

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF NORTHVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
March 26, 2019**

DATE: March 26, 2019
TIME: 7:00 PM
PLACE: Northville Township Hall
44405 Six Mile Road

APPROVED: April 30, 2019

CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 PM

ROLL CALL:

Present: Lisa Anderson, Timothy Guerriero, Eric Lark, George McCarthy, Fred Shadko, Jayne Watson, Tim Zawodny

Excused: None

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

Approval of Minutes:

Planning Commission – February 26, 2019

MOTION by Shadko, support by McCarthy, to amend and approve the February 16, 2019 Planning Commission minutes as follows:

Pg. 2, Line 63: ~~cooling towers~~ mechanical equipment

Voice vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

Correspondence: None.

Brief Public Comments: None.

New Business: None.

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| 1. JSPR19-0002 | Hella |
| Representative: | Alicia Goucher, Allen Industries |
| Location: | 15951 Technology Drive |
| Request: | 2 nd Wall Sign on south elevation |
| Action: | Approve, approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny |

Referencing her March 14, 2019 review letter, Township Planner Frey gave the background to this request for a 2nd wall sign for the new Hella building located at

15951 Technology Drive. The applicant had submitted a permit application for the sign on the west elevation facing Beck Road. Tonight they were requesting a 2nd sign on the south building elevation facing Five Mile Road.

The Planning Commission could authorize a 2nd wall sign when 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 allowed or each sign was no greater than 80% of the size permitted for the sign district in which it was located. In this instance, both signs would meet requirements if the 2nd sign were approved. Neither sign would be illuminated.

Township Planner Frey noted that the applicant's cover letter stated the parcel was a corner lot. While the south building façade was visible from Beck Road, this was not a corner lot. The property at the northeast corner of 5 Mile and Beck was vacant.

Chair Zawodny invited the applicants to make their presentation.

Rebecca Bressler, Allen Industries, 7844 West Central Avenue, Toledo Ohio, and Andrew Pepera, Hella Industries, 15951 Technology Drive, Northville Township were present on behalf of this application for a 2nd wall sign.

Ms. Bressler said Hella would like to put signs from their old building on this one. The south and west elevations were both visible for drivers on Beck and Five Mile Roads. The signs would be helpful for the many deliveries made at this manufacturing facility. The signs were not excessively sized, and would complement the building.

Township Planner Frey said the sign that was in for permit was on the northwest corner of the building facing Beck Road, and was permitted by right as long as dimensional and other signage requirements were met. The sign being considered this evening would be located on the southeast corner of the south building façade, facing Five Mile Road.

Commissioner Watson asked if the purpose of the sign was to increase visibility from inside Technology Park or from Beck Road. Mr. Pepera said the intent was to increase visibility from Five Mile Road.

Commissioner Shadko asked what effect a new building on the empty lot would have on the visibility of the sign proposed to be located on the southeast corner of Hella's building.

The applicants said that the impact of a new building on the corner of Beck and Five Mile would depend on the how large that building was and how it was sited on the vacant lot. A new building would have to be right in front of the Hella building for it to interfere with the visibility of the 2nd sign.

Commissioner Watson said that the sign would be placed on the back side of the building where there were utility boxes. Would the utility boxes be shielded in any way?

Mr. Pepera said there were Arborvitae already in place to buffer the view of the generator on the south side, and more Arborvitae were being planted. Also, pine trees were buffering the parking lot from Five Mile Road.

The Commission noted that the CVS at Five Mile and Sheldon was only allowed one sign, even though they had requested a 2nd one.

Other applications for a 2nd sign had also been denied, although not all. Each application was decided on its own merits.

Commissioner Lark said he was struggling with the idea that if this sign were allowed, how were any of the internal lots on Technology Drive different from this one? Township Planner Frey said there very few buildings in the Technology Park that would benefit from a 2nd sign. The subject building was the only one that fronted onto Beck, even though the access was internal from Technology Drive. C W Bearing, on the corner of Five Mile and Technology Drive, had only asked for one sign.

