

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF NORTHVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
June 26, 2018**

DATE: June 26, 2018
TIME: 7:00 PM
PLACE: Northville Township Hall
44405 Six Mile Road

APPROVED: August 28, 2018

CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 PM

ROLL CALL:

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

Excused: Lisa Anderson

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

Approval of Minutes:

Planning Commission – May 29, 2018

MOTION by McCarthy, support by Guerriero, to approve the May 29, 2018 Planning Commission minutes as published.

Voice vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously

Other Minutes:

Zoning Board of Appeals – May 16, 2018

MOTION by McCarthy, support by Allen, to receive and file the minutes from the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting of May 16, 2018.

Voice vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

Correspondence: None.

Brief Public Comments: None.

New Business

1. JSKPR18-0004 McDonalds

Representative: Frank Martin, Dorchen/Martin Associates, Inc.
Location: 39700 Five Mile Road
Request: Sketch Plan Approval – Drive-thru Modification
Action: Approve, Approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny

Referencing her May 25, 2018 review letter, Township Planner Frey gave the background for this application for exterior building modifications and an adjustment to the drive-thru circulation for the McDonalds at 39700 Five Mile Road. The applicants were also proposing extensive interior modifications that would be reviewed by the Building Department.

The sidewalk in front of the building was proposed to be extended to the sidewalk on Five Mile Road. The island on the north side of the drive-thru would be extended and the small separate island would be eliminated. The menu board would be relocated to a new island on the left side of the drive.

This site was developed several years ago under a different parking standard; the site had 29 more parking spaces than required by the current ordinance. The applicant proposed to eliminate 16 of the northernmost spaces that were never used and replace them with landscape and lawn area.

Township Planner Frey suggested eliminating 4 additional parking spaces on the south side of the detention area. The site would still be in conformance with parking requirements and the change would allow better access to the existing dumpster which was remaining in the same location.

Regarding landscaping, there were a few outstanding items that could be corrected and approved administratively. The proposed landscape upgrades brought the site into compliance with Township requirements.

Township Planner Frey passed around a materials sample board. The colors were similar to the existing building. The majority of existing brick and concrete block would remain. The roofline would change as some of the shingles were being replaced with aluminum canopies. There was no change to the exterior footprint of the building.

Frank Martin, Dorchen/Martin Associates Architects, Southfield MI was present on behalf of this application for sketch plan approval. He explained the exterior upgrade and interior renovations. The restaurant would be ADA compliant under current standards, and would include interior kiosk ordering. On the exterior, the shingled sloped roofs would be replaced with other materials. The bricks would remain. The play place would have a louver that would cover some of the upper glass.

The applicants would eliminate the 4 parking spaces on the south side of the detention area as requested, and would make sure all lighting and landscaping met Township requirements. They would provide a photometric plan.

In response to a question from Chair Lark, Mr. Martin said they would comply with all the issues called out in the consultants' letters as well as Township Planner Frey's review letter.

Commissioner Zawodny asked about the cement board stucco. Mr. Martin showed a photograph of another location where this material had been used. In response to further questions from Commissioner Zawodny regarding corner treatments, proximity of the product to the ground, and exposure to the elements, Mr. Martin reviewed construction technique and details, and affirmed that the product was durable.

Chair Lark asked if anyone in the audience wanted to comment regarding this application. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Lark indicated he was ready to entertain a motion.

MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy, that the Planning Commission approve JSKPR18-0004, a request for sketch plan approval of proposed building modifications and an adjustment to the drive-thru circulation for McDonald's, 39700 Five Mile Road, subject to the condition that outstanding issues listed in the Township Planner's May 25, 2018 review letter be resolved and approved administratively.

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

Motion approved unanimously.

2. JPUD18-0003	Ward Evangelical Presbyterian Church
Representative:	Emily Baughman, Bowman Consulting
Location:	40000 Six Mile Road
Request:	HPUD Amendment #6 – Senior Housing
Action:	Recommended with Conditions to Board of Trustees

Referencing her June 7, 2018 review letter, Township Planner Frey gave the background for this request for HPUD Amendment, in order to construct a senior housing independent living facility on 10.85 acres located on the Ward Church parcel.

