

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF NORTHVILLE  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
January 31, 2017**

**DATE:** January 31, 2017  
**TIME:** 7:00 PM  
**PLACE:** Northville Township Hall  
44405 Six Mile Road

**APPROVED:** February 28, 2017

**CALL TO ORDER:** 7:00 PM

**ROLL CALL: Present:** Richard Allen  
Kent Anderson  
Lisa Anderson  
Eric Lark  
George McCarthy  
Fred Shadko  
Tim Zawodny

**Also Present:** Jennifer Frey, Township Planner

**Guests:** 20

**Approval of Minutes:** Planning Commission – November 21, 2016  
Planning Commission – December 6, 2016

Mr. McCarthy made a motion to accept the draft minutes from the Planning Commission meeting of November 21, 2016, and the Planning Commission meeting of December 6, 2016; supported by Ms. Anderson.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All  
Nays: None

Motion Approved

**Other Minutes:** Board of Trustees Regular – November 17, 2016  
Board of Trustees Special – November 29, 2016  
Board of Trustees Regular – December 15, 2016

Mr. McCarthy made a motion to receive and file the minutes of Board of Trustees Regular meeting of November 17, 2016, the Board of Trustees Special meeting of November 29, 2016, and the Board of Trustees Regular meeting of December 15, 2016; supported by Mr. Anderson.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All  
Nays: None

Motion Approved

**Correspondence:** Ms. Frey confirmed that no additional correspondence had been received.

Mr. Lark stated that one additional piece of correspondence had been received that related to an agenda item and that he would read it into the record during that portion of the meeting.

**Brief Public Comments:** None.

**New Business**

- |                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| 1. JSKPR16-0002 | Meadowbrook Country Club                                   |
| Location:       | 40941 Eight Mile Road                                      |
| Representative: | David Mielock, Mielock Associates, Inc.                    |
| Request:        | Sketch Plan Approval – Refreshment Facility on Golf Course |
| Action:         | Approve, Approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny           |

Mr. Joe Vig of 39771 Golfview Drive, Northville Township, introduced himself on behalf of the petitioners and as a board member of Meadowbrook Country Club. With him were Joe Marini, General Manager of Meadowbrook Country Club; Dave Mielock, architect with Mielock Associates, Inc. and three additional representatives from Meadowbrook..

Mr. Vig gave a presentation on the golf course improvements to date. He explained that the renovations are being done to completely replace the irrigation and drainage systems and the turf for playability and sustainability reasons. With the new turf and with the new infrastructure the golf course is much healthier and will require fewer pesticides.

The new pump house is a key part of the renovation because it is the home of the new FertiGator. The course is fertilized through the irrigation system. The course has been converted back to a much more natural state. Twenty-five acres have been converted to native fescue areas. Generally, the turf conditions now require much less maintenance.

Mr. Vig showed a slide of the pump house that the PC approved a year ago and the prior location of the refreshment building, as well as the proposed location. He explained that the compelling reason to remove the old refreshment building was safety. Due to the location of the building a lot of errant approach shots were hit into the refreshment building or its proximity, which created a bit of a hazard.

Mr. Vig discussed the tree planting that is being done around the perimeter of the course. He stated that the petitioners are requesting that they not be required to landscape around the perimeter of the refreshment building as required by the ordinance since the area is also a shelter for inclement weather. They have done a number of new landscaping projects primarily on the 8 Mile Road frontage and are asking that those plantings satisfy the landscape requirement.

Mr. Vig then introduced Mr. Dave Mielock of Mielock Associates, Inc., at 114 Rayson Street in Northville.

Mr. Mielock stated that the refreshment building is approximately three football fields from the westernmost property and approximately four football fields from the southernmost property. It is a remote building designed to provide restroom facilities and to be used as a place of refuge in the event of inclement weather.

Mr. Mielock pointed out the existing tree buffer between the southwest and the south edge of the course and the residential properties to the south and to the southwest. He pointed out the proposed location of the new refreshment building and stated that one of the objectives was not to have the building be a prominent element on the site. He showed photographs to the PC.

He stated that the petitioners are proposing to use similar materials on the refreshment building to mimic the same type of architecture that was approved for the pump house with the brick and dimensional shingles. The building will be approximately 1,100 square feet with men's and women's restrooms on the wings, room for a couple of tables and chairs inside and pop, beer and hot dogs being served (no gas and no open flame). There will be a large overhang roof area around the building to allow people to pull their carts under the cover during inclement weather.

