

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF NORTHVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
October 30, 2018**

DATE: October 30, 2018
TIME: 7:00 PM
PLACE: Northville Township Hall
44405 Six Mile Road

APPROVED: January 29, 2019

CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 PM

ROLL CALL:

Present: Richard Allen, Lisa Anderson, Timothy Guerriero, Eric Lark, George McCarthy,
Jayne Watson, Tim Zawodny

Excused: None

Staff: Jennifer Frey, Township Planner
Tom Casari, Department of Public Services Director

Approval of Minutes:

Planning Commission – August 28, 2018

MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy, to approve the August 28, 2018 Planning Commission minutes as published.

Voice vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

Other Minutes:

Zoning Board of Appeals – September 19, 2018
Board of Trustees Regular – August 16, 2018
Board of Trustees Regular – September 20, 2018

MOTION by Allen, support by Anderson, to receive and file the minutes from the Zoning Board of Appeals September 19, 2018 meeting and the August 16, 2018 and September 20, 2018 Board of Trustees Regular meetings.

Voice vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

Correspondence: None.

Brief Public Comments:

Chair Lark announced that tonight would be Richard Allen's last meeting, after 34+ years on the Planning Commission. Chair Lark thanked Commissioner Allen for his long service, and read the following Proclamation:

Charter Township of Northville
Proclamation

- WHEREAS, Richard Allen was first appointed to the Planning Commission on December 13, 1984 and has been re-appointed 12 times – amounting to a continuous term on the commission of 34 years and attending 340 planning commission meetings;
- WHEREAS, Richard Allen served as chair and vice chair of the commission throughout his tenure; as well as numerous sub-committees;
- WHEREAS, Approved over 306 site plans for development projects in the township ranging from the 896 acre redevelopment of the Wayne County Training Center property into the Northville Golf Club mixed use Planned Unit Development featuring the golf course designed by Arnold Palmer to small parking lot expansions, façade modifications and requests for additional signs;
- WHEREAS, Richard Allen approved thousands of residential lots/units during his time on the planning commission;
- WHEREAS, Richard Allen was involved in many discussions about zoning ordinance standards that are reflected in today's current ordinance and each of the site plans that were approved during his time on the Planning Commission;
- WHEREAS, Richard Allen was awarded the Helen S. Willis Outstanding Planning Commissioner award by the Michigan Society of Planning at their annual conference in October 2001;
- WHEREAS, Richard Allen has witnessed and shaped the evolution of the township from a rural community in the 1980's to a nearly developed township with a population of almost 30,000 residents;

NOW THEREFORE, I, Robert R. Nix II, Supervisor of Charter Township of Northville, commend the contributions of Richard Allen on behalf of the Township and thank him for his 34 years of service to the community and encourage the citizens to join me in this special observance.

Township Supervisor
Robert R. Nix II

Planning Commissioners Anderson and McCarthy, as well as Township Planner Frey, thanked Commissioner Allen for his insights and breadth of experience, which would be sorely missed.

New Business

1. **JSKPR18-0008** Mission BBQ
Representative: Kevin Deters, Metro Detroit Signs
Location: 20420 Haggerty Road (3 Generations Plaza)
Request: 2nd Wall Sign, Rear of Building
Action: Approve, Approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny

Referencing her September 28, 2018 review letter, Township Planner Frey gave the background for this application for a 2nd wall sign at the rear (south side) of the building at 20420 Haggerty Road (3 Generations Plaza). Mission BBQ was occupying a portion of the former Aubries Pizza location at 8 Mile and Haggerty.

The Planning Commission had the discretion to allow a second wall sign in locations where a non-residential building was oriented such that more than one side of the building could be seen from a road, provided the sign was less than 60% of the maximum sign area permitted on the south elevation.

Based on the 60% requirement noted above, the maximum size for a second sign on the south elevation was 43.20 square feet. The proposed sign was 32.46 square feet in size.

Paul Deters, Metro Detroit Signs, 11444 Kaltz Avenue, Warren, MI was present on behalf of this application. Richard Malec, Director of Operations, Mission BBQ, was also present.

Mr. Deters said the location had been open for a short time and Mission BBQ was struggling with identification; with the trees it was difficult to see the front of the location. For traffic headed northbound on Haggerty Road, the angle of the monument sign was such that a driver was past the building before any branding for Mission BBQ was visible. The second sign would be a significant improvement to this situation.

Commissioner Allen agreed that a sign on the south side of the building was appropriate, particularly with the bend in the road for drivers heading north. Mission BBQ needed the branding visibility, and he supported the request. Commissioner Anderson agreed.

Chair Lark asked if any public was present this evening to comment on this application. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Lark brought the matter back to the Commission.

MOTION by Allen, support by Guerriero, in the matter of JSKPR18-0008, Mission BBQ, 20420 Haggerty Road, that the Planning Commission approve the site plan as submitted for a 2nd wall sign on the rear of the building.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Allen, Anderson, Guerriero, Lark, Watson, Zawodny
Nays: McCarthy

Motion approved 6-1 (McCarthy opposed).