The original HPUD Agreement was approved by the Township in 1996 and included two components: Northville Village Retail Center and Ward Church. Tonight's application related to the church component only. The original HPUD Agreement provided for *shared open space* defined as 450 feet across Ward's northern property line and *private open space* as the remaining open space on the site that was exclusively for church use.

In 2002, the 1st Amendment to the HPUD agreement was approved which authorized Ward Church to develop an additional nine acres of its site as open space or to expand the footprint of the church. Specifically the uses that were authorized in the 2002 amendment were senior housing, a chapel, other residential, conference center, office, recreation or uses complementary or ancillary to a religious or non-profit institution. With the 1st HPUD Amendment, the unused portion of the *shared open space* was reclassified as *private open space*, meaning there was no more shared open space on the Ward site.

Township Planner Frey advised that the subject of tonight's review was limited to the senior

housing component and relocating the ball fields only. There had been recent references to a sports dome proposed on the Ward property but the City had not received an application for this. If an application for a sports facility were received, it also would go through a Planning Commission review and a public hearing process.

Tonight's proposed HPUD amendment included the following requests:

1. Increase the land area for the senior housing from 9 acres to 10.85 acres.
2. Relocate the two ball fields from the current location on the east side to the west side of the Ward Church property. Per the HPUD agreement, the ball fields must maintain a 200-foot setback from the adjacent residential property line to the west.
3. Permit a 51-foot tall building, where the ordinance allowed a maximum 30-foot building height.
4. Allow 151 of the required parking spaces for the senior housing component to be located on the Ward Church property.

Since the last time the Planning Commission heard this proposal, the plan had been revised to propose on-site storm water detention; the previous submission had utilized some of the Ward Church site for this. The applicants had also added some banked parking on their own site.

Senior Housing Use. The project was identified as independent living units and it was important to the Township that the use remain independent housing. The Township was more supportive of a 100% independent living facility because it was different than the majority of the senior housing options in Northville Township; most were assisted living/dependent care or nursing care. The HPUD Agreement should include a mechanism to ensure the project remained as independent living and did not change to an assisted living project at a future date. This was particularly important as the Township had evaluated the request for additional land area, which equated to additional units, for this request as an independent living proposal.

Parking. The applicant was requesting consideration to put 151 of the required 325 parking spaces on the adjacent Ward Church site. Per the zoning ordinance, 325 parking spaces were required. It was unclear why a total of 375 spaces were provided as a combination of on-site spaces, on-site banked parking and off-site spaces. The plan should be revised to account for parking spaces that were required only, without providing the additional 50 spaces.

It appeared that the location of the shared parking could be shifted to the east, so that it would abut the easternmost side of the parking lot. Currently there was a gap of non-shared parking before the shared parking. The HPUD should also specify that the employees of the senior housing were required to park off-site so that the maximum number of spaces was retained on site for the residents and guests. This should be noted on the concept plan and also documented in the HPUD Amendment.

The language regarding the construction of the banked parking spaces should be clarified to say *as determined by the Township*. That also needed to be shown on the plans and incorporated in the Agreement.

Ball Fields. The size of the existing ball fields should be identified and the dimensions of the new ball fields should be given. The new fields appeared to be smaller than the existing fields. The

applicants should discuss the intended age group using the fields and if there had been any conversations relative to size with the Township Parks and Recreation Department since the Department also was allowed to share those fields.

Regarding the orientation of the ball fields, the optimum orientation was east/northeast in order to reduce sunlight in the batters' eyes. That was the configuration of the existing locations and the proposed fields should be flipped to maintain that same orientation.

Building elevations. At the last meeting the Planning Commission asked for building elevations; those were not submitted.

With this revision there was a cross section but it did not provide the details the Commission was looking for regarding establishing the types of materials that would be required and the character of the building that they would anticipate seeing with the senior housing component.

Landscape. There were some details that needed to be resolved. The detention was not permitted to be in the required greenbelt so that would need to be modified.

Township Planner Frey said if the Planning Commission agreed to the proposed height increase from 30 feet to 51 feet for the central portion of the building, the suggestion was to provide additional plant material and additional setback greater than the minimum 35 feet required by ordinance.

