He stated this is a sharing of ideas. This is a Public Hearing. Please don't go down the road of money and things of that nature, just tell us your concerns and the Commission will gladly hear that.

Mr. Vallabhaneni stated his question is what kind of a good job can they do to influence the Commission, because he has heard that their concerns are just one thing and there are other things to consider. What can they do to influence the Commission to put themselves in the residents' shoes and make a decision?

Chairman Greene stated he is already doing that, by lending the Commission his input and all the members

welcome that and appreciate it.

Mr. Vallabhaneni said he wants to make sure they are taken seriously, and not just going in one ear and out the other.

Chairman Greene stated all the residents can do is trust the fact that there is this process that the Commission has to go through with projects of this nature. There are nine Planning Commissioners that have a say in this and make a recommendation to the Trustees, and then there are seven Trustees on the Township Board. It's a process and we are getting through it. The residents are helping us, and it is appreciated. There are no magic words that you can say, we just want to know your honest opinion.

Mr. Vallabhaneni asked that the Commissioners look at this as if this were their homes, to put themselves in their shoes and make the right decision. He addressed Mr. Amann and said that they have been living here since 2015, and no one reached out to them.

Mr. Bob Mac (name on the screen is "Bob Mac"; no address given) stated all he had to say on this is it's a good project. Nobody is going to say they don't want a Hilton Hotel. But it's the wrong spot, end of story. He commented on Mr. Amann's role as project representative.

Chairman Greene broke in during the comment to say Mr. Mac has no basis to make an accusation and if he has nothing concrete to add to this discussion tonight, then we need to move on.

Mr. Mac was asked to unmute if he wished to add anything, he made no further comments.

Mr. K. Modium, 5753 Branch Court, stated he sees the points which his neighbors have brought up so far. He wanted to echo some of the concerns that have already been brought up. The only reason is so the Commission understands how many people are being impacted, there are small children, this neighborhood is fairly young. He also echoes his neighbors' concerns that no notice has reached them so far. On top of that, he wants to see who approved this residential layout before realizing that this is a commercial overlap on top of it. Mr. Modium stated the Commission approved it, and then on top of it want to approve another hotel next to it. It's as good as building a strip club next to one of their houses. Mr. Modium stated that this is completely influencing their lives, their children's future, they can come up with a list which is going to impact this whole thing. He stated he is not saying that growth is not good, but you have got to pick the right place.

Chairman Greene asked how close does he live to this area.

Mr. Modium said right next to it, Willow Brook Sub.

Ashwini Kumar Gangele spoke again. He wanted to answer one question that was raised. Somebody said during the winter they were not sure how the trees look and what is the visibility. Mr. Gangele said that from his bedroom he can count all the cars on Lilley Road and people walking for six to seven months, it is that thin. There is no thickness, no density of the trees. Whatever you are seeing in a picture is not correct. Mr. Gangele asked they please keep that in mind because residents are going to see that once the hotels come. Somebody is going to see into the bedroom, the kitchen, right through. He stated he is sure the Commissioners have families and would not like that. Please consider this as a major security concern and do not approve this project.

Vasu Desu, 5863 Branch Drive, resident of Willow Brook Subdivision, stated he has lived here since 2015.

Mr. Desu stated that if the survey had been done properly, they should have taken feedback from residents in at least two or three houses. None of the neighbors got notifications, no communication from the city. Also, if the survey had been done properly, before this meeting tonight you would have had all this information. A development should not affect other people. This is a young neighborhood with very young kids. Property values will get affected. Mr. Desu also stressed he has concerns for safety and increasing traffic. They already see a lot of traffic in the area, there is a lot of speeding happening on Branch Drive. When the city approves something like this, will they take into consideration the residents' safety? When the city approved Pulte to build the houses, buyers thought this was a residential property. Now after five years, they are saying this is commercial or agricultural. If these hotels happen, it will be very close proximity and whoever wants to buy a house here will feel its very close and very commercial. Mr. Desu asked that the Commission members please hear all their concerns and thanked them for taking his comments.

Mr. Prabhu Venugopal, 42528 Laird, stated he would like to object to this project considering the traffic heaviness that is going to happen on Lilley. Their main entrance is on Lilley. He echoes previous comments that there is a lot of speeding happening in the community, which is really a bothering sign for the kids here, that is his primary concern. He stated privacy is his second concern, and the property value which is going to give the residents a financial burden for all their community members. He would like to request the Commission to take this into consideration and reject the project.

Mr. Vineet Shukla, 5995 Branch Drive, said he echoes the same concerns his neighbors have already provided with respect to no notifications received, traffic is a significant thing that he is really concerned about, and safety and security. Mr. Shukla stated he has two kids and they go all the way up to Lilley Road. With transient traffic so close, it just doesn't put his mind at ease. Mr. Shukla stated he is against this proposal and thanked the Commission for their time.

Ms. Soumya Naidu stated she spoke earlier, but had one more concern to bring up. Was Pulte aware of the zoning back when the subdivision was built?

Mr. Amann said he could answer that. The zoning on these parcels has not changed for 15-20 years or longer and Pulte was fully aware of the zoning. In fact, the parcels to the north are still zoned Office between the project and the residences to the north. If you go to the Canton Township Zoning Ordinance today, it shows the top five, or southern lots of that subdivision are built in what is showing as commercial zoning on the current zoning map.

Ms. Naidu had a follow-up question. How do you justify putting a C-2 and a C-3 in the middle where other zones are all Office-zoned. Ms. Naidu stated she knows this is not something that should be discussed on this particular meeting, but she does not know how that is justified from a resident's perspective. If somebody else were to move to Canton, this is something she would bring up. Ms. Naidu said she would say you are aggressively trying to commercialize Canton, and she would not recommend if one of her friends from West Bloomfield or Novi were to move here, she would not recommend Canton because this is aggressive zoning practices. This is something that needs to be made public to other people to let them know that these are the practices that the city is adopting. If someone had spoken to them earlier, they would have recommended an assisted living facility or a senior living facility they could have worked with them on that. She said the process seems devious.

Chairman Greene stated that the Planning process is transparent. The Commission does not try to rule out residents in favor of commercial, they try to come up with good planning. And you are welcome to come to the very next planning session where we deal with the Master Plan for the Township because your input

would be very welcome in that process. We do that every five years. Chairman Greene did not know when the next one is going to be but he would invite you to stay tuned so that you can be part of that process.

