

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF NORTHVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
April 24, 2018**

DATE: April 24, 2018
TIME: 7:00 PM
PLACE: Northville Township Hall
44405 Six Mile Road

APPROVED: May 29, 2018

CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 PM by Vice Chair Zawodny

ROLL CALL:

Present: Richard Allen, Lisa Anderson, Tim Guerriero, Eric Lark (7:12 p.m.), George McCarthy, Jane Watson (7:05 PM), Tim Zawodny

Excused: None

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

Approval of Minutes:

Planning Commission – March 27, 2018

MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy, to approve the March 27, 2018 Planning Commission minutes as published.

Voice vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

Other Minutes:

Zoning Board of Appeals – February 21, 2018
Zoning Board of Appeals – March 14, 2018
Zoning Board of Appeals – March 21, 2018

MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy, to receive and file the minutes from the Zoning Board of Appeals meetings of February 21, March 14, and March 21, 2018.

Voice vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

Correspondence: None.

Brief Public Comments: None.

**New Business
Public Hearing**

- 1. JSLU18-0001** Dogtopia (3 Generations Plaza)
Representative: John Premo, Kickham Hanley PLLC
Location: 20440 Haggerty Road
Request: Special Land Use request to allow overnight pet boarding
Action: Approve, Approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny

Referring to her April 11, 2018 memorandum, Township Planner Frey gave the review for this special land use request to allow overnight boarding for Dogtopia, located at 20440 Haggerty Road.

Special land use review:

Compatibility with adjacent uses: Dog day care was a permitted use and the overnight component was the special use that was being requested. Having dogs spend the night would not change the external character of the operation.

Compatibility with the master plan: Zoning and use of the property was compatible with the master plan.

Traffic impact: The use would not result in additional traffic or traffic impacts for the retail center.

Impact on public services: None.

Compliance with zoning standards: The retail center was in compliance.

Impact on environment: None.

Specific land use requirements: Facilities must provide appropriate waste removal methods; this would be confirmed by the Building Department when permits and engineering plans were reviewed.

Township Planner Frey said the Planning Commission should consider that the following conditions be required from the applicant for this special land use request:

- Provide acknowledgement from the property owner that tenant spaces adjacent to Dogtopia cannot be leased to a restaurant or food service establishment.
- Provide the emergency evacuation plan.
- No dogs outside between the hours of 8 pm and 6 am.

Commissioner McCarthy asked if the property owner had provided acknowledgement on the restriction that no restaurant could be located next door. Township Planner Frey said any approving motion should include that condition.

John Premo, Kickham Hanley PLCC, Royal Oak, MI, attorney for the franchisees, was present on behalf of this application.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the applicants had spoken with the building owner regarding the restriction on next door restaurants. Mr. Premo said the owner was willing to provide acknowledgement of the restriction as long as the restriction would be lifted should Dogtopia leave the building.

Township Planner Frey explained that special land use conditions were tenant specific in this case.

Vice Chair Zawodny opened the public hearing. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Commissioner Allen made the following motion:

MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy, to close the public hearing.

Voice vote: Ayes: All
 Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

Chair Lark arrived at 7:12 p.m.

Commissioner Anderson said that since this request was addressing only the overnight component of this business, the felt the special land use was compatible with adjacent uses, would not have any significant impact on any of the adjacent uses, was compatible with the Master Plan, would not impact traffic, would not unreasonably impact public services, and complied with zoning ordinance standards.

MOTION Guerriero, support Allen, that the Planning Commission approve special land use request JSLU18-0001, to allow overnight pet boarding at Dogtopia (3 Generations Plaza), 20440 Haggerty Road, with the following conditions:

- **Applicant to provide acknowledgement from the property owner that tenant spaces adjacent to Dogtopia cannot be leased to a restaurant or food service establishments during Dogtopia's period of tenancy; this agreement to be approved administratively.**
- **Applicant to provide emergency evacuation plan.**
- **No dogs outside between the hours of 8 pm and 6 am.**

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

Motion approved unanimously.

Chair Lark assumed the Chair.

- 2. JSKPR 18-0003** 3 Generations Plaza (former Aubree's Pizza building)
Representative: Anthony Randazzo, N & R Pastor LLC
Location: 20420 Haggerty Road

Request: Sketch Plan Approval – Exterior Elevation Change and Outdoor Patio
Action: Approve, Approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny

Referring to her April 16, 2018 memorandum, Township Planner Frey presented the review for this request for sketch plan approval at 20420 Haggerty Road, the location of the former Aubree's Pizza building.