Also, in relation to the relocation of the ball fields, if the Planning Commission recommended relocating them to the proposed location, there should be supplemental plant material within the 200-foot buffer on the west edge of the site.

Township Planner Frey explained process. If the Commission recommended this application to the Board of Trustees and the Board of Trustees approved it, the full site plan would come back to the Planning Commission.

Township Planner Frey concluded her review.

Commissioner Guerriero asked if language had been proposed regarding restricting the facility to independent living only. Had the applicant been made aware of this requirement? Township Planner Frey said the language would be drafted after the Commission and Township indicated they were willing to move this project forward, and after any conditions were listed. Also, she knew the applicants were aware of this requirement; she did not know their response.

In response to a question from Commissioner Allen, Township Planner Frey said an agreement with Ward Church regarding shared parking would be required.

Commissioner Allen noted that the Township Supervisor was adamant that this development be independent living only.

Chair Lark invited the applicants to speak.

Team members present on behalf of this application included:

Richard Tranter, Dinsmore & Shohl, LLP, 235 E. Fifth Street, Suite 1900, Cincinnati, OH 45202

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, prospective purchaser for the property.

Tim Stoepker, Ward legal counsel, Dickenson and Wright

Mr. Tranter pointed out that they had a very long hearing at the April meeting. Tonight they wanted to spend time on the main points that they felt had been identified by Township Planner Frey.

They had originally applied for a 9-acre site development. They were now at 10.85 acres because they decided to accommodate the 1.85 acre storm water facility completely on site and thus eliminate that as an easement issue.

The developers were not involved with the ball field relocation. Ward Church legal counsel Stoepker would speak to that issue later in the presentation.

Regarding height, the applicants preferred to address midpoints rather than height averages. The 51-foot height represented the highest peak of the clubhouse. The midpoint was 40.5 feet. The peak on the two wings was 44.5 feet; the midpoint of the wings was 37.25 feet.

Chair Lark asked if the building had changed since the last time the applicants were before the Commission; it appeared to be taller. Mr. Tranter said he didn't think the building had changed.

Regarding the parking, they would reduce the 375 total spaces to 325 by removing 50 spaces from the offsite location, and moving 4 spaces from offsite to onsite. Therefore there would be 97 offsite spaces, 50 banked spaces onsite, and 178 regular spaces onsite. As the Commission had indicated, they had moved the shared parking to a more convenient location.

Mr. Tranter addressed the following issues:

1. Senior housing use. The use was being developed as independent senior living and would always be independent senior living. Cameron General Developers had developed 21 senior housing facilities across the country; all were independent living. To address the Township's concern, a sentence could be added to the HPUD Agreement: *Any independent living facility cannot convert to assisted living, dependent care, or nursing care facility without application to Northville Township.*
2. Parking. As stated above, the revised plan would show 178 parking spaces on site, 50 spaces banked on site and 97 off site.
3. All employees required to park off site, in the shared parking area. While the applicants agreed with this concept they were requesting some flexibility, so that employees could park on-site when there were sufficient open spaces there. Language could be added that generally said: *To the extent that non-employee spaces are not available, the employees shall park on the non-site facility.*
4. Constructing banked parking. The Township Planner's review letter stated that language

should be included that allowed the Township to determine when banked parking needed to be constructed. To protect the facility from being subject to an arbitrary mandate, they would like to add a qualifier as to when the Township could require banked parking construction, such as: *As determined by the Township due to inconsistent or insufficient parking.*

5. Building elevations: The applicants were requesting heights as already described: the clubhouse peak was 51 feet with a midpoint of 40.5 feet. The peak on the two wings was 44.5 feet with midpoints of 37.25 feet.

All other outstanding issues in the Planner's review letter could be resolved.

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation, Mr. Homayouni showed the elevations of the building and an updated version of the overall plan, including the modified parking as described. They had increased the setback for the detention pond to 35 feet.

Chair Lark asked if the nature or height of the building had changed since the April 2018 meeting. Mr. Homayouni said the height measurements had been calculated precisely since that meeting.

In response to a question from Commissioner Watson, Mr. Lewis explained that the elevations showed 3 components: the wings that housed all of the apartments, and the center building which housed the community area atrium and also apartments on the 2nd and 3rd floors. Because the core of the building was an atrium, fire safety codes required a smoke evacuation system under the roof that could accommodate exhaust fans that would capture smoke before it was exhausted out of the building. That requirement raised the roof height as shown.