Ms. Naidu thanked Chairman Greene for that invitation. She just wanted to mention that the fact that none of them knew about this is why she brought up the word “devious.” None of the residents were aware that this was going on. The talks were between the Township and the applicant of this whole thing, and the subdivision was in the dark.

Commissioner Weber stated there were no talks between the Township and the developer, at least no talks between the Planning Commission and the developer in this. This is the first time the Commissioners have reviewed this project, just like it’s the first time the residents have seen it. As the Chairman has said, there is nothing devious going on here. The Commission is going through a very public process and considering all the factors. And quite honestly, he is offended that it was implied that the Commission is doing something underhanded or devious. The Commission members are all here as volunteers to the community, and are trying to make a decision that they feel is best for the community. We take all the comments into consideration, and we weigh those heavily. There are many other considerations we have to give this too. Again, there is nothing devious about this process, it is a very public process. The Commission cannot speak to what the developer did or didn’t do as far as speaking to the neighbors and such. He has to take him at his word, just like he has to take the residents at their word saying that it didn’t happen. At this point, we have to get off this subject and move on. Commissioner Weber stated he sees people who have already spoken, and would ask that people not get up and repeat their comments. We have been here for two hours and there are other people on the agenda that need to have their matter heard as well.

Chairman Greene thanked Ms. Naidu for her comments and stressed he sincerely extends that invitation when the time comes for to review the Master Plan for Canton.

Commissioner Zuber wanted to add that there is no obligation on the part of the developer to meet with the neighbors. This is something that they did out of the goodness of their hearts to try to work with the neighbors, but there is no obligation for that to happen.

Chairman Greene stated that is a good point. They do ask the developers to do that kind of thing. They say that they have done that and perhaps they did not meet with enough people. That is not for the Commission to decide. What we have to decide is whether or not this project is good for Canton.

Commissioner Zuber mentioned the two residents with their hands up have already spoken, and asked if we should hear from them again.

Chairman Greene stated that if someone has already spoken, we need to move on if there are no further comments.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Weber, to move to close the public hearing. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 9-0. (9:46pm)

Mr. Sloan stated that he looked at some zoning maps during the hearing. The C-2 and C-3 Zoning predate the development to the west and northwest, so this has been C-2 and C-3 for many years including prior to the development of the residential subdivision to the west.

Bryan Amann stated they have heard a lot of comments tonight about the concerns of neighbors and unfortunately some of these folks, although we dealt with the associations, weren’t even living there, and

some were but were not included in the applicant's previous meetings for some reason. Mr. Amann said he would suggest an offer that, if it would be appropriate, they would certainly be willing to meet with neighbors. If the Commission would move to table the item for tonight, Mr. Amann would then like to use the opportunity to reach out to neighbors. Mr. Amann will get from Mr. Sloan the list of addresses of residents they heard from tonight so he can at least try to communicate with these folks to make sure at least they are operating on full information. Obviously, he is not expecting to change minds per se, but he wants to make sure they are operating on the full information. There has been a lot of heavy lifting tonight that hopefully we can deal with appropriately so that when actually getting to a point to discuss the project, everyone will have the same set of facts at least, then the Commission can do whatever you need to do. Mr. Amann said he knows the Commission has other items, and are about to run out of Zoom time.

Chairman Greene thanked Mr. Amann for his consideration. Chairman Greene would like to go to the Commission members for their thoughts.

Commissioner Weber stated he has a number of comments. First off, he appreciates Mr. Amann's offer to go and revisit the survey situation with the neighboring residents. Mr. Weber suggests he make sure it's documented, who you talk to and when.

Mr. Amann explained that the meetings they had were before Patrick Sloan's arrival and Jeff Goulet, the previous Community Planner, actually participated in those meetings from the Planning Division, so they predated that. They were documented and he can certainly pull that up because his credibility is the most important thing he has, especially when he hears people who want to try to put their hotel on Lotz Road accuse me of lying, so absolutely.

Commissioner Weber stated the second thing is, if the inclination of the Commission is to table this matter to allow Mr. Amann to revisit the survey with the residents, his strongest recommendation is to get the market feasibility study re-evaluated. Commissioner Weber stated he is really struggling with this report. He has a problem with the dates, and thinks the fact that this was based on data that was done in 2019 pre-COVID is an issue. He personally is not convinced that there is a need for two more hotels on Ford Road. He is not anti-hotel by any stretch, but does think there are better places. He stated he is not convinced by the data with the occupancy rates that are shown warrant an additional two hotels. Commissioner Weber would like to hear something from Hilton and Marriott as to why they feel the need is there, as opposed to the petitioner that was before this item who was trying to get a hotel on that property. There is open space on Michigan Avenue, but it's not our job to tell developers where to go. Mr. Weber stated, also, with the feasibility study they make a lot of reference to the auto industry here. They talk about the factories closing in Detroit and similar factors. Quite honestly, he does not see what that has to do with Canton. There are factories much closer to Canton; Wayne, Flat Rock, the Rouge, Dearborn, and Ann Arbor, the industry there is generated from the University of Michigan. He sees no mention of that, so he really has to question the validity of the market feasibility reports. Commissioner Weber said this really makes him struggle with the whole project.

Mr. Amann stated he appreciates Commissioner Weber's candid comments. They certainly will address it. Mr. Amann stated he is of the same mind as it relates to the auto plants and U of M. He has worked significantly on major development in downtown Ann Arbor and Detroit, so he understands. They will be updating that information in the process as well to make sure they deal with those concerns.

Commissioner Weber stated they need to address what the future looks like as far as COVID. He thinks they are asking the Commission to act on a lot of assumptions here. No one has a crystal ball as to what business and office space is going to look like here post-COVID. Commissioner Weber stated he knows

the commercial office market is really struggling right now, and are quite fearful of what that's going to look like going forward. He thinks that needs to be addressed as well in any kind of market feasibility analysis. Finally, with regard to neighbors, a number of people from Pickwick Village spoke too and Mr. Amann has made mention of the fact that they are over 400 feet from the development. The southern entrance of Pickwick Village is almost literally across the street from where the entrance is to your proposed hotels. From a traffic standpoint, Lilley Road is already congested, who knows what it's going to look like once Ford Road is expanded, so adding two hotels there he thinks is an issue. Commissioner Weber thinks more thought needs to be given to that and consideration needs to be given to the residents of Pickwick Village as well, especially the ones that are nearest Lilley Road. Even though legally you consider 300 feet, another 100 feet is not much further away. He thinks this is a valid concern.

