

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF NORTHVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
February 28, 2017**

DATE: February 28, 2017
TIME: 7:00 PM
PLACE: Northville Township Hall
44405 Six Mile Road

APPROVED: March 28, 2017

CALL TO ORDER: 7:03 PM

ROLL CALL: Present: Richard Allen
Kent Anderson
Lisa Anderson
Timothy Guerriero
Eric Lark
George McCarthy
Tim Zawodny

Also Present: Jennifer Frey, Township Planner
Tom Casari, DPS Director

Guests: 26

Mr. Lark welcomed Mr. Guerriero to the PC.

Approval of Minutes: Planning Commission – January 31, 2017

Mr. McCarthy made a motion to accept the draft Planning Commission minutes of January 31, 2017; supported by Mr. Allen.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion Approved

Other Minutes: Board of Trustees Regular – January 19, 2017
Zoning Board of Appeals – December 12, 2016

Mr. Zawodny made a motion to receive and file the minutes from the Board of Trustees Regular meeting of January 19, 2017, and the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting of December 12, 2016; supported by Ms. Anderson.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion Approved

Correspondence: Ms. Frey stated that she had provided a handout from The Villas Homeowners Association relative to Item No. 2 on the agenda. She stated that at the appropriate time on the agenda, while it was not a Public Hearing, some members of the audience would like to speak on the topic.

Brief Public Comments: None.

**New Business
Public Hearing**

- | | |
|---------------------|---|
| 1. JR17-0001 | Akhdar Realty |
| Location: | South side of 7 Mile; between Woods of Northville & Northville Plaza Mall
(Parcel ID#77-042-99-0001-001) |
| Request: | Rezone Parcel from General Business (B-3) to Local Business (B-1) |
| Action: | Recommend to Board of Trustees |

Mr. Lark opened the Public Hearing at 7:07 PM.

Ms. Frey introduced the proposal stating that the property, at just under one acre in size, is relatively small and currently vacant. The request is to rezone it from B-3 to B-1 for the purpose of placing a small real estate office on the site.

Ms. Frey reviewed the criteria that the PC was required to consider as they made their recommendation to the BOT. Office is permitted in both the B-1 and B-3 districts. The reason the applicant is requesting the rezoning is the B-1 district requires less setback to the adjacent residential than B-3. The uses allowed in B-1 are less intensive than uses allowed in B-3. The B-3 designation allows uses such as restaurants serving alcohol, uses with outdoor components such as a garden center, drive-thru restaurants, gas stations, service stations, and car washes whereas the B-1 district does not.

Township services and utilities are sufficient to accommodate both B-1 and B-3 classifications.

With regard to the capacity of the street system and its ability to safely accommodate the expected traffic generated by the proposed zoning district, the B-1 classification allows uses that are less intensive in terms of traffic and trips in and out of the site.

With regard to the apparent demand for the zoning district compared to the surrounding properties, several of the uses in the B-3 district are also allowed in the B-1 district.

With regard to the boundaries, Ms. Frey stated that the building area or the footprint in the B-1 district will be greater and will allow greater flexibility than the more restrictive footprint of the B-3 district.

Regarding the last criterion, Ms. Frey said that the intended use is office. She recommended considering Office (OS) zoning rather than B-1 since that is what the applicant said he intended to build. She stated that setbacks for Office zoning are the same as B-1.

A discussion took place among the PC and Ms. Frey regarding zoning classifications for other sites within the Township, incidences of B-1 within the Township that are adjacent to residential properties, the benefits of the B-1 designation over a B-3, parking requirements in the B-1 district versus in the B-3 district and required landscaping and buffers for the site.

Mr. Michael Akhdar of 44915 Thornapple Lane in Northville introduced himself as the applicant. He stated that the main purpose for requesting the rezoning was the setback. If it remains as B-3 a 100' setback is required from the west and the south sides. He learned last week that the County is going to force the applicant to take another 60' from the north side, which would leave an even more restrictive site of 185' by 170'.