The applicant proposed to divide the former Aubree's Pizza building into two tenant spaces: one for Mission BBQ and the other for a fast casual dining establishment. An outdoor patio had been added for Mission BBQ. The existing outdoor patio would be utilized by the other building tenant.

Outstanding issues included:

General:

- All sketch plan conditions must be completed and approved plans signed by the Township prior to the Township accepting engineering and building plan submittals.
- The details on sheet AD.1E needed to be updated so they were not blurry.

Landscape:

- The location of the two relocated bushes must be identified.

Building Elevations:

- The proposed color of the painted lights, wood panels, building paneling, metal coping and existing patio enclosure must be identified.
- The color of the painted lights and patio enclosure must be identified on the material sample board.
- Clarification regarding the new brick piers, would the brick match the existing brick?

Parking calculations:

- Some of the seven additional parking spaces identified to the rear of the main in-line tenant building appeared to conflict with Dogtopia's proposed outdoor run area. The plan should be revised to reflect the outdoor dog area and eliminate conflicts with proposed parking.

The Township's lighting consultant, Stantec, had also reviewed the request: verification on the photometric notes and illumination levels of the surfaces of the building needed to be provided. Other minor corrections needed to be submitted as part of site plan submittal.

Engineering and Fire would not review this request since the footprint would not change. The Building Department would review the interior tenant finishes.

The applicants had brought a material sample board with them this evening.

Township Planner Frey concluded her review.

In response to question from Chair Lark, Township Planner Frey said the applicants were providing unified awnings for the entire building.

Anthony Randazzo, 2617 Beacon Hill, Auburn Hills, was present on behalf of this application, as was Mike Powell, Powell Engineering, 4700 Cornerstone Drive, White Lake, MI.

Mr. Powell said the building would have a uniform appearance across the front façade. Landscaping notes did show the location of the 2 relocated bushes, though the notation was hard to read. They would correct the blurry details on Sheet AD.1E. All lighting fixtures were being changed to LED, and they would comply with lighting requirements.

Regarding parking, Mr. Powell said they could modify the plan to provide all but 3 spaces; they were requesting a waiver for those spaces based on the diversity of use on the site. The different uses would have different peak times for parking; the restaurants would peak at different times than Dogtopia, or the Urgent Care, etc. Previously Trader Joe's and Aubree's Pizza had required intense parking at concurrent times. The new uses should improve the parking situation significantly. There would be employee parking behind the in-line building.

Commissioner Allen asked about enforcing the rule that employees park behind the in-line building, in order to give as much parking as possible to customers. Mr. Powell said they could request this action in their lease agreements.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the applicants would be willing to landbank the 3 spaces. Mr. Powell said they would be willing to do this.

In response to a question from Chair Lark, Mr. Powell said the patios would not be enclosed.

Commissioner Allen asked about the metal awnings. Mr. Powell said these would be 8 feet high and would not obstruct pedestrian traffic.

Commissioner Watson said that there should be security lighting behind the building where there would be employee parking. Mr. Powell said he would make sure there was lighting there.

In response to a question from Chair Lark, Mr. Powell said that they had no issue with the remaining comments in the review letter.

MOTION by Allen, support by Guerriero, that the Planning Commission approve JSKPR18-0003, a Sketch Plan for exterior elevation change and outdoor patio for 20420 Haggerty Road, 3 Generations Plaza, with the following conditions:

- **Outstanding issues listed in the Township Planner's April 16, 2018 review letter be resolved.**
- **Banked parking be provided for 3 parking spaces.**
- **Security lighting be provided at the back of the in-line building where employees would be parking.**
- **Revised plans be submitted and approved administratively.**

Chair Lark asked if any public wanted to speak on this matter. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Lark called the vote.

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

Motion approved unanimously.

- 2. JPUD 18-0003** Ward Evangelical Presbyterian Church
Representative: Emily Baughman, Bowman Consulting
Location: 40000 Six Mile Road
Request: HPUD 6th Amendment – Independent Retirement Community
Action: Recommend to Board of Trustees

Referring to her April 13, 2018 memorandum, Township Planner Frey reviewed this application for a 6th amendment to the Ward Evangelical Presbyterian Church HPUD, in order to construct an independent retirement community on the HPUD property.