Mr. Amann stated he has no problem meeting with them. The proposed entrance is actually south of theirs. Mr. Amann asked to point out two things. Everything he has heard from the Township is that the Ford Road boulevard is going to reduce traffic delays. We all hope that's true but we don't know. But as it relates to the traffic study, keep in mind that the contrast here is not just what the hotels will do, but it's very clear these hotels particularly will have significantly less traffic than what the zoning would allow for any other activity on this site. Mr. Amann stated that they would only need to come to the Planning Commission for site plan review if they want to do a shopping center.

Commissioner Weber stated he agrees with that. But traffic is not his overarching concern. His concern is that whether these hotels are needed here. One of the major criteria we have to evaluate and decide whether to approve a PDD based on need and market demand. Commissioner Weber stated that he does not think the applicant has met that criteria with the information presented.

Mr. Amann stated he has been doing PDD's in the area for 25 years and can say they have gone to the level and beyond of what you have seen on any market studies. There are PDD's in town that have not even had a community benefit attached to them.

Commissioner Weber stated he was not on those Planning Commissions, and he is stating what he thinks about the current PDD proposal. He is looking at two big box stores sitting on Ford Road, and granted, a box store is not the same as a hotel, but he is seeing two empty big box stores on Ford Road, and doesn't know what's going to happen with them. If the hotels don't succeed, Marriott and Hilton can very easily back out and the hotels can decline just like some other hotels we've seen over the years. Commissioner Weber is not saying that's going to happen, but you need to understand where the Commission is coming from too.

Mr. Amann stated that his point is that the Township's past practices and actual application of its Ordinance requirements are such that they wanted to make sure they met those. He stated he is not trying to belittle Mr. Weber's concerns, but hopes that decisions are made within the bounds of the Township's written Ordinance and its past practices and applications within those ordinances.

Commissioner Weber had one last comment to address to the residents of Willow Brook Subdivision. He does not know what the residents were told when they bought their homes, but as Mr. Sloan pointed out, this property is zoned C-2 and C-3. If the hotels don't go there, someone else could come in with a shopping center or some other development. He cannot say if it's any worse or better than a hotel development. Commissioner Weber said he is assuming the residents looked at the surrounding neighborhoods and the surrounding properties, not saying there is any fault on their part or on the part of Pulte, but the fact of the matter is this property is there, it is zoned C-2 and C-3 and probably some day it will get developed, whether it's this development or something else. The only other option is for someone else to buy it and rezone it.

But right now, the Commission has to review projects based on what the terms of the Zoning Ordinances are.

Commissioner Engel stated that tabling the item is fine, but what's going to change in 60 to 90 days? Are Hilton and Marriott going to decide, because of the residents' concerns, that they don't want to do this project?

Mr. Amann stated what he was trying to do was create a chance to meet with residents to go over the totality of the project. Hilton and Marriott have shown a greater commitment to this site in the last 3-4 months based on what they have seen coming out of COVID. As Chris Abbo explained, they would own the sites as a franchisee, so they would actually be operating them. Mr. Amann does not expect that to change at all, he is just trying to make sure that people have all the information.

Commissioner Engel stated then that Mr. Amann does not envision anything changing in the forecast based upon any meetings you may have with anybody.

Mr. Amann stated that is right. To the extent that they have heard their concerns, they have maximized what they can to move the hotels away from those residential areas and minimize the impact on residents. This is what he believes is the best-case scenario.

Commissioner Engel stated he would just rather take a vote on it tonight and move things along.

Commissioner Foster stated she has a number of concerns about this project, but wanted to say to Mr. Amann that she thanks him for his offer to table this proposal tonight and to have conversations with the residents. She has seen previously with developments that taking that time to have the conversation can ease some concerns, and at least make sure that everyone has the correct information about the development and the process. Commissioner Foster stated she is comfortable with tabling this tonight and re-evaluating it in the future.

Commissioner Acharya stated he has a few concerns about the data that was presented today. Particularly, the Canton Township population chart seems inaccurate. To show a chart like that, you should also specify where the data comes from. So just on the basis of the information provided and the significant concerns that the residents have, he is in favor of tabling and re-evaluating.

Commissioner Zuber had a couple questions about the data on the site plan. The description states there would be a total of 229 rooms with the Residence Inn Hotel having 111 and the Hilton Garden with 118. On the site plan we see the Hilton Garden with 118 and the Residence Inn with 119. So that is 8 more rooms than what is shown on the report, which would affect the parking. Maybe a typo there? Commissioner Zuber says she drives up and down Lilley Road every day, and she would strongly suggest that the Commission sees what can be done to try to widen Lilley a little bit farther north from this development if it were to go through. It gets really congested there at that corner and it might be nice to have a wider area, an additional southbound lane.

Commissioner Engel asked if that is something the Commission can address, or is that MDOT or Wayne County?

Mr. Sloan said that Wayne County has jurisdiction on Lilley Road.

Commissioner Weber asked if there is any plan to do anything on Lilley Road as there is on Haggerty as

part of the Ford Road project?

Mr. Sloan does not know the answer to that yet. He has not seen the final designs from MDOT. To answer the question regarding the number of units, he believes the color plan has a typo. On Sheet C3 (black & white sheet) it shows the split of 118 and 111, and their updated site plan shows as 118 and 111.

Commissioner Engel stated that every site plan they review, traffic is an issue. And we know that we can do very little about traffic. We can deny developers to come into Canton and try to force Wayne County and MDOT to make improvements, but that's not going to work. There is no way to force Wayne County or MDOT to do anything. If we want to tell developers that come that because of traffic we can't approve their project, then we will be at a standstill. Commissioner Engel cannot see how traffic can impact their decision.

Commissioner Zuber stated she was not suggesting that. She was just suggesting that if it's possible for the petitioner to look at widening Lilley Road. It would be nice, but it's not a necessity.

Commissioner Engel stated that they could ask them to do it, but he does not want to give any of the residents false hope that there is any way to think that the roads will be improved because of this project.