- 2. JSPR18-0006** Northville Park Place, Office Building
Representative: David Johns, REIS Northville LLC
Location: 10 acres, vacant land, Traditions Drive, East of 7 Mile Road entrance
Request: Site Plan Approval – New Office Building
Action: Approve, Approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny

Referring to her October 15, 2018 review letter, Township Planner Frey gave the background for this site plan for a new office building on 10 acres of vacant land on Traditions Drive, east of the 7 Mile Road entrance.

The proposal for the 10.22 acre site included a 110,165 square foot corporate office headquarters building and its associated site improvements. The storm water detention pond for the subject site would be located on the parcel to the east. Traditions Drive would be extended to the west and connect at 7 Mile and Pierson. A traffic signal was proposed at the intersection of 7 Mile and Traditions/Pierson. Access to the site would be from Traditions Drive. The pathway along 7 Mile would be completed between Cornerstone Drive and Traditions Drive. The sidewalk would be continued along the north side of Traditions Drive to 7 Mile. The sidewalk on the south side of Traditions Drive would be completed as the properties on the south side of the road were developed. The 48-foot tall, 3-story building complied with the 50-foot maximum height permitted by the consent judgement. Water and sewer connection fees would be paid upfront for this project, as opposed to waiting for the Brownfield to pay the Township back for the fees, which could take several years.

The proposed detention pond was set back 75 feet from the 7 Mile Road right-of-way at the east end of the site. The pond setback increased to 90 feet where the existing vegetation began. In exchange for retaining the natural vegetation for the balance of the 7 Mile Road frontage between Cornerstone Drive and Pierson Road, the applicant was requesting the detention pond to be located as shown. Allowing the detention pond to be constructed as proposed would also retain a 3-acre parcel on the south side of the pond for future development.

The consent judgement identified the provision for a water feature at the corner of 7 Mile and Haggerty and a 125-foot "buffer area" along 7 Mile Road from Haggerty to Pierson. The term "buffer area" was not defined in the consent judgment or in the zoning ordinance. The zoning ordinance defined similar terms such as "buffer zone," "greenbelt," and "setbacks," all of which permitted landscaping but did not permit the construction of site improvements in those areas.

The applicant was requesting to continue the existing development pattern along 7 Mile Road, in return maintaining the natural buffer for the majority of the 7 Mile Road frontage all the way to Pierson.

The Township's intent was to preserve the existing vegetation along 7 Mile as a "natural buffer." The notes on sheets L-1 and L-1.2 should be changed to state the existing vegetative buffer (trees, shrubs and understory plant material) should be preserved, except selective removal of dead trees and plant material may be authorized by the Township after a site inspection.

In order to accommodate the required pathway along 7 Mile as shown, a bit of grading encroaching into the 125 foot buffer area was required. In order to minimize the amount of encroachment into the buffer, a portion of retaining wall and/or increasing the slope of the pathway should be explored.

Additional landscape should be provided near the northeast corner of the detention pond, to better fill in the area where there was not any existing vegetation.

Regarding parking, the ordinance allowed parking spaces to be determined two ways: 1) by "usable floor area" (UFA) which was calculated as 85% of the gross floor area, or 2) from a floor plan that supported the usable floor area as defined in the zoning ordinance.

The proposed plan identified 335 parking spaces as being required for the site, based on using 100,317 square feet UFA. Using the 85% of the total building size method, 312 parking spaces would be required. It appeared the applicant elected to use the actual UFA based on the floor plan; this was verified.

401 parking spaces were provided, 66 more than the number the applicant had identified as being required and 89 more than required by using 85% of the total floor area. The note in the site data table indicated the total number of parking spaces shown was what the tenant desired based on a 400-person office staff as experienced at their current facility. In order to justify the additional parking spaces being constructed now, rather than banking the spaces and constructing them if needed in the future, the applicant should provide information at the meeting to support the request for additional parking.

Four parking spaces for electric vehicles were provided near the southwest corner of the building.

Regarding landscaping, the shrubs that were specified as 24 inches tall should be increased to 30 inches, or additional shrubs should be provided.

A wildflower seed mixture should be considered for the areas where grading for the bike path would encroach into the 125-foot buffer along 7 Mile. The wildflowers would create a visual enhancement, a transition from the pathway to the natural vegetation, and would be easier to maintain than grass on the sloped area.

Regarding building elevations, each of the individual facades complied with the requirements for amounts of masonry, non-masonry and windows. A combination of different color bricks and architectural metal panels were proposed. The brick materials should be specified as full brick, to be consistent with what had been required for other recent projects in the Township.

The applicant's representative clarified that the color of the shade canopies at the building entrance and courtyard area would be blue.

The October 17, 2018 lighting review (Stantec) listed 6 outstanding issues that needed to be resolved in order for the plan to comply with Township lighting requirements.

The October 17, 2018 traffic engineer's review (Progressive AE) suggested minor modifications to the site circulation design to help accommodate larger vehicles.