There will not be large gabled ends on the roof in order to try as much as possible to minimize the sight lines on the golf course and the height of the roof. They will attempt to get as many windows looking south onto the golf course as possible.

Mr. Mielock stated that the petitioners' engineer had responded to some of the engineering concerns addressed in Ms. Rickard's letter. Mr. Mielock stated that the petitioners felt that the issues could be handled during the construction and document permitting phase.

Mr. Mielock said that the Fire Department had a concern regarding an access road. He said that a meeting had taken place yesterday with Fire Marshall Hughes, the Chief and the Building Inspector. No conclusions had been reached at the meeting but dialog had been opened up and the parties will work together to come up with a solution to resolve the issue and to meet the requirement.

Ms. Frey said that there is a small amount of plant material that typically would be required around the foundation of the building. The petitioners are asking consideration for the new plant material that was provided on the 8 Mile Road frontage. Ms. Frey stated that the new plant material far exceeds what would be required for the 1,100-square-foot building.

Ms. Frey stated that the planting is in addition to the woodland replacement. When the petitioners did the mass grading for the golf course they had a tree survey performed

and all the trees that were regulated, in good health, and which required replacement have been accommodated on-site.

Ms. Frey said that it did not appear that there were any new trees that were removed as part of this proposal but that should be confirmed.

The PC needs to review and approve the building elevations and the materials.

Ms. Frey said that the Fire Department and the Building Department are willing to work with the petitioners and are confident that they can work out a solution.

Lastly, there are some revisions that need to be met with regard to the lighting review.

The PC asked for clarification from Ms. Frey and Mr. Vig regarding the landscaping being proposed. Mr. Anderson suggested that it would be best to state that the intent is for a natural landscape treatment in concert with the overall program for the site. Mr. Vig stated that that made sense.

Mr. McCarthy raised a discussion regarding the reference in the introductory letter to the improvements to the fire pits. Mr. Vig said that it related to an area of the clubhouse near the 8 Mile Road frontage that was re-landscaped this past summer and that the petitioners were hoping to get some credit for that. Mr. McCarthy clarified that the concessions the petitioners were asking for were for the landscaping and not for the fire pits. Mr. Vig said that that was correct.

Ms. Anderson asked if there would be a full kitchen or only a basic counter in the refreshment building. Mr. Vig said that there would not be a full commercial kitchen and that the service would be very basic. Mainly beverages, hot dogs, and potato chips will be served.

Mr. Allen asked why lighting was required in the building. Ms. Frey stated that it had to do building code.

Mr. Vig stated that the building is seasonal and it is winterized after the golf season. It is used primarily during peak periods of play during the summer and during spring and fall.

Mr. Zawodny asked for clarification regarding the building's external materials. Mr. Mielock said that the same brick, shingles and siding will be used; consistent with the pump house. As for the siding the applicants are proposing more of a lattice work but still a wood product in a creamy color as seen on the pump house would be used.

Ms. Anderson asked if there would be a sign on the building. Mr. Mielock said that there is a logo on the gable end. Mr. Vig said it is the Meadowbrook logo. Mr. Mielock said they will ask for signage approval at a later date if necessary.

Ms. Frey said that that would be part of the building permit process.

Mr. Lark asked if the petitioners saw anything in the comments that they felt would require deviation. Mr. Vig said that apart from the Fire Department comment all of the items were fairly basic and could be handled by them. With regard to the lighting he said that the building is in a unique situation. They will work with the Township to come up with a solution.

Mr. Anderson made a motion that the PC approve the conceptual plan for JSKPR16-0002 for Meadowbrook Country Club with just a brief amendment to add the natural landscape treatment that is in concert with the overall site development for the golf course; that we are not expecting anything above minimal but to do enhancement to make it consistent with the other things that have been done. And also to address the staff comments in review, the Fire Department; and as far as lighting goes, it would be a building that would require minimal lighting; supported by Mr. Allen.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Allen, Zawodny, McCarthy, K. Anderson, L. Anderson,  
Lark  
Nays: None

Motion Approved

2. Meijer Store

Location: 20401 Haggerty Road  
Representative: Craig Armstrong, Elevatus Architecture  
Request: Discussion regarding curbside pick-up approval  
Action: Determination of Similar Use

Ms. Frey stated in June 2015 the PC reviewed an application by Meijer to install a drive-thru window for picking up items ordered on-line. It was proposed on the south side of the building and it had a remote kiosk, window that was going to be added to the building and a canopy. The actual approval did not include a kiosk, window or canopy.