Chair Lark asked for more clarification regarding why the applicants were giving the midpoint height instead of the average height as required. Mr. Homayouni explained that there was some variation in the various peaks, so the midpoint would be a better calculation to use in this particular case. Mr. Lewis added that he was not sure how the Township defined average roof height. The 51-foot peak represented about 10% of the total roof.

Township Planner Frey explained that the definition of average roof height required that measurements were taken every 5 feet to calculate the average.

Chair Lark asked Township Planner Frey if the proposed parking was consistent with what the Township had requested.

Township Planner Frey said the Township Board wanted banked parking on site. While the Board had not specified a number, the concern was that the parcel couldn't accommodate the Township's ordinance requirements and they didn't want to depend on the shared parking to meet all the parking requirements. Significant banked parking would have to be provided in a location that could be built and help meet Township requirements. Tonight's proposal represented the applicant's attempt to provide some banked parking on site and thereby reduce the amount of shared parking.

Mr. Lewis pointed out that the Commission had previously requested information regarding

parking standards for other independent living facilities. They had provided information from their 21 facilities, as well as an independent industry review.

Township Planner Frey stressed that all of the assisted living/nursing care facilities in the Township had originally said they did not need all of the required parking, and all had eventually constructed their banked parking spaces. Independent living brought the likelihood that more people would have cars even if they didn't drive them all the time. She felt the Township's parking standards were accurate.

Discussion followed regarding whether there was sufficient area on the site to accommodate all the required parking. There appeared to be vacant space where additional parking could be installed. Also, what was the mechanism for triggering construction of the banked parking?

Township Planner Frey said more parking might be squeezed in; she would have to see that laid out on the plan. In the past, the Fire Department had triggered the construction of banked parking spaces, based on parked cars blocking drive aisles and parking in fire lanes.

Chair Lark noted that final language in the Agreement would be worked out with the Township Attorney. The Commission could not grant language the applicants wanted.

Commissioner Zawodny pointed out changes in the plan that had not yet been discussed, including changes to the garages and the addition of a garage at the back of the northwest drive aisle, and sidewalks being moved out to road edges instead of having some greenbelt between them and the drive. How did that dovetail into their review? Those things would need to be itemized and listed to make sure they were checked administratively.

Commissioner Watson asked about the ratio of cars to residents.

The applicants explained that their experience was they needed 1.25 cars per unit for the 130 units, and industry studies validated that. That requirement calculated to 163 required spaces for this development, including garages. They had added 15 on-site parking spaces to accommodate employees during the highest work shift. The 178 on-site parking spaces would accommodate guests, employees, and residents of the community.

Also, the community offered full time shuttle service for all residents at no additional charge. Their experience was the parking would be adequate. The transportation they provided made up for any need for a car or need to drive.

Chair Lark asked the applicants to address the ball fields.

Ward Church Attorney Stoepker explained that under the original HPUD agreement between Ward Church and the Township, the Church was required to provide two ball fields for community use. Under the original site plan approval process the fields were located where the proposed senior independent living facility was now being proposed.

The Township had exercised its option to require the fields to be in place and maintained. With the current proposal, the only logical place for the fields was as shown, in the area designated under the original HPUD as recreational space for Ward Church.

One of the questions raised in the review letter had to do with the size of the existing ball fields vs. the size of the new ones. The existing fields were 322 feet on the foul lines and 323 feet at center. In comparison to that the new field on the left showed 312 on the foul line and 399 feet at center. The softball field was 262 feet on the foul line and 277 feet at center. While it appeared that the new fields looked smaller than the existing ones they were essentially the same size. The existing softball field's fence had never been moved in to the correct location; this had been a continuing problem with league play as the existing softball field had no home run fence.

Regarding the comment in the review letter regarding the orientation of the fields, Mr. Stoepker showed the orientation flipped so that the sun was not in the batters' eyes.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Stoepker said that they were proposing an in kind replacement of the ball fields, including in kind replacement of bench areas, backstop, etc.

Township Planner Frey said the Parks and Recreation Department would need to respond to the changed orientation as shown this evening.