The October 22, 2018 Fire Department review called out some notations that would need to be provided on a revised site plan.

The October 11, 2018 engineer's review pointed out that: 1) a land division would be required to create the lot as shown on the site plan, 2) An agreement for cross access would be required for the storm water management system, and 3) The site plan must be approved based on the access (ring road) and utilities being constructed and accepted by the Township.

Dave Johns, Shostak Brothers, representing REIS Northville, LLC, 117800 Laurel Park Drive North, Suite 200C, Livonia MI was present on behalf of this application. Michael Kennedy, Lindhout Associates Architects, 10465 Citation Drive, Brighton, MI was also present, as were several other members of the development team.

Mr. Johns said he felt they could resolve and comply with all issues called out in the review letters. They were working with Wayne County regarding the grading in the area of the bike path in order to minimize disruption of the existing vegetation there.

Regarding landscaping around the detention pond area, they were supplementing the area with many more trees.

Mr. Johns said they would like to fast track this project. They were hoping to get started very quickly on construction, and were hoping for occupancy the first quarter of 2020.

Mr. Kennedy described the building materials, which included 3 kinds of brick: a large dark brick, a light tan brick, and a light brown brick. A white metal panel surrounded the windows, and a green accent metal panel would be placed on some of the corners and entranceways of the building. A clear anodized metal frame was used with the insulated glass. Underneath the soffit of the canopies was an aluminum product that had a wood-grain appearance.

Mr. Kennedy presented a video clip showing a computerized model of the site. The clip showed the building with its associated parking, Traditions Drive had been extended to 7 Mile Road. Mr. Kennedy pointed out existing trees and vegetation that had been left intact, the sidewalk, and the new 12-foot to 15-foot high trees planted around the detention pond. He represented the building would not actually be visible from 7 Mile Road until the intersection of Cornerstone Drive.

The building had a 2-story hall, with an exterior plaza in front. Forty nine parking spaces were provided for visitors to accommodate people attending meetings and training in the building.

Mr. Kennedy described the building's elevations, pointing out where the various materials were used in the design.

Commissioner McCarthy asked if the new detention pond would be sized adequately to take care of the undeveloped parcel to the south.

Mr. Johns said the new detention pond served this headquarters site and the ring road. The vacant 3-acre site was already served by an existing pond on the development further east. This was required during the phased development of this site, which occurred in this order:

1. Clearing and land balancing of the site.
2. U of M development
3. Retail development with 4 outlot buildings, 2 along Haggerty and 2 along 7 Mile
4. Granite City
5. Trader Joe's

Chair Lark asked about the angle of the proposed building. Mr. Kennedy said the placement on a 30-degree angle provided room for the plaza area, for loading, allowed deeper green areas, and also helped with solar heat gain from the western sun. The result was a visually exciting building.

Commissioner Anderson asked about the 125-foot buffer area. Would there be a conservation easement? Mr. Johns explained that the 125-foot buffer was only from the north right-of-way to the back of the parking area. Other than the grading necessary for the bike path, the existing vegetation would not be disturbed, except to remove anything that might constitute a safety issue. As already mentioned, trees were being added to the northeast corner around the detention pond.

The 125-foot buffer was the widest area north of the building; the buffer dropped to 75 feet around the detention pond. Seventy nine trees and 299 shrubs would be planted around the pond. The total planting for the entire site would be 423 trees and 720 shrubs; this would be combined with the buffer of existing vegetation that would be maintained. The landscaping met or exceeded ordinance requirements.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the applicants would accept as a condition of an approving motion maintaining the buffer as described. Mr. Johns said he would have no objection as they were already required to maintain it as a condition of site plan approval.

Township Planner Frey said any approving motion should require that the notes on sheets L-1 and L-1.2 should be changed to state the existing vegetative buffer (trees, shrubs and understory plant material) should be preserved, except for selective removal of dead trees and plant material that might be authorized by the Township after a site inspection.

In response to a question from Commissioner Zawodny, Mr. Johns said the chain link fence would be removed. Commissioner Zawodny complimented Mr. Johns on the serpentine pathway, and suggested that perhaps at each end of the path there might be some very careful selective thinning. Mr. Johns said they could do that and also plant the wildflower mix as requested.

Commissioner Zawodny addressed the tree plantings along 7 Mile Road and where the grading occurred. He suggested, if possible, to cluster the trees and/or modify their spacing,

as well as mix up the species. That type of configuration would blend more with the existing natural setting of the site and help re-naturalize the area.

Commissioner Zawodny appreciated the irregular shape of the pond, which helped integrate the pond with the natural landscape. He suggested adding a few more trees on the eastern tip of the woodland. In a more natural setting, canopies would be intermingled.

Township Planner Frey said she had not yet reviewed the tree plantings by the pond. A condition might be added to suggest or require a more natural tree-planting plan and perhaps require additional trees, where there was that option.