Mr. Anderson asked Mr. Akhdar if there was a reason why he was requesting a change to B-1 as opposed to OS. Mr. Akhdar said that they want more flexibility and the B-1 classification allowed more flexibility.

Ms. Anderson asked if there was a tenant in mind. Mr. Akhdar said that the building would be for his business. They are a medical billing and computer consultant firm that currently is renting in Livonia.

A discussion took place among the PC regarding the B-1, B-3 and OS zoning designations.

Mr. Akhdar said that he reviewed the proposal with his architect and based upon the layout the real issue is with the parking. If the site remains B-3 parking will be insufficient.

A further discussion took place with Mr. Akhdar regarding the proposed location of the parking spaces.

A further discussion took place among the PC regarding the rezoning impact on the potential future development of the surrounding parcels, the fact that the parcel is what Ms. Frey referred to as a remnant parcel, and the difficulty in developing the site due to its small size.

Mr. Zawodny clarified with Mr. Akhdar that the proposed structure will be approximately 5,000 square feet in size with approximately 25 parking spaces.

Mr. Lark asked the applicant to reiterate his objection to the OS zoning classification. Mr. Akhdar stated that there were some things that could not be done in an OS zoning classification that are permitted in B-1. He said that the B-1 classification would allow

them more flexibility going forward. Mr. Akhdar clarified that he currently owns the property.

Mr. McCarthy expressed the opinion that the view from the street will be the same with B-1 and OS zoning and that the building will fit in nicely. Mr. Lark agreed but stated that he believed the PC was attempting to prevent a use that currently does not work but that would work on the site if the setbacks were cut in half. Mr. Akhdar said that the petitioners had no plans to put a restaurant on the site.

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

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
 Nays: None

Motion Approved

Hearing no other comments to come before the PC on this matter, Mr. Lark closed the Public Hearing at 7:32 PM.

A discussion took place among the PC. Mr. Zawodny observed that one of the PC's requirements is evidence and that everything that the PC was being asked to respond to this evening was verbal. Mr. Lark stated that although it would be helpful to have better drawings and a better layout of what was around the site, he believed this petition was a bit different due to its size. In addition, Ms. Frey explained earlier what the Master Plan contemplated for the site to the east.

Mr. Anderson referenced that the applicant had engaged the services of an architect and that ancillary information would be helpful to the PC.

Ms. Anderson expressed concerns regarding the fact that the property is surrounded by residential. In her opinion an office was more transitional to a residential use yet the B-1 classification was more consistent with the B-3 use. She expressed concerns as to whether the B-1 or the B-3 was the best zoning classification.

Mr. Allen made a motion recommending to the BOT rezoning of the subject parcel on 7 Mile, from B-3 to B-1 based upon the size of the parcel and the B-3 zoning creates restrictions on the building envelope; supported by McCarthy.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes: McCarthy, Allen, Guerriero, Lark
 Nays: K. Anderson, Zawodny, L. Anderson

Motion Approved

2. Northville Hills Golf Club PUD Amendment

Representative: Henry Wineman, Five Sheldon LLC
Location: Northwest Corner of 5 Mile and Sheldon Roads (Parcel ID#77-059-99-0002-706)
Request: PUD Amendment

Action: Recommend to the Board of Trustees

Ms. Frey provided a brief background of the proposal. The parcel is approximately 14 acres in size and part of the Wayne County PUD that was executed in 1997. The PUD includes almost 900 acres of property bounded generally by 5 Mile, Six Mile, Sheldon and Beck Road and is currently developed as the Northville Hills subdivision and golf course, the Links of Northville condominiums, Research & Development uses on Centennial Drive, the Villas of Northville condominiums and Northville Hollow detached condominiums at 5 Mile and Sheldon.

Various plans and concepts have been discussed previously but plans have not been presented to the PC for its review.