Commissioner Weber stated he does not think anyone is saying that. There is nothing we can do about the roads, but we can evaluate the use based on how much traffic it will add. We discussed that with a certain restaurant that was proposing to come to the Township. One of the major considerations then was about the traffic congestion that it would cause.

Mr. Amann apologized, but he just heard from his client. The client has asked him not to ask for a tabling of this item because they have done what they can with this project to make it as adaptable as possible for the residents and including the traffic improvements with MDOT and Wayne County. So, the client has asked that there not be a vote to table, but the Commission vote tonight on the project one way or the other tonight.

Chairman Greene asked to clarify that Mr. Amann is withdrawing his offer.

Mr. Amann stated he is. He apparently made an offer he was not authorized to make.

Commissioner Singh stated he has a few concerns, a few of which Mr. Weber has already addressed. A new study should be done based upon all the previous data being too old. Mr. Amann and the owner/franchisee also said that they are doing those and probably they are going to do this for this project too. Commissioner Singh stated he would like to see the results of these studies before we even vote on this. The main thing, after hearing all the residents, is that of privacy. It is a major issue when you have a four-story hotel in your back yard. On the tree density, one of the residents was saying that during the wintertime it is not enough and that he can see cars on Lilley Road. If it is proved it is needed and the project is going through, Mr. Singh would request Mr. Amann to sit with these homeowners and figure out a way that it can stay as private as it is right now. Mr. Singh stated that if he were living in these homes, that would be his concern too.

Commissioner Eggenberger said she appreciates all the people who came to speak. She wanted to reiterate what Doug Weber had said, it is tricky when you buy property you are not always told what the zoning is surrounding you, but is it something that the Commission has to follow. They have to look at the zoning and what is allowed, that is part of what their purview is. That being said, Ms. Eggenberger stated she is

not excited about a 4-story building here. It doesn't seem like something that fits in this spot. It would be a modification that the Commission would have to approve and that's not something that she feels comfortable with. She understands that they might get a strip mall in there, but she also heard the petitioners saying a lot of them are currently living behind Basement Burger Bar, which nobody seemed to be complaining about that.

Commissioner Okon stated he does not see this benefitting the community at all, not in this location. It is a 24-hour business, a sea of asphalt. He can see a lot of music in the parking lots and people celebrating etc., so does not see this is a good use for this area. He understands that the site is zoned commercial, but there are smaller types of developments than something like this. He does not want to see this tabled, but rather vote on it now and he will not be supporting it.

Commissioner Foster wished to speak again now that we apparently are not tabling this item. She shares Nancy Eggenberger's and Alan Okon's concern about 4-stories of the property. She wonders if there is anything more that can be done to put a barrier between the homes and the property to block some of the view. Ms. Foster does see value in having conversations between the petitioner and the residents, so she is sad to see that offer has been withdrawn. Ms. Foster stated she is not in favor of this application at this time, so if they are voting tonight, she will be opposing this project.

Chairman Greene stated that when he first looked through the packet on Thursday, he looked at this project from the standpoint of the project itself. The building is nicely laid out, and the elevations are quite nice. He has some objections to certain aspects of the height. The biggest issue he has is that the buildings are too tall and placed in the wrong location. Chairman Greene stated he used to live in that area when it was Laird Farm. He was close enough that he could smell and hear the animals. So, he knows if he lived in that same location today and looked at a 4-story building, it would be like a wart on an otherwise smooth skin. It is the wrong location from the standpoint of use, and honestly cannot understand why the Canton hotel group wants to put hotels so far away from the main thoroughfare of I-275. Chairman Greene stated he does not think it is good for them and definitely not good for Canton. The information in terms of surveys needs to be re-done because COVID has changed everything about our lives. The reasons for going to hotels is going to vary, it's going to change. Businesses are not necessarily sending representatives everywhere. There is going to be use but we do not know where it's going to come from. He thinks it's too early to say that the information supports having more hotels. One thing that concerns him a lot is the lack of contact with residents. He knows the project sponsor is not obligated to do this, but the Commission urges that. Chairman Greene said to Bryan Aman that Mr. Amann has been through these types of applications before so he knows the process. Chairman Greene stated he thinks they should be looking at their ordinances regarding communication in these special meetings to communicate to neighborhood associations. Chairman Greene stated he happens to know that almost every neighborhood in Canton has an association, so we need to be reaching out to association leaders. That was done on purpose a long time ago to make associations a very viable part of Canton residency. Those are his reasons. He did not hear anything positive tonight in terms of this project, not one thing to encourage him to support this project. He recommends denial of this project.

Chairman Greene stated it sounds like there are more members favoring denial than even tabling.

Motion by Weber, supported by Okon, to move to deny the Preliminary PDD approval for Canton Hotel Group on tax parcel nos.: 043-99-0004-000, 043-99-0017-000, and 043-99-0029-000, on the grounds that it is not demonstrated that there is a definite benefit provided in the community for this project, and most notably there is not a proven need or market demand for this project in this location or in the Township at this time.

Commissioner Zuber called the vote:

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

Nays: Engel

The proposal has been denied by roll call vote, 8-1.

Chairman Greene thanked Mr. Amann and thanked the audience for their participation.

Mr. Sloan stated just for clarification the Planning Commission's motion was a recommendation. That recommendation moves forward to the Township Board.

Chairman Greene stated again that this was a recommendation to the Township Board of Trustees for denial.

NEW BUSINESS-SITE PLANS & SPECIAL LAND USE

3. 047-SLU-6342 **BARBAT ORGANIZATION** – Consider Special Land Use and Site Plan on parcel no. 047-SPC-6460, 047-99-0006-001. Property is located north of Ford Road, between Haggerty Road and I-275.

Mr. Sloan stated that at its meeting on March 8, 2021, the Planning Commission recommended approval of a special land use for an automobile filling station with a fast-food restaurant. Since that time, the plans have been revised to account for the future right-of-way of Ford Road based on MDOT's proposed right-of-way plan for the boulevard project in this specific location. Additionally, the proposed drive-through has been removed.