Now, Meijer desires to add a drive-thru pharmacy pick-up and is asking to reclassify what was previously submitted as an SLU for the curb-side pick-up to be a pick-up door only and not a drive-thru.

The PC needs to determine if the pick-up area operates like a drive-thru. If not, Meijer will go through the SLU review process for the pharmacy drive -thru. If it is determined that the customer pick-up is a drive-thru, the petitioner is prepared to seek a variance from the ZBA.

Ms. Frey included the definition of a drive-thru from the ordinance.

Mr. Craig Armstrong of Elevatus Architecture, 111 East Wayne Street, Suite 555, Fort Wayne, Indiana 46802, explained that the idea of the curbside program when it was initiated two or three years ago was that a customer would order on-line, a number

would be generated, the customer would drive up to a canopy with a kiosk and punch in the number, and a code would be sent to the store to notify store staff that the customer is there. The customer would then pull up to a second canopy where the customer's car would be loaded by store staff.

Mr. Armstrong said that development and intricacies of the program did not prove conducive to that element but it is more beneficial for a customer to still shop on-line and allow staff to shop for them. When they get to the store location, however, it is better that the customer call the store from his or her cell phone and pull into the pick-up loop and staff will load up the grocery cart, go to the customer's car and load the vehicle.

The drive-thru, canopy and kiosks have been eliminated. Mr. Armstrong felt the nature of the drive-thru at this particular store is a "dedicated parking" lane within the pick-up loop. It is heavily landscaped and it has a space for six parking spaces for up to six people at any one time to get their groceries through the door.

The PC asked several questions of Ms. Frey and Mr. Armstrong to get clarification regarding the proposal.

Ms. Frey explained the factors that the PC had the ability to analyze in arriving at its decision, including peak hour use, nature of the use, aesthetics of the use, traffic generated by the use, noise, vibration, dust, smoke, glare, odor, and other impacts in terms of health, safety and welfare.

Mr. Lark raised a further discussion regarding the finding of similar use and Ms. Frey explained that the ordinance allows only one drive-thru window. She explained that if the PC were to find that the curbside was similar to a drive-thru then the avenue for the pharmacy pick-up would be to seek a variance from the ZBA. However, if the PC were to determine that the curbside was dissimilar and that they were not both drive-thru's then the petitioner would proceed through the site plan review and SLU process with the PC.

Ms. Anderson asked if there were any other businesses in the Township with both a curbside and a drive-thru. Ms. Frey stated that she was not aware of any.

Mr. Zawodny asked if money was a factor in deciding not to add a kiosk and a canopy and that in his opinion that would impact how the PC would determine whether the drive-up use feature would meet the definition of a drive-thru. In his opinion, the curbside pick-up would qualify as a drive-up service and if there were a procedure in place within the ordinance and within the ZBA to address that he felt it would be logical to follow that procedure.

Mr. Lark agreed with Mr. Zawodny's comments and stated he felt there were enough similarities despite the fact that there may not be a kiosk. He added that the purpose

of the statutes is to look at traffic flow, use and amount of use. He felt it was too similar to put another drive-thru feature in without a variance.

Mr. Armstrong asked Ms. Frey to read the section of the ordinance that addressed drive-ups as he was only able to find verbiage that specified one drive-thru window per site and not necessarily a drive-thru function, although banks are allowed two. Mr. Lark stated that he was not convinced that the difference between a window and a door would be determinative.

Mr. Allen made the comparison between a drive-thru dry cleaner and the use in question because customers in both circumstances would not be ordering a product but rather would be exchanging items.

Mr. Anderson expressed the opinion that it was difficult to not look at the use as a drive-thru function and that it would make sense to go through the variance process in terms of setting a precedent for two drive-thru functions.

Ms. Frey read the pertinent section of the ordinance.