Tonight's request is to amend the PUD agreement to convert approximately five acres, of the almost 14 acres, that was designated as Neighborhood Commercial and to Senior Housing and to allow the height of the buildings within the senior housing component to be up to 45' tall. Ms. Frey stated that the ordinance allows a height up to 30'. The balance of the site will remain as Neighborhood Commercial. Ms. Frey stated her letter included other requests for the Neighborhood Commercial portion of the site but the applicant has requested those requests be removed from consideration at this time.

Ms. Frey stated that the east side of Sheldon is zoned B-3 (General Commercial). A discussion took place among the PC and Ms. Frey regarding the zoning change.

Mr. Henry Wineman of 4008 Hidden Woods Drive in Bloomfield Township introduced himself on behalf of the owners. He gave a brief background on the proposal stating that he was involved in the development of the Northville Hills Golf Club by Biltmore Properties and Toll Brothers. This development represents the last undeveloped parcel of the approximately 600 acres of Northville Hills Golf Club.

Mr. Wineman stated there was going to be a senior living development on the east side of Sheldon Road. The parcel in question was carved out as Neighborhood Commercial to provide service retail for the Northville Hills development and the surrounding area. He stated he is proposing to amend the PUD agreement again to permit the construction of a senior housing development on five acres on the west side of the property, which borders the Northville Hills Golf Club condominium development. The senior housing development will include both assisted living and memory care.

They are also requesting that the PUD agreement be amended to permit the portion of the building closest to Five Mile Road to be three stories.

Mr. Mark Pomerence of 4825 N.W. Canal Street, Riverside, Missouri, Vice President of Operations of Northpoint Development, introduced himself on behalf of Northpoint Development and Stonecrest Senior Living. He stated that Northpoint Development is a real estate development company and ownership and management firm based out of

Kansas City specializing in high-end, multi-family and senior housing. They partner with Integral Senior Living out of Carlsbad, California. Mr. Pomeranke stated that they are currently under development at Stonecrest of Troy and Stonecrest of Rochester Hills. Both were done under a PUD.

Mr. Pomeranke gave an overview of the plan via a PowerPoint presentation. The facility is a long-term care facility providing residents the care they need with their daily activities. There is a one-story memory care component operated separately from the assisted living component but the kitchen and electrical/mechanical spaces are shared.

There are approximately 87 units with 91 beds, 64 in the assisted living component and 27 in the memory care component. The petitioner is asking for three stories because it shortens the hallways and allows residents easier access to the core amenity areas such as the activities spaces and dining. It also allows the petitioner to keep the footprint tighter and allows for more green space on the property. Also, with a three-story building they are able to do more interesting things architecturally.

Mr. Pomeranke stated that the petitioner met with The Villas representatives approximately one week ago and had a very productive conversation. The understanding is that the petitioner will orient the three-story building closest to Five Mile Road and away from the neighborhood.

Mr. Pomeranke showed images of the elevations and explained that the building is 45' tall. He felt that the petitioner met the intent of the two and-one-half story, 35' building, with approximately 60 percent of it being three stories tall.

The petitioner has been very conscientious regarding parking. None of the spaces face the neighboring homes. Some of them face the property line but are not directed at any specific home. On the north side there are generous setbacks and the area will be highly landscaped. The service area is located away from the residential.

The petitioner will work with the Township and EMS to put a program in place for ambulance pick-up and drop-off, which is at the front door, minimizing the disruption to the neighbors.

Mr. Pomeranke stated that the traffic will be well below what would occur in a retail use, which translates into less parking, more green space and less storm water runoff.

Mr. Pomeranke presented renderings and elevations to the PC.

A discussion took place among the PC and Mr. Pomeranke regarding the buffering and berms. Mr. Zawodny asked if consideration was given to placing a berm along Five Mile Road and Mr. Pomeranke said that the petitioner would consider it.

A discussion took place regarding the property line between the senior housing and the retail. Mr. Pomeranke stated that the petitioner had attempted to address shared access. Mr. Anderson questioned the easement on the adjacent property. Mr. Pomeranke stated that they had not fully worked through the legal lot split but they would have it finalized when they returned for site plan approval.