In response to further questions from Commissioner Zawodny, Mr. Kennedy reviewed the building's design, which utilized multiple materials and colors. He gave the sizes of the bricks, which were also listed on the samples, and explained that all mortar would be the same color. Commissioner Zawodny was concerned that while he liked the dynamics and overall design of the building, too many different types of colors and finishes were being used. Mr. Kennedy pointed out that in general they were using all earth tones with the exception of the blue on the entryway and white accents as shown.

In response to a question from Chair Lark, Mr. Kennedy said the use of blue at the entryway clearly delineated that feature.

In response to a question from Commissioner Anderson, Mr. Johns said they were installing the asphalt bike bath along all of the 7 Mile Road frontage from Cornerstone to Traditions Drive.

In response to a question from Commissioner McCarthy, Mr. Johns explained that four existing buildings to the west would be demolished as part of this project. The demolition would start as soon as possible.

In response to a question from Commissioner Guerriero, Mr. Johns said the environmental studies for the four buildings to be demolished were complete.

Commissioner Watson asked if the Township property would be able to tap into Traditions Drive at a later date. Department of Public Services Director Casari explained that where the road was on Township property the Township would always have the right to connect. If the Township should ever want to tap into the portion of the road on the REIS site, easement agreements would have to be completed.

Commissioner Anderson asked why the site needed 49 visitor parking spaces. Mr. Johns said the client frequently had groups of 25+ come to the building for training and meetings. All activity would be internal to the building.

Chair Lark acknowledged that due to the consent judgement a traffic study was not required. However, given the number of parking spaces being developed and the 400 office space population, was there any concern about congestion on the interior roads, especially as other uses developed adjacent to this one? Mr. Johns said there were no traffic concerns. They were working with Wayne County who also did not have concerns, and who were in process of

reviewing the plans. Wayne County had required a traffic study analyzing multiple intersections on Haggerty, along with an analysis of 7 Mile all the way to I-275.

In response to a question from Chair Lark, Mr. Johns said they could resolve all issues called out in the review letters.

Commissioner Zawodny asked about the roof access stair called out in the Fire Department review. Mr. Kennedy said that there was an area that went to the 3rd floor adjacent to the boiler room, which led to a 4-foot x 8-foot rooftop hatch. They would also be adding a door on the west elevation to the riser room. They were comfortable with all the comments in the Fire Marshall letter.

In response to a further question from Commissioner Zawodny, Mr. Kennedy said they were planning a green roof or ballasted roof on the 2-story element. They preferred the green roof but they had to make sure they could get plantings that would thrive there.

Commissioner McCarthy pointed out that stones were shown at the base of the building on the north elevation; the Township had frowned on that type of configuration. Would they consider wood mulch in that area?

Township Planner Frey explained that planting beds were required to be mulched. This plan showed an in-between type of situation as the 2-foot wide area with rocks was not a planting bed. Perhaps the rock feature could be labeled an architectural element, to separate it from other properties where mulching was required in planting beds.

Mr. Kennedy said they would rather use stone because it blended well with the masonry and provided a better look for the building. Stone was also easier to maintain, and better handled the wash off the building.

Commissioner Allen said that a stone area inevitably got filled with dirt and weeds. Commissioner Zawodny suggested using paver stone.

Commissioner Guerriero was concerned that this would be a new high volume use, with 400 daily users, yet there would be no traffic study. Township Planner Frey explained that this was a condition placed in the consent judgement. Wayne County would weigh in at the interface to public roads, but not on the interior roads.

Commissioner Watson asked if the trees on the computer model were to scale. Mr. Kennedy said they were to scale, and the building would be mostly shielded from 7 Mile Road.

In response to a question from Commissioner Zawodny, the applicants explained that the swale around the detention pond would be natural to the water edge.

Chair Lark asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak on this item. As no one came forward to speak, Chair Lark indicated he was ready to entertain a motion.

MOTION by Zawodny, support by Allen, in the matter of JSPR18-0006, Northville Park Place

Office Building, that the site plan for the new office building be approved, with the following conditions:

- **Acceptance and compliance with staff comments in the review letters, including planning, engineering, lighting, fire, and traffic.**
- **Further study of the pedestrian/bike path along 7 Mile for potential modifications to the elevation in order to minimize the amount of cutback into the woodlands and the amount of backfill required.**
- **The streetscape along 7 mile be changed to more naturalize the trees by modifying the spacing of the trees and the placement of the species as described this evening.**
- **Administrative review and approval of the revised landscape plan showing proposed improvements of the plantings around the detention pond, including possibly adding more trees to the northeastern portion.**
- **The clearing of any of the woodlands along 7 Mile be limited to the minimum possible level to preserve the existing vegetative buffer, including trees, shrubs and understory plant material, with selective removal of dead trees and plant material accomplished after authorization by the Township after a site inspection.**
- **Notes referencing the detention pond as being part of the road plans be removed, as the detention pond was part of the site plan submission.**
- **Preservation of the heavily wooded buffer along 7 Mile Road as presented this evening.**
- **Pond layout will remain substantially as shown, providing a natural layout for that feature.**

Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Allen, Anderson, Guerriero, Lark, McCarthy, Watson, Zawodny
 Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

3. JPUDAM18-0001 Mill Ridge

Representative: Tim Loughrin, Robertson Brothers Homes

Location: 6 Mile Road, West of Ridge Road

Request: PUD Amendment #3 to Change Duplexes to Detached Condos

Action: Discussion Only

Township Planner Frey explained that the applicant was looking for direction, specifically regarding the architectural design, materials, and number/percentage of side entry garages for the proposed PUD amendment to change duplexes to detached condos.