Mr. Sloan further explained that this property is located at the northeast corner of Ford Road and Haggerty Road. There is a current gas station and convenience store on the site. As a result of the Planning Commission meeting on March 8th, MDOT has given its proposed right-of-way plan to the applicant. There was a question over some property ownership along Ford Road, and that issue has since been resolved. MDOT does not appear to be making a claim of ownership for that strip of property. MDOT has replied to the applicant in terms of the proposed impacts on Ford Road, what they are designing and what their proposed right-of-way is along that road. Based on the MDOT right-of-way, the applicant has revised the site plan to fit the ROW. As a result, the convenience store building has been pushed farther north and narrowed, and the proposed drive-thru lane has been removed. So, now there is not a drive-thru proposed on the plan, and there is an indoor fast food restaurant accessory to the building itself.

Proposed Special Land Use: Mr. Sloan stated the proposed gas station will have 12 pumps, which is the same number of pumps as the current station. The proposed convenience store/fast food restaurant building will be 4,200 sq. ft.

Schedule of Regulations: Based on the Schedule of Regulations, the proposed building has a front yard setback of 25.2 feet from Haggerty Road, which is less than the minimum setback of 50 feet required by the Central Business District Overlay. Section, 6.10(D) of the Ordinance allows a front yard setback to be reduced upon recommendation by the Planning Commission that a reduced setback would meet a desirable site design objective. Mr. Sloan stated the proposed setback on Haggerty Road would not necessarily need a variance, and it's a modification the Planning Commission can make under the CBD Overlay. So, the request from the applicant along Haggerty Road is 25.2 feet for a front yard setback.

Mr. Sloan stated the minimum side yard setback of 15 feet is required on the north side of the lot, and the applicant proposes a setback of 10 feet. The CBD does not allow the Planning Commission discretion on this one, so the Zoning Board of Appeals will have to consider a variance for that. The ZBA will consider a variance at its June 10th 2021 meeting for that proposed setback on the north side of the lot.

Mr. Sloan stated that the current lot size is less than one acre, as required for a gas station. The current lot size is 0.91 acres, but that is an existing nonconformity. The CBD Overlay requires sites to have 25% open space, and the proposed plans will increase the open space area from 15.7% to 26.7%. So that will be taken from a non-conformity to a conformity with the open space. The proposed building and canopy coverage of 21.3% exceeds the maximum building coverage of 10% per the ordinance. This is one where the Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) will also be considering a variance at its June 10th meeting.

Development Standards for Automobile Filling/Multi-Use Stations: Mr. Sloan stated the applicant proposes to comply with the standards. The development standard requires the building front yard setback of 85 feet, but the CBD supersedes that in terms of having lower setbacks.

Mr. Sloan stated the gas canopy is detached from the principal building and is designed to be architecturally compatible with the building, with the columns wrapped in brick. It has a short mansard roof structure on the perimeter. Mr. Sloan said staff recommended earlier in the process that they try to make that canopy a little more appealing (Mr. Sloan displayed the plan on screen). Staff will defer to the Planning Commission whether the canopy mansard roof is something that is desirable or something we should do away with. A fast-food restaurant has to be attached to the principal building for a multi-use station, and this one is.

Traffic Impact and Access Management: There are currently three (3) points of access: two (2) curb cuts on Haggerty Road and one (1) curb cut on Ford Road. There are no cross-connections to adjacent sites. The proposed site plan will have one access on Ford and one access Haggerty, and a cross connection north to a common access drive. There will be a proposed reciprocal easement agreement so that the gas station, as well as the hotels to the north, Tim Horton's, and Bob Evans, can use each other's access. This could relieve some of the traffic by dispersing it in other areas.

Mr. Sloan stated that the applicant has submitted a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and the Township's traffic engineering consultant (WadeTrim) has replied to the study. The consultant recommends that if the redevelopment is completed before the boulevard is completed, their recommendation is to make the Ford Road driveway a right-turn-in right-turn-out only, and to make the driveways at Haggerty Road operate in the same manor. That would eliminate any hazardous of left-hand turns onto Haggerty Road from the driveway as well as from Ford Road. Mr. Sloan says this may result in some drivers turning right and traveling west until they find a driveway to turn around, but it's an unavoidable temporary condition until the boulevard is completed. As a result, the applicant proposes "No Left Turn" signs at the exits at Ford Road and Haggerty Road, as well as stop signs and stop bars. There is not as much of a concern with the boulevard being constructed. The major concern is that there is an anticipated detrimental effect on traffic operations if it is developed before the boulevard.

Parking: Mr. Sloan explained that there are 37 spaces proposed and 44 spaces are required. The applicants are requesting a modification to reduce seven (7) spaces based on auto filling multi-use stations of similar size as well as the Parking Generation of the Institution of Transportation Engineers. The average peak demand for similar size convenience store/gas station is less than 37 spaces. Therefore, staff believes that 37 spaces are sufficient for the use.

Fuel Unloading: Mr. Sloan stated there is a fuel loading area located east of the canopy. The site plan

proposes an 8:00am to 5:00pm delivery window. The loading area is illustrated approximately 64 feet, and the loading space required in the Zoning Ordinance is 50 feet, so it is longer than necessary. Sheet C-4 illustrates the fuel truck length of just over 50 feet. Based on those dimensions, that fuel truck would fit in there and still allow to pass through.

Architecture: Mr. Sloan stated the architecture of the building has at least 50% of the face brick as required by the Zoning Ordinance.

Landscaping, Screening, and Tree Preservation: The landscape plan is designed to comply with the Zoning Ordinance. There is a proposed modification to have the landscape buffer along Ford Road to be 20 feet, which is 5 feet less than the minimum depth of 25 feet. This will be a recurring issue along the corridor when the boulevard is being constructed. Mr. Sloan said the applicants have applied for a variance from the front yard landscape buffer requirement to reduce from 25 to 20 feet.

Sidewalks: Mr. Sloan said there are sidewalks proposed along Ford and Haggerty as well as a sidewalk from Haggerty Road to the proposed building on the site.

Lighting: Mr. Sloan stated there is lighting throughout the site as well as light fixtures on either side of each entrance.

Signage: Signage will be under the purview of the of the Building & Inspections Division. There is a ground sign proposed.

Dumpster Enclosure: The dumpster enclosure illustrated on the plans on the northeast side of the site is designed to comply with the Zoning Ordinance.