Mr. Anderson asked if the intent was for the access to the assisted living to also serve the retail. Mr. Pomeranke stated that at some point in time it would.

Mr. Lark raised a discussion regarding the road that runs up the north and west side of the site. Mr. Pomeranke stated that fire truck access was a big concern and that the Fire Department typically likes to have 360-degree access around the site. The building is a non-combustible building. On the three-story component they are fully sprinkled. The neighbors have requested the access drive be removed. The petitioner is open to doing that but stated that it currently serves for emergency vehicle access.

Mr. Lark referenced the correspondence from The Villas stating that they were in favor of the proposal if the items listed in their letter were addressed or agreed to. Mr. Pomeranke stated that he had not seen the current version.

Mr. Wineman stated that he had seen the list from The Villas. Mr. Wineman said he agreed to the items pertaining to the senior housing component as identified by the residents.

Mr. Allen stated that restriction No. 2 was beyond the PC's scope.

Mr. Pomeranke said that the petitioner was comfortable with the spirit of the list of conditions. With regard to the 100' landscape setback with no less than a 6' landscaped berm topped with continuous staggering growth, Mr. Pomeranke said that the petitioner was working on it. The petitioner was committed to meeting with the owners of The Villas again prior to finalizing their final site plan and asking the BOT to amend the PUD.

A continued discussion took place among the PC and Mr. Pomeranke regarding the access road and the proposed 45' height of the senior housing component. With regard to the 45' height, Ms. Anderson asked if the building could spread a bit further east instead of north. Mr. Pomeranke said that theoretically it could but the petitioner stated that there were functional limitations on the lots and they wanted to make sure there were useable lots that could be adequately developed. From the petitioner's perspective they could not develop east.

Mr. Guerriero asked how many units the 64 beds in the assisted living unit translated into. Mr. Pomeranke said that it represented approximately 61 units. Mr. Guerriero asked for clarification regarding employees. Mr. Pomeranke said that total salaried employees at any given time would peak at approximately 28 at mid-day. There are three shifts from 6 AM to 2 PM, 2 PM to 10 PM, and 10 PM to 6 AM. Mr. Guerriero asked how many of the

approximately 80 residents would have vehicles. Mr. Pomeranke said it is different at each facility but typically from one to five residents will have a vehicle and of those none will ever drive them. The community has a town car and a bus.

Mr. Allen raised a discussion regarding the two-story height of the Rochester Hills and the Troy facilities. Mr. Pomeranke said that there was no chance to ask for anything different at those facilities. In Troy, parking could be put on the adjacent city property and thus the petitioner was able to do a two story facility. For the subject site, there is a bit more flexibility with the PUD. Mr. Allen asked if the building in Rochester Hills was a bit below grade and Mr. Pomeranke said that it was and that the subject site will be similar. He said that the petitioner was asking for 45' but it was actually approximately 33' to the roofline. They put a steep pitch on the roof because they like the look architecturally but if they needed to reduce the height they could always change the pitch of the roof. Mr. Allen asked if the 45' was to the peak of the roof or if it was the average height of the roof. Mr. Pomeranke said it was the average height of the roof and that the peak height was approximately 48'.

Mr. Bill Wehrle of 44565 Broadmoor Circle North, president and one of five directors of the condominium association, gave the PC an update. The board and residents met with the petitioners, developers and attorneys. They favor the development of the facility and want them as neighbors. They would like to come to agreement on the six items outlined in their letter. The petitioner has agreed to the items.

The only issue other than the six items outlined was the height issue but Mr. Wehrle believed that it was not an issue now for most of the residents. The height could be addressed with a 6' berm and evergreens.

Ms. Frey stated that in addition to the BOT agreeing to the amendment, The Villas also need to agree to the amendment.