Mr. Stoepker further explained that he had been in discussions with Township Supervisor Nix regarding Township use of the fields. The HPUD Agreement had a provision that allowed the Township to exercise its right every 5 years to use the fields, and to agree upon the extent of that use, but it couldn't be less than 1 day per week. In 2013 the Township agreed to Monday use; that had morphed into the Northville Baseball-Softball Association's (NBSA) league play every Tuesday and Thursday night. While this was not under Parks and Rec supervision, it did fall under a loose definition of Township use.

The ball fields would not be lit and would have a 200-foot setback as required. Additional landscaping would be provided as a buffer to the housing development to the west, as requested.

Chair Lark asked for more information regarding the Township's use of the fields. What did the proposed amendment say about that? He understood that the Township would like the use guaranteed for 2 days per week into perpetuity, rather than having to renegotiate the use every 5 years.

Mr. Stoepker said that was under review. There was conversation as to how best to keep the Parks and Rec Department in the loop, as currently the discussion was occurring directly with the NBSA.

Chair Lark pointed out that the applicants were asking the Township to be flexible regarding building and height and the number of units on this site. What was their position tonight on including an agreement granting the Township ball field use into perpetuity for 2 days per week?

Mr. Stoepker said his position was that a common goal could be reached. Discussions had just begun regarding this issue, within the last couple of days. Right now the NBSA was acting as a sub group of the Township. He was not prepared to work out an agreement today.

Chair Lark invited public comment.

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation, Edward McCall, 40744 Delta Drive, Northville Township, and president of the Northville Trails Homeowners Association, spoke regarding this application. Northville Trails had 82 homes. The HOA had sent a survey to approximately 105 email addresses that included heads of households and spouses, and almost 50% responded. They had presented the Commission with information gathered from that survey.

Regarding Ward Church selling to the developers, survey results showed 1/3 disapproved, almost half were neutral and approximately 20% approved.

Regarding moving the ball fields closer to the neighborhood, 56% disapproved of the closeness of the ball fields. There appeared to be some history that had caused some lingering acrimony, in terms of tree destruction over time, and miscommunication regarding tree removal. The Association was requesting better tree preservation than had occurred in the past.

In terms of general comments during group discussions with Ward Church, concerns included trespassing, noise, potentially illegal parking on East Northville Trail, games going too late, the sound of the ball on the bat, etc. Also, the residents would like protection against lighting being installed in the future.

Mr. McCall noted that Ward Church had met with the presidents of the homeowners associations for Parkstone and Northville Trails subdivisions. Later Ward Church representatives had come to a homeowners association meeting for Northville Trails.

Mr. McCall said 2 items were addressed by the survey that were not on tonight's agenda: 70% of respondents opposed a new soccer or sports venue at this location, and over 60% supported a new fire station there.

Commissioner Allen noted that there were 3 sites under consideration by the Board of Trustees for a new fire station; no site had as yet been selected.

Commissioner Guerriero asked if during the meetings with Ward Church representatives, had any of the concerns of the residents who said they disapproved of the ball field relocation been resolved or ameliorated? Mr. McCall said in his opinion they had not been.

In response to a question from Chair Lark, Mr. McCall said the HOA had used SurveyMonkey.com, and had used the email list kept by the association secretary. They worked hard to keep that email list up to date, and felt they had contacted everyone in their association except for perhaps 1-2 households.

Commissioner Watson asked if the landscape plans shown tonight addressed the landscaping concerns of the residents.

Discussion followed. Landscaping did not really address noise concerns. Additionally, ITC had been responsible for significant tree destruction in the utility easement, and that added to the issues. Mr. McCall asked a resident to further discuss this matter.

William Salliotte, 17520 E. Northville Trail, showed the Commission where the berm decreased to ground level. He pointed out that over time the lower branches of pine trees had died and been trimmed up, so they no longer buffered the area visually, and from his back yard he had a view of the parking lot. He asked that more berms be added to the eastern side of the landscape buffer and lower plantings also be added. He did feel that changing the orientation of the ball fields as discussed this evening was very positive.