Township Planner Frey explained that the original agreement was approved in 1996, and included two components: the Northville Village Retail Center and the Ward Evangelical Presbyterian Church. The 1st amendment was approved in 2002 to authorize Ward Church to develop an additional nine acres of its open space for senior housing, a chapel, other residential, conference center, office, recreation or uses complementary or ancillary to a religious or non-profit institution.

Tonight's request included the following:

1. Increase the land area for the senior housing from 9 acres to 10.85 acres.
2. Permit the proposed senior housing component to utilize the church's storm water detention area.
3. Relocate the two ball fields from the current location on the east side of the Ward property to the west side. Per the HPUD agreement, the ball fields must maintain a 200' setback from the adjacent residential property line.
4. Permit a 41' tall building, where the ordinance required a maximum 30' tall building.
5. Provide 151 of the required parking spaces for the senior housing component to be located on the Ward Church property.

Township Planner Frey reviewed the request as follows:

Senior Housing Use. The township was more supportive of a 100% independent living facility because it was different than the majority of the senior housing options in the Township; most were assisted living/dependent care or nursing care.

1. The PUD agreement should include a mechanism, or mechanisms, to ensure the project remained as independent living and did not change to an assisted living project. This was particularly important as the Township evaluated the request for additional land area which equated to additional units for this project.

Building Height. The applicant should provide the maximum building height. The 41' height provided was an average.

Off-site Parking. The applicant believed the Township's parking requirements were more than

their anticipated need and as a result were requesting consideration to put 151 of the required 325 parking spaces on the Ward Church site, or request a waiver to the Township's parking requirements. The ordinance allowed the Township to consider shared parking when:

1. Peak usage would occur at different periods of the day;
2. The shared parking was conveniently located in proximity to all uses being served;
3. The location of the shared parking would not create vehicular/pedestrian conflicts or physical barriers.

One hundred seventy four (174) parking spaces were provided on-site. Assuming each unit had only one car, only 44 parking spaces remained on-site for residents, employees and visitors. It was likely some units would have more than one car.

Based on past experiences in the Township, every senior housing facility had requested to provide banked parking, saying they needed less parking than the Township's parking requirements, and in every case the facility had constructed the banked parking. Other senior facilities that constructed their banked parking were assisted living facilities. An independent living facility would likely have additional daily parking demand.

The Township recommended additional parking for residents and guests be provided on-site. The additional parking could be identified as banked parking initially and, if the Township determined additional on-site parking was required, it could be constructed for resident and guest use. It was highly unlikely that residents and guests would know there was additional parking at Ward Church.

Language regarding the construction of banked parking, as required by the Township, should also be incorporated into the HPUD amendment.

The number of employees at peak shift should be identified and employees should be required to use the shared parking at Ward, leaving the limited extra spaces on-site for resident and guest use only. The HPUD amendment should specify that employees were required to utilize the shared parking at Ward Church.

The location of the proposed shared parking at Ward Church must be delineated on the concept plan to ensure it was conveniently located and reasonable for staff to use it.

No sidewalks were provided to the adjacent church parking lot. A sidewalk would be required to provide safe pedestrian access to the front door of the proposed facility.

A written shared parking easement and agreement would be required to be reviewed and approved by the Township attorney.

In the event a shared parking agreement could not be negotiated with Ward, the applicant would request a waiver to the Township's parking requirement. In order to consider a waiver, the Township required that the total number of parking spaces meeting Township requirements be "banked" on-site so that it could be constructed if the Township determined it was needed.

Ball Field Relocation. The original HPUD agreement stipulated that the church would construct

two softball fields on the easterly portion of the shared open space area. Two ball fields were constructed on the eastern side of the Ward property. The approved HPUD concept plan also identified one small ball field on the western edge of the Ward site, outside of the "shared area". It was unclear if this was intended to be an additional ball field for Ward's use, but it was never built.

The plan that identified the relocation of the ball fields indicated "approximate" location and "to be designed by others". The actual location must be identified for this amendment and the location must identify the distance from the adjacent residential property line. The ball fields must maintain a 200' setback to the residential lot line; a site plan would be required for the relocation of the ball fields. Last, because the ball fields were proposed to be relocated to Ward's property, Ward might need to be a party to the HPUD amendment.

Other Concept Plan Review Comments

The sidewalk should be continued around the large landscape island on the north side of Cross Road.

The sidewalk located within the large landscape island north of Cross Road should be set back a minimum of 5' from the edge of the parking lot in order to allow tree plantings.

The edge of the Cross Road easement must be identified.