Mr. Lark raised a discussion regarding the conditions and whether The Villas' attorney recommended getting some of them into the PUD amendment agreement. Mr. Wehrle said yes. Ms. Frey stated that the senior housing group could enter into a separate agreement with The Villas, but some of the things The Villas are requesting are already required by the Township or not applicable for the Township to include in the PUD amendment.

Mr. Anderson made a motion to recommend approval to the BOT; the only real issue is the buffering and I think as long as that is handled in a very naturalistic way with a combination of plant materials and some earth work I think they can accomplish that. I don't think it's physically appropriate to just have a linear berm and that would destroy any existing plant material. I don't have a problem with the 45' height; supported by Mr. Allen.

A discussion took place among the PC regarding the property line on the east side, the zoning and the PUD, and the 45' height and the potential to set a precedent for the commercial component.

Mr. Lark suggested amending the motion to include language included in the February 28, 2017 correspondence from The Villas be incorporated into the PUD agreement. Ms. Frey stated that the Township attorney would review it. Mr. Allen stated he would be more comfortable with those being addressed between the senior housing operator and The Villas. Ms. Frey stated that perhaps there could be a separate agreement with the developer.

Mr. Guerriero asked if The Villas was going to enter into a private agreement with the developer incorporating the six points previously discussed.

Mr. Lou Thomas of 44640 Broadmoor Circle North introduced himself as an attorney with The Villas. He said that The Villas might enter into a private agreement with the developer.

Ms. Anderson expressed the opinion that the language should be in a separate agreement with the developer.

A further discussion took place. Mr. Thomas stated that The Villas had a veto right and that they were going to do everything they could to preserve their rights. They did not want to give up any of their rights as to the Phase II parcel by agreeing to this.

Mr. Lark said that since The Villas had a veto right then perhaps it was not as important to include the six items into the PUD agreement. With that he withdrew his amendment.

A further discussion took place regarding the site becoming a separate parcel with a separate owner. Mr. Wineman said that there will be a reciprocal easement agreement covering the maintenance of the common drives.

Mr. Wehrle stated for the record that the 45' that The Villas was in favor of applied only to the front building.

Mr. Anderson stated that the approval should be contingent upon the reciprocal agreement being executed or definitely the BOT being made aware that there is a reciprocal agreement that is proposed that has not been accomplished yet in order to make this site plan work.

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

Motion Approved

3. JSC17-0001

Ridge Hills

Representative: Brad Botham, Pinnacle Homes
Location: Southeast area of 7 Mile and Ridge Roads
(Parcel ID#'s77-030-99-0016-001; 030-99-0016-004;
030-99-0016-006; 030-99-0016-007)
Request: Final Site Plan Approval
Action: Approve, Approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny

Ms. Frey stated the PUD concept plan was approved toward the end of last year. All of the things the PC discussed during the PUD approval of the concept plan, including the layout, the circulation, the unit count and the number of front-entry garages were illustrated on the site plan.

The previously approved development had a number of trees that were removed along with a woodland replacement requirement. The roads and infrastructure went in on the site but the trees never did because they did not get to that point. As a requirement for this site, the petitioner needs to capture the 562" of replacement trees and identify those on their landscape plan. Also, if there are any additional trees that have to be removed to create the new cul-de-sac and the units around the cul-de-sac that needs to be incorporated into the woodland replacement requirement and shown on a revised site plan.

Ms. Frey stated that as part of the PUD agreement the asphalt pathway along 7 Mile Road must be extended to Ridge Road, this can be done within the existing road right-of-way for the off-site portion of the path. This needs to be shown on the plans.

The Master Deed and the Exhibit B drawings need to be submitted and reviewed by the Township. The PUD agreement has a provision for two models and after that the Exhibit B drawing is required prior to issuing any more permits for units.

If any lighting is proposed at the entrances, the photometric information needs to be provided.

Lastly, the index sheet on the cover sheet needs to be updated to reflect the sheets that are part of the site plan submission only. The engineering sets are not needed now and will come later.

Mr. Allen disclosed that the landscape plan for this development was drawn by his son. Past review by the Township Ethics Committee revealed that no conflict of interest existed.