Review comments included:

- The number of units would remain the same at 82.
- There was a discrepancy between the plan and summary letter that identified 20 side entry garages (24%) and the site plan notes which indicated 21 (25.93%).
- Units located on a corner shall provide an additional 5-foot setback on the side that did not contain a driveway.
- Was there an opportunity to switch the garage side on straight street segments to reduce repetition?
- A complete plan review would be done for the official submittal.

Some units had been constructed or were under construction; those would remain as built. The development would then transition to detached condos.

James Clarke, President, Robertson Brothers Homes, 6905 Telegraph Road, Suite 200, Bloomfield Hills, MI was present on behalf of this discussion regarding the proposed PUD amendment.

Mr. Clarke said that approximately 1-1/2 years ago they had brought a duplex project to the Commission, which was approved. They had based that project on focus group study as well as potential buyers for the duplexes. However, since that time they had found that the almost 2500 square foot Cape Cod design was too large for the market and was not selling. To date they had sold 8 homes, 6 of which were ranches, 1 more for the small ranch at 1800 square feet, and only 1 of the larger 2400 square foot units. Robertson Homes felt they would not succeed if they continued to build 50% of the units for a market that didn't want them. They had had 500-600 people looking at this development, and those people were saying that they wanted ranch homes.

They had currently built 7 buildings with 14 units. Two of the units were models: one of the ranch and one of the larger 1-1/2 stories. It was the ranch that was selling.

The current ranch design was 2068 square feet. The smaller ranch, which had the 2nd story on it and became the larger home, was an 1800 square foot ranch that with the 2nd floor became the 2499 square foot home.

With the new plans, Robertson Brothers was proposing ranch homes around 1800 square feet. Setbacks would be greater in a number of areas. There would be no change in the open space or setback requirements, and the units would often exceed the required setbacks. For instance, the requirement was for 25-foot setback from the sidewalk or curb for a front facing garage; they were providing 30 feet in all instances. The front plane of the building must be set back 20 feet; in all cases they were a minimum of 25 feet. They were meeting the minimum requirement of 20 feet between buildings, and in some cases more was provided. The minimum setback from side to rear yard was 50 feet and that was being met. Minimum rear-to-rear yard setback requirement was 70 feet; in most cases they were providing 100 feet and the 70-foot minimum was always met.

It was possible that they would request that a rear deck be allowed to encroach into the setback, but that would only be triggered if a buyer wanted the optional sunroom, and in no case would they be encroaching into the approved building setbacks and the 50-foot perimeter greenbelt.

Mr. Clarke said that he counted 19 side-entry garages or 23%, when the existing duplexes were counted. They had 9 side-entry garages as shown on the plan plus the 10 in the existing duplex homes.

Robertson Brothers had met with 5 of the 8 homeowners last night to discuss this situation. Robertson Brothers did have successful experience with other developments, when they

changed home types to meet market demands. The proposed changes would bring a higher price per square foot. He did not think the value of the homes would diminish.

Township Planner Frey said that half the roads and utilities were already constructed. Mr. Clarke said some storm and other lines would have to be moved; Robertson Brothers would go through the engineering process for those changes.

Commissioner Allen noted that in the northwest corner there were 3 units on one driveway. Mr. Clarke said that they had done that in other developments.

Commissioner Allen asked where guests would park. Mr. Clarke said there were parking spaces for 2 cars in each garage, 2 spaces in the driveway, and parking on the non-hydrant side of the street per the PUD approval.

In response to a question from Commissioner Anderson, Mr. Clarke said they had built units #3-16 and #29 - 34 as duplexes. Units #3 and #4 were models, unit #5 was sold, and #6 was a spec home. Units #7 and #8 were not built. Unit #9 was a spec, #10 was sold, #11 and #12 were sold, #34 was sold, #31 was not sold, #32 was sold, and #29 and #30 were not sold.

In response to a question from Chair Lark, Mr. Clarke said the base price for the detached condos would be in the \$400,000's. The 2-story duplexes started in the \$500,000's.

Ranches under the new plan would have 2 bedrooms and a den, with a full basement that could be finished.

Chair Lark said that he was struggling with the fact that there was more room in between the duplexes than there was between the proposed detached units. The new plan showed row after row of front entry garages.

Mr. Clarke said they were asking for a modification of ordinance requirements regarding the number of front entry garages, specifically regarding the 80% requirement. All other ordinance requirements were met.