The speed limit of Cross Road must be identified in order to verify whether or not the required spacing between the two proposed senior housing driveways, and the proposed western driveway and the existing Ward Church driveway, was met.

Township Planner Frey concluded by saying that the requested recommendation would be for two components: the HPUD Amendment and the concept plan.

Chair Lark invited the applicant team to make their presentation.

Development team members present included:

Richard Tranter, Dinsmore & Shohl, LLP, 235 E. Fifth Street, Suite 1900, Cincinnati, OH 45202
Emily Baughman, Civil Engineer, Bowman Consulting Group, 311 South Wacker Drive, Suite 1950, Chicago, IL

Payman Homayouni, PE, Bowman Consulting Group, 311 South Wacker Drive, Suite 1950, Chicago, IL

Bob Lewis, Director of Development, Resort Lifestyle Communities, Cameron General Contractors, 7101 S. 82nd Street, Lincoln NE 68516

John Milwaukee, Director of Campus Services, Ward Evangelical Church

Tim Stoepker, Ward legal counsel, Dickenson and Wright

The team gave some background to their experience in developing independent living communities throughout the United States. They currently owned and operated 21 communities, had 13 under construction, and 23 in development. They were strictly

independent living, and offered a highly amenitized environment with month-to-month lease agreements. Their typical facility had 130 units.

Mr. Lewis said their target clientele were people 75+ years old. The average age across their communities was 81. Their units varied in size from 500 square feet (studio) to 1300 square feet (3 bedroom), with most of the units having 1 or 2-bedrooms. The broader community would not be serviced by the restaurant, salon and other facilities.

The applicants' research showed that there was a need for independent living in the general Township area. There were 12,981 income-qualified seniors within an 8 mile radius of the site. 70-75% of the facility's residents would originally live within 8 miles of this location. Today there were approximately 3,700 independent senior living units available for those 12,981 seniors, and the average age of those facilities was 29 years old.

This project had an approximate construction value of \$25 million and would be fully taxable. It would provide 25-30 full-time equivalent jobs, with 15 employees at any peak shift time. The highest shift would be during the business day.

Concierge parking would be provided, but at least 50% of the residents would not own a car or drive. 171 spaces on the property would be adequate for residents, staff, and visitors. Engineering society studies set the average parking spaces per unit for this type of facility at .4. Sharing parking with the church was a good alternative to building unused parking.

Commissioner Anderson asked if the statistics came from similarly located facilities. In Northville, people needed a car to get around. Mr. Lewis said the other facilities were in similar locations.

Chair Lark asked about the balance between taxes paid and services required, especially as the average resident age was 81. Mr. Lewis said 75% of the residents would already come from an 8 mile radius. All would continue to pay taxes.

Commissioner Allen noted that with the limited public transportation available, there was an incentive for people to keep their cars. Mr. Lewis pointed out that they provided 24-hour shuttle transportation. In response to a question from Commissioner Anderson, Mr. Lewis said they would have one shuttle bus.

Ms. Baughman passed out a schematic that showed the location of the parking easement. She described the project as being on 10.85 acres, with a density of 11.98 units per acre, and a building footprint of 67,500 square feet. They were providing 174 parking spaces as already noted, with shared parking with the church adding another 151 available spaces. Those spaces were connected by a sidewalk and crosswalk over an existing drive to the Church site. The speed limit on Cross Road was 25 mph; the Cross Road easement directly abutted their property line. 50 individual fully enclosed garages were being provided. With the shared and constructed parking they met the total parking requirement of 325 spaces.

Additional sidewalks and crosswalks had been added. The shared parking was adjacent to their site, convenient, and without vehicular or pedestrian conflict. They would revise their plan to show the crosswalk.

Commissioner Zawodny noted that the garages might need individual access doors to meet building code requirements.

Commissioner Zawodny said that while the Church property was directly adjacent to this proposed development, the shared parking was actually not directly adjacent, but rather was on the other side of the storm water management facility.

It came out in discussion that the provided documents did not show the entire PUD area, but only a portion of it. Commissioners would like to see a drawing that showed the entire site.

Commissioner Zawodny asked why the shared parking was located where it was instead of utilizing an area to the west and north of the church building that was closer to the proposed development.

Mr. Stoepker explained that the closer area was already the subject of a shared parking agreement between the Church and the retail center, as had been a condition of the original HPUD. However, to the best of his knowledge, that parking area was never used.