A discussion took place among the PC and Ms. Frey regarding the tree count, landscape plan and pathway.

Ms. Frey stated reviewed the comment from engineering that the petitioner is to provide the C-permit from the County identifying that the easements, landscape walls and utilities, etc., are not within the 25' buffer. The Fire Department approved the site

plan and all the other items were things that would get picked up during the Engineering review.

Mr. Brad Botham of 1668 S. Telegraph Road in Bloomfield Hills introduced himself on behalf of Pinnacle Homes.

Mr. Lark asked Mr. Botham if he had reviewed the review comments in Ms. Frey's February 7, 2017, letter. Mr. Botham stated that the petitioner had reviewed the comments and that they had no issue with the tree replacement. They are happy to escrow for any costs associated with installing the sidewalk along 7 Mile Road. He believed that the existing right-of-way was 30' there as opposed to the petitioner's proposed 60'. He believed there may be some geometrical conflict with tying in the sidewalk there.

Ms. Frey stated that the logistics could be worked out and that the Township wants the sidewalk installed and that they do not want to escrow the money.

Mr. Lark asked Mr. Botham about the Engineering comment. Mr. Botham stated that they are looking to regrade the detention pond such that the existing landscape structure will be outside of the 25' buffer.

Ms. Anderson asked about the elevations, specifically if the petitioner was planning brick all the way around the site. Mr. Botham said that they were.

Mr. Zawodny raised a discussion regarding the landscape and tree replacement. Mr. Botham stated that as a benefit to both their residents and the residents that border the site the petitioner proposes to upsize some of the trees to provide additional screening.

Mr. McCarthy asked if the elevations submitted as part of the packet had been built somewhere else. Mr. Botham said that the side-entry unit had not been built and that it was developed for this community. Mr. Botham stated that the front-entry version has been built in many instances.

Mr. McCarthy asked Mr. Botham to elaborate on the interior floor plans of the various designs. Mr. Botham stated that there are two separate floor plans or two separate interior layouts, each with a handful of different exterior elevations or façades.

Mr. Allen made a motion that the PC grant final site plan approval to JSC17-0001, Ridge Hills, and that this approval is conditioned upon compliance with our consultants' review comments; supported by Ms. Anderson.

Mr. Zawodny suggested amending the motion to incorporate the comments regarding the increased plantings and compliance with the review letter from staff, that as stated by the applicant that would be along the eastern and southern borders buffering the adjacent residential communities.

Mr. Allen made a motion to approve JSKPR 16-0001, Aisin World Corporation, parking lot revisions, and that approval is contingent upon modifications of the landscape plan as contained in our consultant's letter; supported by Ms. Anderson.

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

5. JPUD17-0001 Heritage Park
Location: 41390 5 Mile Roads (former Iglesia Church site)
Request: Concept Plan Review – PUD Rezoning for Active Adult
Community (AAC)
Action: Recommend to Board of Trustees

Ms. Frey stated that the PC previously reviewed the PUD for the AAC and held the required Public Hearing. At that time, the PC requested the applicant address three specific things: 1) to soften the rigid appearance of the detention pond and perhaps consider splitting it on either side of the entry drive; 2) to provide a dimension plan that identifies the typical and variable setbacks, the spacing between units, and the setback of the side-entry driveways to the adjacent buildings; and 3) to consider some amount of front-entry garages to reduce the tight turning radiuses and proximity to adjacent buildings and provide greater green space and flexibility for the units.

The PC was provided three options for their consideration. Ms. Frey highlighted the differences among the three applications. The first was to provide four front-entry garages. She explained that 20 percent of the 14 units equated to 2.8 or three units; however, four seemed to provide a better mix of front-entry to sides. With that layout there are still a number of units that have only 26' from the face of the garage to the adjacent unit. She explained a few more details concerning buffers and encroachments and that the plan has 23 percent open space.