Ms. Anderson and Mr. Anderson asked for clarification regarding the location and function of the door being used for the deliveries. Mr. Armstrong stated that the door is located on the side of the building. It is accessed only by store personnel and it is secured by a keypad. Mr. Armstrong confirmed that the only function of the door is to accommodate customers who are picking up in their vehicles.

Mr. Allen expressed the opinion that based on the discussion thus far the PC appears to feel that the drive-up use feature should be considered a drive-thru.

Mr. McCarthy expressed the opinion that at a typical drive-thru cars are lined up one behind the other whereas under the proposed circumstances there are six parking spaces to which the goods are delivered. In his opinion that took away the drive-thru concept.

Ms. Anderson stated that she would feel differently if customers were pulling up into a parking spot in the front of the building and the groceries were delivered via the main doors. However, much of the drive-thru concern deals with the traffic circulation. In the case in question there is a dedicated area in a U shape with a dedicated door where the deliveries are being made. In her opinion it was difficult to see the difference between that and a drive-thru.

Ms. Frey clarified the verbiage in the ordinance addressing one drive-thru per site.

Mr. McCarthy asked Mr. Armstrong where they would consider placing the second drive-up use. Mr. Armstrong stated that the plan is very similar to the original plan proposed in 2006 and feels they can address the traffic concerns raised in the original proposal. He said that they would accomplish that by making some modifications to





Mr. Joe Boji of Boji Development at 31000 Northwestern Highway, Suite 145, Farmington Hills 48334, stated that the site plan is for 14 single-family condominium units with full basements on one level. They will be age restricted to 55 and older.

Mr. Boji gave a PowerPoint presentation and provided images of their product. He confirmed each home has a minimum 5' deep front porch.

Ms. Frey clarified that all side-entry garages are being proposed for the Northville Township site.

Mr. Boji said that instead of the garage door being the same material, brick or stone will be used and two to three windows will be placed where the garage doors would normally go in a front-entry garage.

Ms. Anderson asked the typical size. Mr. Boji said that the units will range from approximately 1,700 square feet to just over 2,000 square feet.

Ms. Anderson asked about the price point. Mr. Boji stated that they had not yet determined the price point but speculated that it should be in the mid-\$300,000 to low \$400,000 range.

Mr. Lark asked about a second story and Mr. Boji confirmed that there will be no upstairs in any of the units. The applicant designs specifically for their clients, who are 55 years of age and over, mostly retired or retiring soon. Most of the doors in the units are ADA-accessible.

Mr. Anderson asked about the large portion of the existing wooded area that is being retained as a buffer backdrop, specifically the detention basin, which is more structured than what he would prefer to see on a site such as this. He said if the petitioner could make it physically blend in with the naturally wooded area that they are preserving it would help preserve the site and its consistency.

Mr. Anderson stated that while he appreciated all of the side-entry garages he believed that they posed a challenge to the site plan. Where there are driveways that are starting out, there is a challenge at least with the curb line in front of the house that is adjacent to the house that the driveway is serving. The driveways are very tight between the buildings and the fact that there is probably 5' or less between the driveway and the next building. Mr. Anderson said he believed that when the developer looks at it in the next stage, where there is a 1,700-square-foot footprint versus the 2,000-square-foot footprint, he may have to add more of the 1,700-square-foot footprints in order to loosen the space up a bit. Alternatively, in order to make the plan work a bit better the developer may have to add in a few front drives, where possible, in order to make the plan work.

Mr. Boji stated that he agreed but that the footprint difference between the 1,700 and the 2,000-square-foot models was only 3' in width. Mr. Anderson said that he believed

the developer had a challenge to demonstrate that this plan with the proposed number of units will work. He suggested that the developer may have to lose a unit in order to fit everything in.

Mr. Boji asked if there was a requirement for the space between the driveway and the house. Mr. Anderson stated that it was probably 4' from the adjacent house to the driveway. Ms. Frey stated there were setbacks from structure to structure but she did not believe driveways were taken into account.

A discussion took place among the PC and the developer regarding where issues might occur between units and the developer suggested that certain driveways could be reconfigured. The developer stated that the utilities might be allowed to come in between certain units.

Ms. Anderson stated that the ordinance requires only 80 percent and not 100 percent side-entry garages. She suggested that that may have an impact on how the developer may create more space.