Commissioner Zawodny asked if there was any ability to renegotiate that agreement, in order to allow this development to have closer shared parking.

Mr. Stoepker said that idea could be researched further. The shared parking proposed this evening was to the east of the sanctuary and south of the proposed facility and water basin; that was the parking least used by the church.

Commissioner Zawodny asked if there was any conceptual information regarding building appearance, structure of the building, rendered elevations, etc. Those would be critical to evaluating this request.

Mr. Lewis said each of their communities had unique architectural elements that matched the surrounding neighborhood. In this instance they would most likely try to match the color of the brick used on the church, and include some architectural elements of the retail center. They had not finished the full design, but the materials would be high quality, including brick, stone, Hardie plank, perhaps EFIS. Vinyl would not be used. Decks would be a composite material. They could not provide the maximum building height yet because the design was still in process. The highest peak would be in the building core, where there would be an atrium with a smoke evacuation system at the roof. The maximum height was likely to be slightly over 47 feet, with average height at 41 feet. Only the core would reach the maximum height. They could provide renderings of the elevations, if desired.

Commissioner Watson asked about traffic flow in terms of parking. Would the concierge parking fill the on-site parking before using the shared parking? Mr. Lewis said the on-site parking would be filled first. If the parking lot was full they would use the shared parking.

In response to questions from Commissioner Guerriero, Township Planner Frey said the Township's parking standards in this instance were specific to the independent living use. Past developed projects – mostly assisted and nursing care – had also claimed they didn't need the parking required by the Township for their specific uses, but in every instance they had built the banked parking. People were not giving up their cars as quickly as anticipated. They might give up driving but they still needed a place to park their cars.

Commissioner Guerriero asked if supporting data had been provided regarding the applicants' claims regarding necessary parking. Mr. Lewis said he thought they had provided that. They had a survey of each of their communities in terms of how much parking per unit was provided, and also what was required by the applicable jurisdiction and how many were being used.

Commissioner Guerriero asked if there were any independent studies that produced results consistent with their experience. The applicants were saying there was a 150-space difference between what the Township required and what was needed.

Mr. Lewis referred to the Traffic Engineering Manual, which concluded that independent living units across the country needed an average of .4 parking spaces per unit. They could supply that information.

Township Planner Frey said the Township Board would want to see additional banked parking on the site. Commissioner McCarthy commented that there appeared to be sufficient land available to provide banked parking on site. Commissioner Allen felt that the shared parking as presented appeared contrived.

Mr. Lewis said the church was not interested in constructing more parking; they felt they were over-parked as it was.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Stoepker said the land to the north was open recreation space. At one time that was shared space with the Township, but when the 1st HPUD amendment was adopted that space reverted solely to the Church; it was still retained as an open space area and that was the intent going forward. In the current instance, they were trying to pull development east and south, to be as far from the park and wetland areas as possible. They did not want development to go further north.

Commissioner Allen pointed out that the walk from the proposed shared parking to the facility would be difficult in inclement weather.

Commissioner Anderson said she would like a better understanding of where the open space was to the north and how much was there. The open space and shared recreational area was obviously negotiated in the original HPUD, and the Commission should ensure the Township retained the benefits negotiated in the original agreement.

Mr. Stoepker explained that the area where the independent living facility was going to be located included the current location of the ball fields; this would have no impact on the

natural features to the north. The new area for the ball fields appeared to have been contemplated in the original plan.

Mr. Homayouni made comments regarding storm water management, which would be connected to the existing storm water detention area. Department of Public Works Director agreed that there was probably enough room for the applicant's plan to meet Wayne County standards.

Township Planner Frey asked why the requested HPUD amendment didn't include the pond, and instead showed retention as an easement. Mr. Tranter said they had tried to minimize the modifications; they were already asking to increase the area for the senior living facility from 9 to 10.85 acres. The senior living facility would indemnify and maintain the easement. They were trying to respect the original HPUD plan.

Regarding the ball fields, Mr. Stoepker directed the Commission's attention to the location of the new ball fields shown on a conceptual sketch distributed this evening; a better conceptual plan would be provided. The original HPUD agreement had approved a ball field in the new location; that field was never built. The 200-foot setback from any residential lot line had to be maintained. They would infill the existing landscaping. They had met with the presidents of neighboring homeowners' associations to let them know what was going on.

Chair Lark asked if the ball fields would be the same size as the current ones. Mr. Stoepker said the new ball fields at a minimum would be equal to the existing fields, and would likely be better. The new fields would be available April 1, 2019.