Commissioner Watson asked if deliveries would enter Technology Drive from Five Mile or Beck Road. Mr. Pepera said both roads would be used. GPS took drivers next door. Commissioner Watson thought a ground sign on Technology Park would better serve Hella. Mr. Pepera said there was going to be a monument sign at the Technology Drive entrance.

Chair Zawodny said he agreed that other buildings within Technology Park did not have extra signs, and he would like to keep true to the spirit of the sign ordinance. Was there any consideration for taking the sign at the northwest corner and moving it further south to gain visibility from eastbound Five Mile Road?

Mr. Pepera said he believed the sign was placed at the northwest corner before Hella knew they had to get approval for a second sign.

Seeing that discussion had ended, Chair Zawodny indicated he was ready to entertain a motion.

MOTION by McCarthy, support by Shadko, to DENY PSPR19-0002 – Hella – Request for site plan approval - 2nd Wall Sign.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Anderson, McCarthy, Shadko, Watson, Zawodny

Nays: Guerriero, Lark

Motion approved 5-2 (Guerriero, Lark opposed).

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| 2. JSPR18-0007 | Willow Pines Retirement Community |
| Representative: | Payman Homayouni, Bowman Consulting |
| Location: | Ward Church, 40000 Six Mile Road |

Request: 130 Unit Independent Retirement Community
Action: Approve, approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny

Referring to her review letter dated March 4, 2019, Township Planner Frey gave the background for this request for site plan approval for a 130 unit independent retirement community. The configuration of the parcel and the placement of the proposed building was consistent with the 2018 HPUD amendment. The PUD required that the project receive site plan approval from the Commission.

Outstanding issues included:

Landscape and woodlands replacement:

- As a condition of permitting a three-story building, additional landscape should be provided within the front yard to reduce the visual impact of the building. An additional seven canopy trees, 27 ornamental trees and 67 shrubs were proposed within the greenbelt.
 - Additional canopy trees should be provided along the east property line, between the greenbelt and the existing tree line, to reduce the impact of the building at its closest location to Ring Road.
 - Additional canopy trees or dogwoods should be provided to fill in the gap on the north side of the pond, west of the entrance drive and between the proposed dogwoods.
- Upright/columnar tree species should be considered for locations between the sidewalk and the building. The proposed Ginkgo, Honey Locust and Maple trees were located 10'-15' from the edge of the building but had a 30'-70' spread at maturity. Something smaller should be substituted.

Building elevations:

- The percentage of brick, secondary building materials and windows should be provided for each elevation, in order to confirm compliance with ordinance standards.
- The building wall and waste receptacle enclosure details, and brick dimension, should be provided to avoid any confusion over the term "brick veneer," which was equal to "full dimensional."
- EIFS was proposed on the front elevation. The proposed EIFS colors appeared to be white and light beige; some of the EIFS was proposed at the base of the columns. By the current building material standards, if EIFS was approved by the Planning Commission, the colors were required to be darker and EIFS was not permitted to be used at the base of the building. Additionally, at the last Planning Commission meeting when modifications to the building design standards were discussed, the Commission identified eliminating EIFS as a permitted building material, and EIFS had been removed as a permitted building material in the draft ordinance amendment. The Planning Commission should provide direction to the applicant as to whether or not EIFS would be permitted for this project.
- Metal clad fascia was proposed. At a previous meeting the Planning Commission had discussed the use of metal clad fascia at the Mill Ridge Project.

The Commission should provide guidance on the acceptability of using metal clad fascia for this project.

- From the drawing it was unclear if the fence on top of the central portion of the building was intended to be decorative or to screen the rooftop equipment. Looking at other Resort Lifestyle Communities projects on-line, where rooftop equipment was located behind a fence, the fence did not adequately screen the rooftop equipment. The applicant should clarify where the rooftop equipment would be located and provide a different manner of screening the equipment from view.
- Elevations for the garages were required.
- A material sample board was being provided this evening.