Special Land Use Review Standards: Mr. Sloan stated that based on the standards in the review, staff finds that the proposed automobile filling/multi-use station meets the Special Land Use criteria of Section 27.03(C) of the Zoning Ordinance. Mr. Sloan read some of the criteria:

- The proposed use is compatible with adjacent nonresidential land uses.
- The proposed use will be accessible to Ford Road and Haggerty Road as well as an internal access drive to north, subject to providing the reciprocal easement agreement as well as MDOT and Wayne County approval of the site.
- If MDOT does not object to the proposed site layout or otherwise cause the site or layout to change, then the proposed use would be compatible with proposed designs and accessibility of the adjacent areas.
- The proposed uses will enhance the surrounding environment by increasing compliance with the Zoning Ordinance in many areas, planning for MDOT's proposed future right-of-way along Ford Road, creating a new access to the north, and closing a curb cut at Haggerty Road.
- The proposed use is not expected to unreasonably interfere with or discourage the appropriate development and use of adjacent land and buildings.
- The land use will not be adjacent to or surrounding a residential land use.

Mr. Sloan stated that these are staff's conclusions in terms of most of the major special land use criteria. Their recommendation is the approval of the Special Land Use and site plan, subject to approval of variances by the Zoning Board of Appeals, approval of the proposed access easement to the north, and approval by all state, county, and municipal agencies.

Commissioner Weber stated he really would like to see this corner cleaned up. He asked if the drawing is accurate, that this will be a Shell Station now?

Mr. Sloan responded he does not have an official name.

Commissioner Weber stated his biggest concern is the access in and out. He is worried about the crossing, if someone makes a left turn onto Ford Road out of that entrance, or vice versa onto Haggerty, he would definitely want to make sure that they get that reciprocal easement in place for the entry on the north side of the property. Commissioner Weber knows they talked a lot about having “no left turn” signs the last time they reviewed this. But unless the Canton Police are going to sit there and enforce that 24-7, he does not know how heavily enforced that will be. Mr. Weber stated that the only other alternative he can think of is, he has seen some entrances with the little islands that force you to turn. You can go in, but you cannot go out that way. Otherwise, he does not have any major objection to this development.

Commissioner Engel stated he is fine with the project as it is.

Commissioner Zuber had a couple concerns. One being, she is still not sure about the mansard roof on the pump canopy. The gray timberline GAF shingles are not particularly pretty, and she just does not know if there is a need for the mansard part of that roof. She would also like to think of the building as more of a 3D entity instead of just a façade on Ford and Haggerty. She thinks that if there is going to be a cross access agreement, a reciprocal agreement with the neighbor to the north, it would be nice if the building did not look like the back end of a building to the north and to the east. It would be nice for that to be a little more in keeping with the front on Ford Road.

Chairman Greene asked of Commissioner Zuber as an architect, the mansard roof gives it that more homey type of an appearance which may not be appropriate for Ford Road. But it does soften the appearance of that canopy. He asked if she is saying she would prefer just a plain facing for that?

Commissioner Zuber stated that personally, yes. She thinks that it looks a bit hokey, but that is her opinion as an architect.

Chairman Greene stated he would agree on the north and the east side. They need to do something to make that look nicer. The non-business side does not have to look like an alley side. Chairman Greene stated that if they approve this, he would like to see the applicant work with staff and make this part of the project and make this a little bit more interesting. Chairman Greene said this is going to be seen, and he doesn't want to be like any other community that just lets a plain brick wall go.

Commissioner Acharya stated he has no concerns with the project.

Commissioner Eggenberger stated she is also fine with this. She did not like the plan before with the drive-thru, so she is thrilled to see the changes.

Commissioner Foster stated she appreciates the updates to the plan and is happy with this moving forward.

Commissioner Okon stated he agrees with the changes. He is glad the drive-thru is gone and it's just a carryout. He is fine with the project.

Commissioner Singh stated he has no issues. The only issue before was the left turn on Ford Road but thinks with the Ford Road boulevard, that will be taken care of. He is okay with the project.

Chairman Greene stated the only questions he has is regarding parking. It may not be a big issue, but the loss of seven parking spaces in a situation where they are landlocked, does anybody see a problem with

that? If, for whatever reason, all of those spots are filled, people will have no place to park, yet they will come in and try to park in some weird location near site. Is that not a concern?

Commissioner Weber asked what the restaurant will be.

Mr. Sloan stated they do not know what the franchisee or restaurant will be.

Commissioner Weber stated he understands Chairman Greene's concern,

Chairman Greene said it may not be a legitimate concern, because a lot of times the parking lot requirements on the books might be overkill, so losing seven spaces may not be a big deal in a situation where people are coming and going this quickly. He stated he is actually more concerned with the flow. He does not see anybody going up to the corner to turn right and go into the other facilities to the north of them. He sees them using that driveway to go straight through to the north. He does not see them turning on Haggerty at all. It may not be a problem, but it might be an unintended consequence of a design like this. Otherwise, this is a good project, he wants to see the site cleaned up.

Mr. Sloan displayed an aerial view of the area to illustrate. There is an existing drive that goes northward from Ford into the hotels etc. He stated he is hopeful that those that are coming westbound will continue to use that.

There were no other comments from the Commission members.

Motion by Weber, supported by Eggenberger, to move to recommend approval of the special land use for an Automobile Filling/Multi-Use Station on parcel no. 71-047-99-0006-001 at 41350 Ford Road, subject to approval of variances by the Zoning Board of Appeals and approval of the proposed access easement to the north; and further, I move to recommend approval of the site plan for an Automobile Filling/Multi-Use Station on parcel no. 71-047-99-0006-001 at 41350 Ford Road, including a modification to reduce the required front yard setback of the building to 25.2 feet from Haggerty Road pursuant to Section 6.10(D), footnote (e) of the Zoning Ordinance, subject to approval of variances by the Zoning Board of Appeals, approval of the proposed access easement to the north, and approval by all state, county, and municipal agencies.

Mr. Sloan asked if the Commission wanted to remove the mansard roof for the canopy. There was discussion regarding that.

Commissioner Zuber said she was the only one who had any concerns with it.

Commissioner Weber stated he is fine with it.

Commissioner Zuber stated she is not crazy about the mansard roof in general, but feels in this particular case it is an unnecessary piece on top of a perfectly good flat roof structure.

Chairman Greene stated that the mansard roof is not going on the building either, so there is no continuity in terms of the design. There is a good case for leaving it off.