The second plan provides for eight front-entry units. That still leaves four units with only 26' between the face of the garage and the adjacent unit. She explained a few more details of the plan and that the plan has 22 percent open space.

The third plan is for all front-entry garages and has a small encroachment into the required 50' buffer. It also has a small encroachment for five of the units, which is necessary due to the setback. The plan provides a total of 25 percent open space and less driveway area between the units.

Ms. Frey pointed out that the adjacent project, the Woods of Northville condominiums, has all front-entry garages.

A discussion took place among the PC, Ms. Frey, and the applicant, Mr. Joe Boji, regarding the ordinance requirement for decks, the limitations on driveway proximity, front-entry versus side-entry garages and the various limitations implications of each.

The applicant showed various elevations via a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Allen asked the applicant to consider upgrading the garage door style, which he said he would consider.

Mr. Lark confirmed the units are all single-story units.

A further discussion took place among the PC and the applicant regarding the driveways, the amount of space between units, the possibility of eliminating one unit (which the applicant was opposed to), front-entry versus side-entry garages, placement of the sidewalks and parking issues with regard to the driveways and sidewalks.

Mr. Anderson suggested front-entry garages on one side of the street and without sidewalks.

Mr. Lark asked Mr. Boji if he had seen the three general comments at the end of Ms. Frey's review letter and whether he had any issues with them. Mr. Boji said that he had seen the comments and stated that with regard to No. 1, it could be revised. With regard to No. 2, Mr. Boji stated that the applicant agreed to extend the sidewalk to the Northville Forest Apartments to the east. With regard to the third comment and Unit No. 14, Mr. Boji stated that the unit can be shifted approximately 6' to the south, which would result in approximately 1.5' more space between the other units on that side of the road.

Mr. Boji asked the PC for a suggestion as to the optimal distance between units for a side-entry garage. Mr. Anderson stated that 4' would be acceptable and 5' would be comfortable. Mr. Boji said he could achieve that but that it may require that there is not a minimum of 20' between the other homes. There could be 18' or 18-1/2' between those homes and the applicant could work with the spacing so that homes with side-entry garages would have 29' between units.

Mr. Anderson said that the housing prototype being offered by the applicant is desirable for the Township but that he would prefer that side-entry garages be worked in within a rhythm that looks good and is comfortable as a street elevation.

A further discussion took place among the PC and the applicant regarding the front-entry and side-entry garage issue. Options and variations were suggested.

Mr. Lark asked Mr. Boji what his preference was and he stated that he preferred Option No. 2 for this development.

qualified demolition contractors who were pre-qualified a couple of years ago. They are big companies that can take on the magnitude of the project.

Remediation work on soil contamination is underway at 5 Mile and Beck. They will pretreat the ground water and discharge it into the sewer system.

No Truck Signs have been approved for Napier Road from 6 to 8 Mile Roads and on 6 Mile Road from Ridge Road to Napier Road. They will be posted in a couple weeks.

In December, we were successful in an early opener on the water contract. It allows us to open the contract one year sooner. We are able to lower our peak hours through some studies, which has resulted in minor decrease in our rate from GLWA, which will be effective July 1.

- **Eric Lark:** Mr. Lark was excused from the last ZBA meeting. Ms. Frey reported on behalf of the ZBA that there was a lot of discussion about the setback requests for a cell tower on 6 Mile on Dr. Clancy's property (in front of the police department). At the last minute the applicant brought in an attorney, who wants to provide supplemental information because they believe there are some regulatory exemptions because of coverage gaps. The ZBA postponed the petition. Ms. Frey is in the process of speaking with the Township attorney on the matter. She believes our ordinance under wireless communications has a provision for this.

There was an additional variance request for a drive thru pharmacy at Meijer, which was approved in part and denied in part.

- **Richard Allen:** Mr. Allen reported that the BOT had a short meeting with no items that applied to the PC.

Extended Public Comments: None.

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

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None
Motion Approved

Meeting adjourned at 10:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted:

Laurie A. Palazzolo
Recording Secretary