Site layout

- The secondary site access, located at the southwest corner of the site, was proposed as a gated access, which was not permitted. It appeared that the applicant had met with the Fire Department, and a non-gated 27-foot access would be provided.

Township Planner Frey summarized other staff reviews. Any approving motion should be conditioned on compliance with the lighting ordinance, as well as the revisions to the easements, covenants and restrictions provided by City Attorney Gaber. All the issues called out by the Traffic Engineer had been addressed. Most of the comments by the Fire Department would be addressed during building construction.

Public Services Director Casari said he had met with the applicant regarding locating the sanitary sewer so it was not too close to the pond. This could be finalized during engineering review.

Chair Zawodny invited the applicants to make their presentation.

Travis Mihelick, Attorney, Dinsmore & Shohl, 900 Wilshire Drive, Troy, MI was present on behalf of this application. Bob Lewis, Cameron General Construction, 7101 S. 82nd Street, Lincoln NE, and Payman Homayouni, PE, Bowman Consulting, 311 South Wacker Drive, Chicago IL, were also present.

Mr. Mihelick said they were requesting approval with conditions this evening. They had met with the various Township departments, and felt they could resolve all outstanding issues. They would supply the additional landscaping as suggested by Township Planner Frey. They also felt they could work with the Township regarding building materials.

Mr. Mihelick made some comments regarding easements and protective covenants:

- The applicants were providing a non-gated 27-foot wide drive connection with a 10 foot sidewalk easement as a second access, which would go from their site to the Church's parking lot.
- The applicants could resolve issues regarding the easement agreements as called out in the March 1, 2019 Township Attorney's memorandum, with the exception of item #6. As part of the easement agreement, Willow Pines had a

private easement for signage. The Township Attorney had said no signage was permitted, but the applicants felt that was inaccurate. They understood they would need to seek Township Approval for any future signage, but what they wanted now was to have a private property right easement to put signage up in the future. Mr. Mihelick asked that if an approving motion was conditioned on the Township Attorney's comments, that particular comment - #6 in the Township Attorney's letter – be removed.

Commissioner Lark explained that the Township Attorney was saying the signage was inconsistent with the HPUD agreement. Commissioner Anderson added that she was opposed to waiving the Township Attorney's advice; she advised Mr. Mihelick to take the matter up directly with the Township Attorney.

Mr. Mihelick showed the sample board to the Commission. The materials would conform to Township requirements.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Lewis said the brick veneer was not being used as a structural element. Even though labeled brick "veneer", it was full brick and set with mortar. It was not thin brick, although the brick on the sample board did appear thin. The brick would be labeled full dimensional brick on the plans.

Mr. Lewis continued that they had removed the EIFS material and were now using Hardie Plank, with some architectural concrete on the front columns. The lower elevation colors would be darker. They would comply with the architectural material percentage standards in the ordinance. Aluminum would be used for the fascia, soffits and gutters. They would work with Township staff to make sure they were compliant with rooftop screening requirements.

In response to questions from Commissioner Anderson, Mr. Lewis said the garages would use the same building materials as the rest of the building, and would meet the percentage building material requirements of the ordinance. The dashed lines on the plans represented a 25-foot setback line with a 30-foot garage setback. The building's wings would be stick-built, with the center core being steel. The Fire Department needed more information on type of construction, height measurements, and the sprinkler system so they could make a determination regarding whether the applicants needed to provide full access behind the building. The applicants would comply with Fire Department requirements; if 360-degree access were needed they would provide it. That might necessitate some additional tree removal, but nothing else would change. All other Fire Department issues were resolved.

Township Planner Frey said if full Fire Department access was required and did change the site plan significantly, the site plan would come back to the Commission. The feeling now was that full access would not be required, as the building would likely be sprinklered.

Commissioner Anderson asked for demographic information regarding potential residents. Mr. Lewis said they were a non-licensed facility, and would not be providing

medical care. The average resident age was about 80 years old; approximately 50% did not drive. The community would be highly amenitized with transportation, meals, shuttle bus, lifestyle director, etc.