Township Planner Frey said the ordinance requirement was for a minimum of 80% to be side-entry garages, but the Planning Commission could modify that based on architecture, design, etc. The Township struggled with the repetitive rhythm of front entry garages along a street, although the Township was also hearing that people in active senior developments seemed to be asking for front entry garages.

Tonight Robertson Brothers was asking for support for a) the design and 2) the number of front entry garages. The Commission would probably need to look at this question for every Active Adult Community that came before them, and the Commission would need to look at the number of front entry garages, what the layout was, what opportunities there were through architecture or clustering, setback modification, etc. In the present instance the road network was already planned and partially constructed, so there was less ability to modify the road network. However, perhaps there was some ability with siting the homes or flipping the garages to the other side of the house.

Commissioner Allen noted that there was 20 feet proposed between the detached condos. He thought the spacing between duplexes was 25 feet, per ordinance.

In response to a question from Chair Lark, Township Planner Frey said the duplex requirement for front entry garages was 50% because with a duplex there was always one front and one side entry garage. When the Active Adult Community was created, the 80%/20% was what the R-1, 2 and 3 Districts required, and that was carried over to Active Adult, with the Planning Commission given the ability to look at the architecture, the site, etc. in order to allow modifications.

Mr. Clarke said the market did not want the turning movement into a side entry garage. Also the perception was that side-entry garages meant that when you drove down a street, you saw the garages, not the homes. On front entry garages, with the garage set back, the actual house could be more prominent. They were proposing the garages be set back 5 feet from the front of the house. However, because they had extra setback room they could perhaps stagger the homes, so they were not lined up so precisely. They would also work with the Commission on the architecture. The ordinance required changes in color, massing or elevation for every six homes. When they brought in their proposal in December, there would be more variety shown. The garages would have windows, further minimizing the overall impact of the garage.

Commissioner Allen said the development could be required to provide architectural details for the garage doors. Mr. Clarke agreed.

Commissioner Zawodny said while he understood the need for the project to be successful, he felt the new proposal seemed too dense. He suggested reducing the number of units. Fewer units would allow for design options that would provide a more naturalized environment and a less repetitious arrangement as opposed to a more urban feel. A modified plan would be more acceptable if the density were reduced.

Mr. Clarke spoke to the need to keep the original open space percentage. Township Planner Frey explained that if 25 feet were provided between detached units, 5 of those feet could count toward open space.

Commissioner Watson felt what was being presented this evening was not yet a cohesive plan. The front entry garages needed to be softened. The design needed to provide more of a village feel, if this level of density were going to be approved. Some of the driveway configurations felt they existed to just randomly pack units into the site. She also questioned if there was a way that the applicant would distinguish the already-built units and have those flow into to the new product area?

Mr. Clarke said the materials, colors and architecture would address this issue. Premium materials would be used.

In response to a question from Commissioner Allen, Mr. Clarke said the road on the west was the approved road and the pipe was in the ground. It would be prohibitively costly to

reconfigure the road. Commissioner Allen said varying the front yard setbacks might soften the look.

Commissioner Zawodny said that he felt this development needed to reduce the number of units, provide a cohesive development with what was already built, and provide varied elevations with the garages set back from the front line of the house.

Chair Lark agreed, specifically mentioning that the density along the west edge of the development could be reduced.

Mr. Clarke asked if there was latitude to allow more front entry garages if they worked on the garage appearance, the elevations, and the articulation of the buildings on the western drive. Before reducing the density he would like to see if he could improve the design such that the density would not be an issue.

Commissioner Anderson said it seemed to her the Commission was going to have to give some latitude on the front entry garages in order for this project to be successful.

Chair Lark agreed that some latitude would be necessary. However, he would like to see less density.

Commissioner Guerriero said he was not sure that if the development had come to the Commission originally with 82 units laid out in this manner it would have been approved. He also thought density was going to be an issue.

Commissioner Watson said that one way to make a transition from the constructed duplexes to the detached condos was, on the east, to continue the same pattern of side and front entry garages until the corner was turned, so the design change was not so abrupt.

Chair Lark asked if anyone in the audience wanted to speak on this issue.

Mike Jelso, 42500 Bradner, said that they were the owners of unit #30. They were not opposed to the changes described this evening, as long as the aesthetics and continuity of design were maintained.

Glen McClure, 17685 Ridge Road, said that he owned property next to this development. He had been opposed to this development from the beginning, when the developer had been given variances and special consideration. The Commission and community had been assured that the type of homes being built was what Northville needed, and now the developers were saying something else. It seemed to him ridiculous that they were changing plans midstream, with the resultant squeezing of units into the available space, tree removal, etc.

Mr. Clarke responded, saying that the proposed new units were not as deep as the original ones. They were not asking for any changes in tree removal, setbacks, etc., from the original plan. There would be a larger setback for all the units to the north.

Township Planner Frey said that the duplex setbacks had met the ordinance requirements.

Butch George, former owner of the property, said it was important for the area and everyone living nearby for the development to be finished.