Mr. Lark suggested that given the configuration, for him intruding a bit into the setback would not be problematic.

Mr. Lark asked about a common element and stated that with the driveways as they are currently there will still be a unit that looks rather like a lot. Ms. Frey said that everything except the 10' X 10' area around it will be the common area and there will be no lot lines or unit lines.

Ms. Anderson asked if the developer was age restricting the site and Mr. Boji stated that the age restriction was specified in the common documents and in the master deed.

Mr. Allen disclosed for the record that the landscape plan was prepared by his son. The Ethics Committee has reviewed the matter and has determined that no conflict of interest exists.

Ms. Frey stated that the ordinance requires a recognizable benefit. She stated that the benefit is that the units with a first floor bedroom have been determined to be a highly desirable product for the Township. Currently the inventory of this product in the Township is very low. The developer intends to age restrict the units and she believed that would alleviate some of the potential concerns that the PC has had on other projects with different floor plans. The Township does not have the ability to restrict the age of the buyers or residents but the developer can do that on his own and that is the intent of this project.

Ms. Frey stated that the property is currently zoned R-3. In the packet there was a configuration that demonstrated something that would meet the R-3 requirements, which was a rectangular lot without much creativity. Creating the AAC gives the developer the opportunity to do some clustering and slightly curve the cul-de-sac to

give it a bit more variety along the edges. Most important, it will provide the opportunity to preserve the existing vegetation around the perimeter of the property.

Ms. Frey stated that if the site were to be developed as a standard R-3 under its current zoning designation, those would all be lots and they would all be cleared in order to fit units on them. The current proposal affords the opportunity to preserve some of the property's natural features.

Ms. Frey said that a 5' wide sidewalk is proposed on both sides of the road as well as along the 5 Mile Road frontage. It will abut to a sidewalk to the west. On the east there is a gap of approximately 60' between the sidewalk and the existing sidewalk where it picks up in front of the adjacent apartments. The ordinance requires a continuous pedestrian system that links the areas of development and other destinations of the surrounding area. Both the internal sidewalk and the sidewalk along the frontage do that. If the developer were to extend that in the right-of-way to the adjacent Northville Forest it would provide a nice connection and eliminate a gap in the sidewalk system.

Mr. Lark asked the developer if he was willing to extend the sidewalk and Mr. Boji said that he was willing to do that.

In terms of the adjacent land uses Ms. Frey said that there are detached condominiums to the west and apartments to the east so the development fits in nicely.

Based on the size of the site at only six acres and what could be developed on it under the traditional R-3 classification, Ms. Frey said that there really is not an additional impact on schools, recreation or traffic operation. She stated that the traffic operations fall below the threshold of needing any kind of traffic analysis. That would be the same if it were to be developed as an R-3 or if it was a cluster. That is a benefit for the rezoning.

Ms. Frey went over the PUD review comments. The Township has the ability to approve some waivers. As submitted the plan does not request any waivers. However, in response to the Township engineer, who was concerned about the distance of the sanitary sewer between Units Nos. 8 and 9, it appeared that some of the buildings could be shifted to encroach slightly into the east property line to accomplish her desired separation of the sanitary sewer between Units Nos. 8 and 9. Ms. Frey added that it would help with some of the driveway situations that were discussed earlier and would perhaps create a bit more flexibility in spacing.

Additionally, Ms. Frey suggested some front-entry garages. She believed that that, in combination with a bit of an encroachment for Unit No. 10 would provide some benefit to the driveways and their configurations for the side-entry garages.

The project requires a 35' greenbelt along 5 Mile Road with an average of 50'. Ms. Frey stated that this project provides a total of 50' along the entire frontage. Thus, the

developer slightly exceeds the open space requirements. No open spaces would be required if the property were to be developed under the R-3 zoning.

Ms. Frey said that the PC would need to make a finding that the sample elevations contained in the packet meet all of the criteria, e.g., that 1) they are harmonious with the adjacent land uses; 2) unifying elements such as accents, style, color and material are provided for each product; and 3) that the primary materials include the brick, stone, wood lap siding, and architectural shingles.

The applicant is not requesting a density bonus. The open space requirements have been met.