Commissioner Lark asked what the fencing in front of the building. Mr. Lewis said the fencing provided a screen wall for a ground air conditioning unit. Chair Zawodny requested landscaping around the fencing. Mr. Lewis agreed to do that.

In response to a question from Commissioner McCarthy, Mr. Lewis said relocating the ballfields had been handled at the PUD level. Township Planner Frey said the ballfields needed to be in by 2020, but that would come before the Commission.

Chair Zawodny asked if the intent of the line of the western wing was not to be parallel to the line of the parking. Mr. Lewis said that was correct.

In response to a question from Chair Zawodny, Township Planner Frey said the metal clad fascia appeared to be eaves, trim, soffits and gutters. Mr. Lewis said that was correct. The materials were aluminum. If metal clad was not allowed they would work with staff on what the replacement material would be.

Chair Zawodny said the intent was if the applicants were working with better quality materials for the siding and trim boards, eaves and rakes should follow through with the same material. If installed properly, Hardie board was just as maintenance-free as the siding. Aluminum could be used on gutters and downspouts.

Chair Zawodny asked how close the brick color was to the material used by Ward Church. Mr. Lewis said the color was closer to what was at the shopping center, and was actually a color that would be in character with both buildings. Chair Zawodny said the desired outcome would be to have brick color in the same family, same tones, as used throughout this campus environment.

Commissioner Shadko asked if Cross Road maintenance would be shared with the Church. Mr. Lewis said there were 3 parties that would be part of the road maintenance agreement: The Church, the shopping center, and the senior housing development.

Commissioner Shadko referred to the demolition plan on Sheet C8. Currently there was a path that ran north/south from an existing utility building behind the church and provided access to the trails that threaded through the north. The drawing showed the path was gone. Would a replacement path be built so that people could get from the church property to the trails?

Mr. Lewis said that was the first time the question had come up. If a trail needed to be provided, they would do that.

Commissioner Shadko said the trails were used not only by church members, but also by neighbors in the area. The Township owned the property to the north of Bell Creek, and

It came out in discussion that there would likely be excess dirt on the site resulting from excavation. The applicants planned to use the excess dirt for berms, in cooperation with Ward Church.

Other Business:

1. Zoning Ordinance Discussion – Building Materials

Chair Zawodny explained that tonight's discussion was a result of earlier Commission discussion regarding changes to Article 33 Site Plan Review, especially regarding building materials. The Commission had received draft ordinance revisions to review and provide comment this evening.

Township Planner Frey said that based on the discussion at the February Planning Commission meeting, she had prepared draft modifications to the building material standards that strengthened the intent of having building design requirements and added new language regarding Building Design, Massing and Form, Building Materials, Roof Design, Awnings and Canopies, and Building Additions or Alterations.

Round table discussion and suggestions included:

In General:

- Strengthen landscaping requirements.
- Be sure that capitalization style is consistent throughout, especially regarding the term "planning commission".
- Add a separate paragraph at an appropriate location giving the Planning Commission the ability and flexibility to exercise some discretion in approving exceptions.
- Screening of ground-based mechanical equipment needed to be emphasized. If language regarding this was not in the landscape section of the ordinance or elsewhere, add it in the appropriate location.
- The Township Attorney would review all language before going to Public Hearing.

170-33.6.A. (Purpose)

- Change "*non-single family residential structures*" to something less ambiguous, i.e., "*commercial and non-single family residential structures*" or something similar.

170-33.6.A.(1) Building Design, Massing and Form

- Subparagraph (b): Keep first sentence and add the word "detailed". *Elevations shall illustrate the building design, height, and detailed description of all construction materials.*
- Subparagraph (c): Add wording to indicate approval by the Planning Commission, i.e., *Colored elevations shall be submitted for Planning Commission approval.*

- Subparagraph (d) should be left in, rather than deleted: *Buildings shall consider the scale and proportion of existing structures in the area. Roof configuration and materials shall be architecturally compatible with adjacent buildings and enhance the predominant streetscape character.*
- Subparagraph (f): Delete “trees” from this section, as the requirement for additional landscape is in subparagraph (i).