There were no objections to the mansard roof from the other Commissioners.

Mr. Sloan stated that this was something that, during the review, staff has asked for some designs to make the canopy look a little better. This is what they came up with. Does the Commission want to leave it up to the applicant whether they keep it not?

Chairman Greene asked if this roof would hide the automatic firefighting equipment?

Mr. Sloan stated probably not.

Chairman Greene stated he would be okay with leaving it in their hands.

Commissioner Weber amended his motion to not require the mansard roof on the canopy and to leave it to the discretion of the applicant in working with Planning Staff to come up with a suitable solution.

Amended Motion:

Motion by Weber, supported by Eggenberger, to move to recommend approval of the special land use for an Automobile Filling/Multi-Use Station on parcel no. 71-047-99-0006-001 at 41350 Ford Road, subject to approval of variances by the Zoning Board of Appeals and approval of the proposed access easement to the north; and further, I move to recommend approval of the site plan for an Automobile Filling/Multi-Use Station on parcel no. 71-047-99-0006-001 at 41350 Ford Road, including a modification to reduce the required front yard setback of the building to 25.2 feet from Haggerty Road pursuant to Section 6.10(D), footnote (e) of the Zoning Ordinance, subject to approval of variances by the Zoning Board of Appeals, approval of the proposed access easement to the north, and approval by all state, county, and municipal agencies. And further move to not require the mansard roof on the canopy and to leave it to the discretion of the applicant in working with Planning Staff to come up with a suitable solution.

Commissioner Zuber called the vote:

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

Nays: Zuber

Motion passed by roll call vote, 8-1.

4. 005-DIR-6637 **AERIAL ASSETS** – Consider Developer Instigated Revision (Architectural Modifications) on parcel no. 005-99-0007-700. Property is located east of Lilley Road and north of Warren Road.

Mr. Sloan stated the applicant has proposed a modification to an industrial building. On August 5, 2019, the Planning Commission recommended approval of a Special Land Use for an Airport-Related Business for McMahon Helicopter Service at the subject location. The Township Board approved the Special Land Use on August 27, 2019. Subsequently, there was a site plan prepared and approved on January 10, 2020. Since that time, the owner has changed the designers of the project, and revised the plans. The plan revisions themselves can be reviewed by Staff because the changes are minor. However, one of the changes that is not minor that must be considered by the Planning Commission is a change to the architectural elevations. The building architecture Section 26.06 of the Zoning Ordinance requires that an industrial district building may have a maximum metal wall material of 50%, and the proposed building will have 57% (42% is metal siding & 15% is metal doors); therefore, it is increased by the fact that there are large hangar doors, which are metal. Also, the Ordinance requires that the office portion of an industrial building include 75% masonry and the proposed office portion of the building has 64% masonry with the remaining materials being metal siding and glazing. Mr. Sloan stated that 26.06, footnote h of the Zoning Ordinance allows the Planning Commission to approve modifications to the building material standards to achieve a specific architectural objective as demonstrated by the project sponsor. The architectural elevations are on Sheet A3-01, and the architect has provided a letter describing the request.

Mr. Sloan stated that Staff's recommendation is that, while compliance with the architectural standards is attainable for the overall metal on the building and masonry on the office portion of the building, the large hangar doors which increase the metal percentage are on the east side of the building, and additional masonry for the office portion would result in the loss of windows. If the proposed architectural elevations are acceptable to the Planning Commission, Staff would recommend approval of the architectural modifications pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance.

All Commission members stated they have no issues with this project.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Acharya to move to approve the request for architectural modifications to the proposed building and office portion of the building on parcel nos. 71-005-99-0006-000 and 71-005-99-0007-000 as requested by the applicant on Sheet A3-01.

Commissioner Zuber called the vote:

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

Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 9-0.

5. 133-DIR-6729 **TACO BELL** – Consider Developer Instigated Revision (Exterior Modifications) on parcel no. 133-02-0075-306. Property is located north of Michigan Avenue and east of Geddes Road and Canton Center Road intersection.

Mr. Sloan stated the Taco Bell on Michigan Avenue proposes exterior renovations to the restaurant and site, including the removal of the cupola over the Kentucky Fried Chicken entrance. According to the applicants, KFC is being removed from this location and Taco Bell will occupy the entire building. Because of the removal of the cupola, Staff felt this should be referred to the Planning Commission to determine the architectural modification. Staff recommends approval because it would be consistent with the Taco Bell building.

Mr. Sloan stated Staff just has a few recommendations in terms of replacing some directional signage on the site as opposed to removing all of it. Staff recommends the site comply with the approved 2006 landscape plan, and that all the lighting on the site comply with the Ordinance.

All Commissioner members stated they are fine with these changes.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Acharya to move to approve the site plan for Taco Bell on tax parcel no. 71-133-02-0075-306, subject to the following conditions:

- 1) Directional signage on the site shall be replaced rather than removed as recommended by staff.
- 2) The site shall comply with the approved 2006 landscape plan, and changes must comply with the Zoning Ordinance.
- 3) All lighting on the site shall comply with Section 2.13 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Zuber called the vote:

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

Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 9-0.

6. 052-SPB-6508 **CHERRY HILL PRESERVE CONDOMINIUMS** – Consider Site Plan 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.

Mr. Sloan stated the project sponsor proposes to construct twelve (12) 2-unit attached residential buildings on the site which is zoned R-4. The R-4 Zoning allows 2-unit attached residences via Special Land Use. The Planning Commission recommended approval of the Special Land Use on December 7, 2020, and the Township Board approved the Special Land Use on January 12, 2021. The proposed site plan is consistent with the Special Land Use plan.

Mr. Sloan explained the site is zoned R-4 Single Family Residential, and is on 7.71 acres. The site meets the requirements for the setback from Cherry Hill Rd. as well as the 20-foot setback from the internal roads. The minimum setbacks are maintained at 35 feet, side yard setbacks are maintained at 10 feet as well as the building separation distances. The minimum floor area is 1,300 square feet and the maximum building length is under 100 feet. It meets the height requirements as well. On November 12th 2020 the site got variances for wetland setbacks of encroachments into the 25-foot required wetland setbacks. About ¾ of the existing trees will be preserved and the applicant proposes to mitigate remove trees in accordance with Article 5A of the Zoning Ordinance. The site will have internal sidewalks on both sides (4 feet in width) pursuant to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for 2-unit attached buildings. The parking standards will be a matter of having 2-car garages as well as driveway to park cars. The road is also 27 feet wide, so there will be on-street parking on one side.