Ms. Frey briefly reviewed the rezoning criteria that the PC would need to use in order to make a finding before the proposal goes on to the BOT. First, the PC would need to determine if the project qualifies as a PUD or if there is additional information that the PC needs to satisfy those conditions. The PUD agreement would be required before the plan goes on to the BOT.

Two things that the PC would need to consider would be the conceptual building elevations and the materials, and whether the PC wants to entertain the ability for a small encroachment into the 50' setback on the west side in order to create greater distance between Units Nos. 8 and 9 for the sanitary sewer. The PC can give consideration for up to three front-entry garages to help alleviate some of the congestion on the site.

The Township attorney would review the PUD agreement prior to it going on to the BOT.

Ms. Frey stated that the engineer did a review and there were a couple of things that she indicated, which could easily be shown on the concept plan.

The Fire Department had some comments but they were primarily relative to site plan review.

The traffic engineer did not see any significant design or operational issues based on the site plan and the cluster option that was presented to the PC.

Mr. McCarthy asked if the trees along the roadway were considered part of the tree replacement requirement. Ms. Frey said that they were not but that there is a street tree requirement. During site plan review that will be reviewed and that will be over and above the required landscape requirements.

Mr. Boji stated that the developer does landscape packages that are included in the sale of the home. The developer controls how many trees and shrubs are planted and their locations, which can be part of the tree replacement.

Mr. Zawodny asked if the elevations that are depicted were related to the photographs that the PC was shown tonight of similar products. Mr. Boji said that they were.

Ms. Frey said that there are sketches that show some units with the particular garages.

Mr. Zawodny asked if they would include those elevations all the way around. Ms. Frey said that the developer is designing them because they do not have the side-entry garage currently.

Ms. Frey asked Mr. Boji what the intent was for the side-entry and rear-entry units in terms of materials. Mr. Boji said that typically the units are 50 percent masonry and 50 percent composite siding.

Ms. Anderson asked Mr. Boji to speak to the criterion that addressed the fact that the zoning is more appropriate than the current zoning. Mr. Boji said in response that the current zoning would allow for 11 units and that the aesthetics of the subdivision would not be as nice as what is being proposed. It would be basically a straight cul-de-sac all the way to the back with rectangular lots being served on either side. Under the PUD the developer is allowed more flexibility with the clustering so that they can wind the road and they can position the units in different ways to maximize disruption to the environment while still maintaining the same or an increased number of units.

Mr. Lark said that the materials state that with the 11 units it was not fiscally viable. Mr. Lark asked Mr. Boji to speak to that point. Mr. Boji said that because of the cost of the property and the development at 11 units, for the developer it would be cost prohibitive to do the development. Conversely, with 14 units in this type of development it makes sense to move forward.

Mr. Lark asked if it would cost more to remove the trees in the other scenario. Mr. Boji said that it would cost more to remove the trees. Additionally, the road is longer and there would be fewer units.

Mr. Lark raised a discussion regarding the elevations and the materials. Mr. Boji reiterated what he had previously said regarding the materials for the side-entry garages.

A discussion took place regarding the 50 percent figure for the one-story unit.

Mr. Zawodny expressed a desire for some variation in materials with the side-entry garages.

Mr. Anderson stated that his preference would be to review the actual elevations and materials that were being proposed. Ms. Frey suggested forming a sub-committee or, alternatively, a special meeting could be held at which the materials could be provided to the PC prior to the February meeting.

Mr. Allen expressed the opinion that the biggest hurdle for the developer was to get the driveway placement/accessibility/proximity to adjacent unit under control.

Ms. Frey suggested having the developer submit a revised plan that incorporates the front-entry garages and the encroachment into the east setback to see what it does for the layout and to see the elevations at that time as well.

Ms. Anderson asked if there were any timing issues on the property. Mr. Boji stated that they had to close on the property by a certain date.

Both Mr. Anderson and Ms. Anderson expressed support for moving the project forward. Mr. Lark concurred.

Mr. Lark asked the developer if he had seen Ms. Frey's January 10, 2017, letter and if he was willing to meet all five of the conditions outlined in the letter. Mr. Boji said that he had seen the letter and that he was willing to meet all the conditions.

Mr. Zawodny asked if that also would include the engineer's recommendation that a minimum of 40' separation be placed between Units Nos. 8 and 9 for the utilities. Mr. Boji said he could not commit to that because they have done other developments where 40' has not been provided and there were no issues. Ms. Frey stated that the issue was something that the engineer and Mr. Casari would evaluate.