Commissioner Anderson spoke to the need to ensure the continuation of the ball fields, which were heavily used by the Parks and Recreation Department and youth throughout the community.

Mr. Stoepker agreed. The ball fields were an integral part of the community, and the Church viewed them as a contractual and community obligation that they were proud to provide.

Chair Lark asked if moving the ball fields created any parking issues. Mr. Stoepker said no parking issues would be created, and the same parking would be utilized as was used presently.

Mr. Milwaukee reviewed Church parking needs, including Sunday services. They had 5 services spread out from 8 a.m. to noon, with at most 1900 parishioners in total attending a facility built for 5000. Parking had never been an issue, even with Sunday ball field tournaments that began at 8 or 9 a.m., concurrent with worship services.

Mr. Tranter concluded their presentation, and asked for a positive recommendation to the Township Board, with conditions that could include:

- Banked parking, as long as they didn't have to go north into the wetlands area.
- Submission of a revised concept plan clearly showing the location of the shared parking.
- Submission by the Church of a concept plan for the new ball fields.

Mr. Tranter said the height issue was critical for them. They needed to provide an average height of 41 feet, with a maximum height of 47'6".

Commissioner Anderson noted that the written information referred to a maximum height of 58 feet. Mr. Lewis explained that they had redesigned the building and were now requesting 47'6".

In response to a question from Commissioner Zawodny, Mr. Lewis said the eave height would be 29'11"

Commissioner Allen said he thought the Commission needed an overall drawing of the entire site, and more detail on the new ball fields. He supported increasing the area for the independent living facility from 9 to 10.85 acres. Banked parking was essential.

Township Planner Frey asked for more direction regarding on-site banked parking and shared parking. She advised that the Township Board would want to see detailed plans and a detailed agreement at the same time.

Commissioner Watson said that the entire Church property had a lot of parking. She did not support encouraging building more parking spaces if they were not needed, especially if the Church – at their own risk – was willing to give up 151 parking spaces, possibly permanently. Regarding the ball fields, she would like to see the proposed screening. Also, the shared parking with the retail was now used for the ball fields. When the ball fields moved further away, would the use of that parking change?

Chair Lark said he was initially troubled by the extra acreage being requested for this project, along with the 50%-plus increase in height over the HPUD height standards. The amount of parking proposed for offsite parking was a large percentage of the required parking. Discussion tonight had lessened his concerns, but he needed to see more information about the parking. It would be ideal if some banked parking could be put on the parcel without losing the natural areas.

Commissioner Zawodny commented that this was a two-sided issue: the spirit of the proposed use, and the actual proposed use. The spirit of the proposed use seemed to fit well with the church use. How that use was developed – the technical aspects of it – provided tension to this development. The Commission needed to be concerned with how this development would set precedent for other possible developments in the Township. Regarding the building height, a quick Internet search had yielded other buildings the applicants had developed. Those appeared to have a sense of scale and open space with significant setbacks, etc. Historical treatment indicated that the taller a building was, the more it was set back and the greater landscaped frontage was required. Tonight's plan showed a drive and a sidewalk, along with parked cars, 20 feet or less away from the building, limiting the ability to do developmental landscaping to help break the scale of the structure. This needed further study.

Commissioner Zawodny noted that none of the current Commissioners had institutional memory of the original HPUD; it was difficult to make decisions to amend something where

Commission. VAN would return to the Board of Trustees for loft design approval, possibly in May.

Chair Lark thanked Commissioners Allen, Watson and Zawodny for serving on the subcommittee that met with VAN representatives regarding the design of the commercial component before it was presented to the Board of Trustees.

Eric Lark, Zoning Board of Appeals

A request for the temporary use of a garage for storage while a new house was being built on a residential property had been approved with conditions.

Department of Public Services Director Casari

Director Casari reported that after the tree planting on 6 Mile Road was completed, the pathway would have scheduled maintenance, including resurfacing of some areas.

Chair Lark said there was still an issue with water coming across 6 Mile Road. Director Casari said he was monitoring that situation. Per the County, the contractor's punch list was not complete for that work.

Demolition work at the old psychiatric hospital was on schedule. Sections of the exterior had previously been coated between the floors; the coating was being tested for asbestos. The project was still scheduled to be complete by early October.

Commissioner Allen asked about a drainage issue on Beck Road south of Main Street. Director Casari said he would follow up.

Extended Public Comments: None.

Adjournment: 9:38 p.m.