Seeing that no one else came forward to speak, Chair Lark summarized Commission concerns as follows:

- Density was an over-riding issue. It was difficult to see how the changes the Commission wanted could be accomplished without decreasing the number of units.
- The Commission might not have approved this plan if it had been the original plan.
- The Commission understood there would need to be some flexibility to the number of side-facing garages.
- The Commission had liked the cluster design of the original plan; the layout of the proposed plan should be more similar to that.

Chair Lark closed the discussion.

4. **JSKPR18-0009** McDonald's
Representative: Shawn Smith, SES Branding
Location: 39700 Five Mile Road
Request: 2nd Wall Sign
Action: Approve, Approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny

Township Planner Frey gave the background for this request from the McDonald's located at 39700 Five Mile Road for a second wall sign, two signs total: one on the south elevation and one on the east elevation. The standard for considering a second wall sign was: *Where a business is oriented such that more than one side of the building can be seen from a road provided a sign is less than 60% of the maximum sign area allowed or each of the signs is not greater than 80% of the size permitted.*

At the October 17, 2018 Zoning Board of Appeals meeting, McDonald's requested 2 additional wall signs, three total. That request was denied because the ZBA did not find the request satisfied the variance criteria. McDonald's then determined they would modify the request to ask for only one additional wall sign – an “M” logo on the south and east side of the building – and seek approval for the 2nd sign from the Planning Commission. Each “M” logo was proposed to be 14 square feet, which was well below the 43.2 square feet of sign area permitted for the south elevation and the 77.76 square feet permitted for the east elevation. There was an existing non-conforming pole sign that would remain unchanged.

Brandon Gantt, SES Branding, 6001 Nimtz Parkway, South Bend, Indiana, was present on behalf of this application. McDonald's was requesting a second wall sign, the “M” logo on the east elevation, as part of the modernization of the McDonald's branding at this location. The “M” logo would be over the entrance door.

Commissioner McCarthy thought the pole sign provided strong identity for this location.

Commissioner Allen thought the directional signs should be updated and improved. Currently the directional sign at the entrance driveway was hidden by shrubbery.

Commissioner Zawodny concurred that as long as the pylon sign was on site, it was difficult to justify within the scope of the ordinance a 2nd wall sign on the basis that the sign would help identify the location, which was already well identified by the non-conforming pylon sign.

Mr. Gantt explained that architecturally, nationwide McDonald's was moving to the type of signage being requested this evening.

Commissioner Allen said the new architecture at all locations was a big plus. However, in this instance, placing a sign on the east elevation did not serve a real purpose as far as capturing drivers' attention on the road, especially since the entrance sign was rendered invisible by the surrounding shrubbery.

In response to a question from Commissioner Guerriero, Mr. Gantt said the franchisee would not consider removing the pylon sign in exchange for the requested second wall sign.

Chair Lark said he agreed with a comment in the October 17 ZBA draft minutes that people could find the door once they were on site.

Township Planner Frey pointed out that an "M" logo would be permitted on the door window, as a window sign, per ordinance regulations.

In response to a question from Mr. Gantt, Township Planner Frey explained that the ordinance allowed one wall sign at this location, but did not mandate which elevation the sign should be on.

Commissioner Zawodny suggested that with the location at the pylon sign in the front, the location could have the "M" logo sign on the east wall, and an "M" logo sign on the west door, thus covering all elevations.

Chair Lark asked if there was any public who wished to speak about this matter. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, he brought the matter back to the Commission for a motion.

MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy, in the matter of JSKPR18-0009, McDonald's, 39700 Five Mile Road, to deny the application for a 2nd wall sign, because McDonald's could relocate the one permitted wall sign to the east, and there also needed to be some work done on the existing directional sign at the entrance driveway to make it more visible.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Allen, Anderson, Zawodny
 Nays: Guerriero, Lark, McCarthy, Watson

Motion to deny failed 3-4 (Guerriero, Lark, McCarthy, Watson opposed).

Chair Lark asked for a motion to approve.

MOTION by Watson, support by Guerriero, in the matter of JSKPR18-0009, McDonald's, 39700 Five Mile Road, to approve the application for a 2nd wall sign.

Commissioner McCarthy commented that he had voted "nay" in error on the first motion.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Guerriero, Lark, Watson
 Nays: Allen, Anderson, McCarthy, Zawodny

Motion to approve failed 3-4 (Allen, Anderson, McCarthy, Zawodny opposed).

After a discussion of process, Commissioner Anderson offered the following motion:

MOTION by Anderson, support by Allen, in the matter of JSKPR18-0009, McDonald's, 39700 Five Mile Road, to reconsider the previous motion to deny the application for a 2nd wall sign.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Allen, Anderson, Guerriero, McCarthy, Watson, Zawodny
 Nays: Lark

Motion carried 6-1 (Lark opposed).

MOTION by McCarthy, support by Anderson, in the matter of JSKPR18-0009, McDonald's, 39700 Five Mile Road, to deny the application for a 2nd wall sign.

**Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Allen, Anderson, McCarthy, Zawodny
 Nays: Guerriero, Lark, Watson**

Motion carried 4-3 (Guerriero, Lark, Watson opposed).