Architecture. The architecture of the buildings will be 50% masonry and required offsets in the rear.

Lighting. The lighting will meet the Zoning Ordinance. It will have two (2) 12-foot high decorative lights are located at the entrance.

Sign. A monument entrance sign is proposed at the front which will be required to be reviewed by Building & Inspection Services.

Master Deed and Bylaws: The Master Deed and Bylaws are included, and only minor modifications are required for section references as well as references to the approved site plan and Zoning Ordinance.

Mr. Sloan stated that, because it is consistent with the Special Land Use Plan, Staff's recommendation is to approve the Cherry Hill Preserve site plan subject to any necessary revisions to the landscape plan, Master Deed, and Bylaws to comply with the Zoning Ordinance.

Commissioner Weber asked when would this be going into construction.

Mr. Bruce Michael stated they would start construction as soon as they obtain all the final approvals in Engineering and Permits. They have already received the wetland fill permit from EGLE, so that would probably be the longest lead item. They hope to start this fall if they could.

Commissioner Engel had no comments.

Commissioner Acharya had no comments.

Commissioner Eggenberger had a question for Commissioner Zuber. From an architectural viewpoint, is there any way to make the roof less big? Maybe a dormer?

Commissioner Zuber stated there is a lot of roof. She does not know of anything easy to do besides changing the floor plans, which are pretty basic as they are.

Chairman Greene asked if she could see a fake dormer right over the middle section somehow?

Commissioner Zuber said probably over the front porch, that would be nice, if looking at the front elevation.

Chairman Greene asked if that would be done on both units. The rendering is probably exaggerated in this view. Looking at the straight-on drawing it doesn't look as bad. But it still needs something in that center part. What if they were to put something else with a peak? But if you do it on one, would you need to do it on the other in the same location. They are basically identical.

Commissioner Zuber stated she thinks putting something over the porches would help, a dormer. But with the back elevations, it's a shame that the bathrooms are at the back and they don't want to put windows in the bathrooms.

Chairman Greene thinks they will probably each have decks back there. The deck configuration would change what that looks like.

Commissioner Zuber stated there is an optional patio shown on the plan and it doesn't go behind the bathrooms.

Chairman Greene stated he is not as concerned about the rear as his is at the front. Does it need a little fake dormer above the porch?

Commissioner Zuber agreed that it does.

Mr. Sloan stated that can be part of the motion as long as it is specific. In working with the applicant on this, there are a number of different unit models and options that come with the base model. Anything that can specify the requirement will help.

Chairman Greene stated then that this could be a "work with Staff" measure. Chairman Greene added that he likes the idea of the cultured stone veneer as opposed to the brick, that's a little change in pace. He stated again that he would like to see something added to the motion for a small fake dormer somewhere over the porch.

Commissioner Zuber stated maybe not such a small one.

Chairman Greene stated that will be a "work with Staff" type of thing. Perhaps Staff could get in touch with Dawn Zuber for preliminaries if they present them.

Mr. Sloan confirmed that the Commission is asking for dormers over the front porches. He stated they can work with that.

Motion by Zuber, supported by Acharya, to move to recommend approval of the Cherry Hill Preserve site plan for twelve (12) 2-unit attached residential buildings on parcel nos. 71-052-99-0042-000, 71-052-99-0044-001, and 71-052-99-0044-002, subject to any necessary revisions to the landscape plan, Master Deed, and Bylaws to comply with the Zoning Ordinance, and subject to adding some dormers over the front porches.

Chairman Greene had a question for the project sponsor. There are 24 families who will live on this one street and you can only park on one side. What happens if a couple units have a big party, where will people

park?

Mr. Michael stated that every unit has two parking spaces inside of the garage and then two more spaces that will be in the driveway, so essentially four spaces per unit are available. And then some additional parking on one side of the street. That should accommodate most of what they are looking for.

Chairman Greene stated there is no parking on Cherry Hill Rd., correct?

Mr. Michael stated no, they certainly would not expect anyone to park there.

Commissioner Zuber called the vote:

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

Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 9-0.

Commissioner Weber asked if Mr. Sloan had any word on what caused the fire at the barn.

Mr. Sloan stated he has not heard anything official on that. The last he heard, there was still an investigation.

NEW BUSINESS – STAFF REFERRAL

7. 072-SFP-6739 **THE MEADOWS OF CHERRY HILL** – Refer review of Final Site Plan to staff for approval on parcel nos. 072-99-0005-704 & 072-99-0009-002. Property is located west of Ridge Road, between Saltz Road and Cherry Hill Road.

025-SPP-4232 **RIDGE CREEK** – Refer review of Reapproval of Preliminary Site Plan to staff for approval on parcel no. 025-99-0004-701. Property is located west of Ridge Road, between Warren Road and Hanford Road.

Motion Zuber, supported by Foster, to refer Item #7 to Staff. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 9-0.

NEW BUSINESS-SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR JULY 12, 2021

8. 010-PDDA-6754 **HAVENS ORTHODONTICS** – Set public hearing for review of PDD Amendment for parcel nos. 010-99-0013-000 & 010-99-0014-000. Property is located east of Canton Center Road, between Joy Road and Sheldon Road.

115-SLU-6714 **KAMILLIA BAGLEY DAYCARE** – Set public hearing for review of Special Land Use for a Group Child Care Home for parcel no. 115-02-0053-000. Property is located north of Geddes Road, between Beck Road and Denton Road.

024-RZ-6682 **ANDERSON** – Set public hearing for review of Rezoning for parcel no. 043-99-0010-000. Property is located north of Warren Road, between Ridge Road and Napier Road.

062-PDP-6757 **MONARK GROVE CANTON** – Set public hearing for review of Preliminary PDD (major) for 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 and Beck Roads.

Motion Zuber, supported by Weber to set the Public Hearing for July 12, 2021. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 9-0.

ADJOURN

Motion by Zuber, supported by Eggenberger to adjourn the meeting. Motion passed unanimously by roll call vote, 9-0. Meeting adjourned at. (11:08pm)

Melanie A. Sherwood
Recording Secretary