Mr. Zawodny stated that it would be helpful to have a dimensional plan that showed the minimal dimensions between each unit. Mr. Boji said that typically the architect will do it only with the ones that vary but he agreed to it.

Mr. Lark read a letter into the record that had been received from Mr. James J. Lokar of 41621 Blairwood Circle, Plymouth 48170, expressing the opinion that the development would create gross problems with traffic and congestion and felt it would take away the beautiful residential living that exists.

Mr. Lark summarized the comments from the traffic engineer that indicated the AAC use would not result additional traffic concerns. Mr. Lark stated that the developer has complied with all of the AAC buffers and setbacks.

Ms. Frey clarified that 11 typical single-family homes would generate a certain amount of traffic. Traffic studies have indicated that with the empty nester development even at 14 units there would be fewer trips per day.

Ms. Gail Chechlowski of 15492 Oak Pointe Circle in Plymouth stated she lives in the closest condo at the northwest corner of the development. She expressed concerns with the sewer design since the development will tear up their woods and cut across the northern section of the association property. She asked if another route could be used for the sewer.

She also expressed a concern for the trees and the wooded area and concerns regarding a potential impact on property values as a result of the development.

She asked who would be responsible for the maintenance of the sewer lines and about replacement of trees and lawn that will be torn up by the sewer line. She also expressed concerns about the distance from the new units to the property line.

Ms. Frey confirmed with the applicant that they would be seeking an easement from the adjacent association. Ms. Frey stated that tree removal and restoration can be discussed with the developer in return for the easement. Ms. Frey stated that the maintenance of the sewers would be the responsibility of the Township.

Regarding distance of the units from the property line, Ms. Frey stated that the ordinance requires a minimum 50' and the proposed units comply with that. Ms. Frey explained that the units in Ms. Chechlowski's complex are also 50' from the property line, plus or minus.

Mr. Allen made a motion to close the Public Hearing; supported by Mr. McCarthy.

Voice Vote:           Ayes: All  
                              Nays: None

Motion Approved

Mr. Lark closed the Public Hearing at 8:49 PM.

Ms. Anderson stated for the record that in looking at the rezoning criteria and all of the standards that have to be met it was her opinion that the petition met all of the standards. In her mind it was consistent with the Township's goals, policies and future land use and that it was compatible with the site's physical and environmental features as well as with the permitted uses. She felt that the applicant addressed and met all of the criteria.

Mr. Allen felt that the site plan needed to be revised to correct the garage issues and the required setbacks for the sewer. There was a suggestion by Mr. Anderson to modify the detention pond to give it a more natural appearance. Architecture also would need to be reviewed.

Mr. Allen made a motion that the PC postpone a decision on Heritage Park JPUD17-0001 to give the developer a chance to make the revisions to take care of the comments that surfaced at tonight's meeting; supported by Ms. Anderson.

Roll Call Vote:       Ayes: McCarthy, L. Anderson, Zawodny, Allen, K. Anderson,  
                              Lark  
                              Nays: None

Motion Approved





Ms. Frey asked the PC to provide her with feedback on how the Township staff is doing and if there are any needs that can be addressed.

The BOT has asked for a joint meeting with the PC at the beginning of March to discuss what has worked and what has not worked with respect to the AAC regulations.

- **Eric Lark:** Mr. Lark reported that the ZBA met on December 12. Front and rear setbacks were approved on Clement Road. There was also a waste receptacle and fence issue on Gerald Avenue in which the ZBA granted a wall on the east side so that the dumpster would be screened on one side. There were conditions pertaining to the future in the event the fence is taken down, in which case the receptacle should be covered in masonry to comply with the ordinance.
- **Richard Allen:** Mr. Allen reported that the BOT approved Mill Ridge but with some conditions, including a subcommittee of the BOT to review architecture. Some minor trim changes will be made to break up the appearance on the sides of the units.

**Extended Public Comments:** None.

**Adjournment:** Mr. McCarthy made a motion to adjourn the meeting; supported by Zawodny.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All  
Nays: None  
Motion Approved

Meeting adjourned at 9:26 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Laurie A. Palazzolo  
Recording Secretary