Therefore the motion TO DENY was approved.

Other Business: Zoning Ordinance Discussion – Building Materials

Township Planner Frey gave the background for this agenda item. As a result of discussion that had occurred around the topic of building materials during previous site plan reviews, Commissioner Zawodny suggested the Commission review the current ordinance language to determine if it warranted any changes. The current language read:

The primary building material shall be brick. A minimum 80% of all building facades, excluding the roof and windows, shall consist of masonry products, such as brick, cut stone, integral colored split face block, native field stone, cast stone, limestone, granite or equivalent, as determined by the Planning Commission. The Planning Commission may modify the 80% exterior finish requirement for facades not visible from a public street, provided they are adequately screened from adjoining land uses. The remaining maximum 20% of the facade may utilize other materials for architectural detailing, such as fiberglass reinforced concrete, cement board siding, stucco, polymer plastic (fypon) or EIFS, provided they are not located at the base of the building. These accent

materials shall be darker tones in order to maintain a cleaner appearance and to reduce maintenance issues.

Front building facades shall provide a minimum of 15% glass windows but shall not exceed 80% glass. Calculations were exclusive of the roof area. Reflective glass is not permitted on any façade.

Items for discussion:

- The first two sentences read, regarding non-residential buildings: *The primary building material shall be brick. A minimum 80% of all building facades, excluding the roof and windows, shall consist of masonry products, such as brick, cut stone, integral colored split face block, native field stone, cast stone, limestone, granite or equivalent, as determined by the Planning Commission.*

This language was not as clear as it could be, as the first and second sentences did not seem to align with each other. Did the Commission want to clarify further what the 80% specifically referred to? Could primary building material be any of those materials listed? What did "primary" mean, in terms of percentage?

- The Commission had in the past required masonry product to be "full brick or stone." Should that specific language be added to the ordinance?
- The Commission had in the past approved metal panels for some R & D buildings to give buildings a more contemporary appearance. Should language be added to add metal as a permitted non-masonry product? Eliminate EFIS as a permitted non-masonry product?
- Were there any new materials that should be added to the ordinance as permitted materials?

Commissioner Guerriero thought that some education could take place regarding this discussion, including education regarding the technical aspects of the materials, as well as the benefits and disadvantages of certain materials.

Township Planner Frey said the first thing to be discussed was a design question: historically the Township had encouraged brick to be the underlying building material. Should this continue or would a more contemporary look also be appropriate? Perhaps Commissioner Zawodny could help inform this discussion.

Commissioner Zawodny said he would gather some articles and illustrations regarding the building materials and trends being discussed.

Discussion included the following:

- Applicants had been confused by the wording of the ordinance, especially the first 2 sentences as noted.
- Did the Township want to have a specific "Northville look," in terms of architecture and materials?

- Visual cohesion added a premium to communities.
- Brick as the primary building material for commercial buildings had been consistent over time except perhaps in the research area, where the desired image was sometimes one of innovation.
- Millennials might not be attracted to “old staid” brick.
- Commissioner Allen said that approximately 30 years ago there was a conscious decision to have a cohesive look based on brick. Perhaps it was time to allow other materials.
- Good design could not be regulated, although zoning and overlay districts could define base line design and materials. Design did not have to be a “one size fits all” proposition.
- Construction was an economic as well as a design decision. The Township did not want to price new construction out of the market.

Chair Lark thought that the original vision of cohesion through design and materials, with brick as primary, should not be overly modified, but the ordinance should be clarified wherever necessary. He did think the Township should be true to the core vision that was defined several years ago.

Township Planner Frey said she could move forward on this project. She invited Commissioners to refer her to ordinances from other communities that might also address this issue. Everyone could take pictures of buildings they liked and send to Township Planner Frey to include in a PowerPoint presentation, or send her addresses and she would take pictures.

Township Planner Frey said that it was important to clarify what “primary” meant in terms of primary building material, and resolve other ambiguities in the current ordinance.

Chair Lark asked Township Planner Frey to continue to move forward on this project.

Department Reports:

Township Planner Frey

- Township Planner Frey reviewed the actions of the Zoning Board of Appeals on October 17, 2018. There was one ZBA application for November.
- The last Planning Commission meeting of the year would be December 4.

Department of Public Services Director Casari

- The demolition of the tall structure on the hospital property would begin tomorrow.
- Some brick had been saved from the building, cleaned, and was being offered for sale.

Chair Lark commented that the grass on the north side of 6 Mile Road by Winchester was dead.

Commissioner Anderson said that if recreational marijuana was approved at the upcoming November election, the Township might need to start thinking about how they would address that, in terms of marijuana businesses. Even if the community opted out, the Township needed to be ahead of the curve on this issue.

Commissioner Allen said that for tree root balls where the wire had been left around the root

ball, a metal detector could find that wire so it could be removed.

Commissioner Allen asked about the landscaping at the Six and Park Party Store. Township Planner Frey said enforcement was ongoing.

Extended Public Comments: None.

Adjournment: 10:30 p.m.