Regarding 170-33.6.A.(2) Building Materials

- Subparagraph (c): Add language that requires primary building materials to be continued across all building façades, without requiring all façades to be exactly like the front, i.e.: *“Primary building materials shall be integrated into all exterior façades.”*
- Subparagraph (b): Delete ~~“and traditional earth-toned colors,”~~ so that the ordinance would not be too proscriptive.
- Some flexibility for approving exceptions would be provided in the statement giving the Planning Commission some discretionary ability as noted above.

Regarding 170-33.6.A.(3) Roof Design

- Subparagraph (a): Leave deleted sentence in or alternatively provide language that requires rooftop equipment be shown on the plans and elevations. The deleted sentence read: *Rooftop equipment shall be illustrated on the plans and shall be screened from view by parapet walls or other architectural elements that complement the overall building design.*
- The existing requirement in (a) for *“A note that all rooftop equipment will be screened must be provided on the plans”* helped discover nonconformance during Building Department review.
- Subparagraph (c): Add word “roof” to differentiate from Paragraph (4) Awnings and Canopies below, i.e., *Overhead roof canopies . . .*

Regarding 170-33.6.A.(4) Awnings and Canopies

- Subparagraph (b) might need some flexibility of approval, related to the statement giving the Planning Commission some discretionary ability as noted above.

Regarding 170-33.6.A.(5) Building Additions or Alterations

- No changes were suggested for this section.

Township Planner Frey said she would incorporate tonight's comments in a new draft, and bring the new language back to the Commission for further discussion.

Brief discussion focused on Section 17-33.7. *Standards for approval*, Paragraph C: *Site appearance and coordination*. Commissioner Watson suggested that proposal renderings and elevations show greater site context, including showing the surrounding area and how the building was sited on the property. Commissioner Zawodny noted that some communities required a cross-section through the site, which helped with such things as the visualization of building height and massing, and how effective a

landscaping buffer would be. A cross-section could give visual cues regarding areas of concern.

Department Reports:

Township Planner Frey

- There would be an April meeting, including:
 - Chick Fil A was locating in front of Kohls; this had been approved by the Board of Trustees as a consent judgment amendment. The Planning Commission would review the site plan under the direction of the BOT.
 - Mill Ridge detached units.
 - Public hearing for a conditional rezoning near Five Mile and Haggerty, for an automatic car wash.
- MI Homes had contracted with local artists Nancy and Russell Thayer for two art installations in the park at Village at Northville: (1) Piece relating to the Stinson Aircraft Company in the pergola area, and (2) Contemporary piece near the fountain.

Eric Lark, Zoning Board of Appeals

- There was no ZBA meeting in March and none scheduled for April.

Fred Shadko, Board of Trustees

- In addition to the art installations just described in the Village at Northville, there would also be 6 large metal historical marker plaques depicting six of the most interesting historical features of Northville Township, placed on pedestals surrounding the park.

Director of Public Services Casari

- Foundation permits had been issued for Village at Northville Buildings F and G.
- A permit had been issued to Cooper Standard for foundation and structural steel. Cooper Standard was removing 4 buildings at the northeast corner of the old hospital site.
- At the hospital site, all that remained was restoration and some grading.
- Overall, building activity remained strong.
- Waste hauler GFL had been meeting with all the communities it served. Because of changes in the recycling market, GFL was asking for help to offset rising costs. The Township had refused several options put forth by GFL, but had offered to help educate the public, especially regarding how contaminated recyclable materials made all materials unusable.

Commissioner Shadko spoke regarding the continuing problems with the landfill, especially with strong odors. The Township was working with the MDEQ and the EPA. The MDEQ was planning on holding a Town Hall regarding issues with the landfill.

Extended Public Comments: None.

Adjournment: 9:06 p.m.