Mr. Salliotte noted that he had FOIA requests in place and he requested that no firm decision be made about the ball fields until he had received the FOIA information. His understanding was that the Church was putting artificial turf in the new ball fields and he was seeking information as to who was financing that.

The Commission asked Township Staff to work with ITC in order to discover what could be successfully planted under power lines to give a landscape buffer without interfering with the lines.

Andrew Arena, 40613 Coachwood Circle, President of the Parkstone Homeowners Association, noted that some of the people in his association had responded to the survey previously mentioned. They had not done a separate survey. The plans shown this evening were different than those shown at their homeowners association meeting, when the soccer building was in play. He was relieved it was not on tonight's agenda, as they had visions of something like Total Sports in Wixom. They were very concerned about traffic on Six Mile Road. They felt a traffic study and a noise study should be required, especially if a soccer facility was installed. If a soccer facility were proposed, he felt the neighbors would be very vocal about their opposition.

Township Planner Frey clarified that while the soccer facility was not on tonight's agenda, there was no guarantee it wouldn't come up in the future.

Thomas Stanek, 17540 E. Northville Trail, addressed concerns he had with the way ITC was cutting trees. The tree destruction combined with ball fields now planned for land immediately adjacent to his rear yard was a concern. He felt ball fields should be put elsewhere in the Township, for instance at Seven Mile and Haggerty.

Discussion followed regarding the location of the ITC easement. It was possible the ITC easement was entirely on the Northville Trail side. In any event, Northville Township had no jurisdiction over that easement, and utility companies generally were clearing their easements to prevent trees from falling on their lines.

Commissioner Watson asked about receiving a formal landscape plan regarding the ball fields. Mr. Stoepker said that would be included during site plan submission. Ward Church was committed to additional landscaping to buffer the ball fields from the residents, including adding berms if necessary and also adding lower landscaping if that would help.

Commissioner Guerriero asked how often the fields were in use.

Steve Myers, 19970 Silver Springs Drive, said the fields were used primarily April to July 15 every evening until about 8:30 p.m. and typically for 12-13 weekends during the summer, from 9 a.m. to 6:00 or 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Stoepker said the volume of use would stay the same.

Carol Maynard, 17184 Fairfield Court, opposed the proposed senior independent living facility. She spoke of her experience with her mother at a similar facility, and spoke to problems of facilities overcharging seniors for what they received. She pointed out that seniors needed to downsize to smaller homes with small yards, rather than facilities like the one proposed.

Chair Lark noted that the Township had added an active adult zoning designation to its zoning ordinance.

Seeing that no one else came forward to speak, Chair Lark brought the matter back to the Commission.

Commissioner Zawodny said he remained concerned about the height of the buildings, especially in terms of their proximity to driveways, setbacks, and roads, along with the ability – or lack thereof – of providing landscaping to lessen the impact of the greater height.

Landscaping was going to be critical to this development. The applicants needed to show that they could meet requirements for buffering the building, tree replacement, and additional plantings.

Commissioner Zawodny was also confused about the comments made earlier by the applicants regarding stormwater detention being a justification for asking for 10.85 acres, as the previous submission had shown the detention being on the Ward Church site yet that submission had also shown 10.85 acres.

Regarding the ITE easement and destruction of trees there, Commissioner Zawodny encouraged the residents to be active in terms of having strong negotiations with the utility company. He knew that was a battle not easily won because utility companies were trying to prevent power outages such as those experienced in recent years.

Regarding the ball fields, Commissioner Zawodny thought the whole process should be looked at closely, especially to see if the ball fields could be shifted a little further away from the residences. Perhaps a win-win situation could result if the soils that would usually have to be trucked out of the construction site could instead be used for constructing berms to provide more of a sound barrier for the fields. Low growing trees and shrubs should be considered when pine trees lost their lower branches.

Last, Commissioner Zawodny supported the ball fields in general, as they provided an overall positive experience for young people in the community.

Chair Lark agreed with much of what Commissioner Zawodny had just stated. While Chair Lark was concerned about the height of the buildings, he would be willing to trade a permanent agreement regarding the Township use of the ball fields for the extra height. Landscaping would be key. The ball fields needed to be built to current league specifications. He was also in favor of the ball fields generally, but as much as possible the disruption to the neighbors needed to be minimized.

Commissioner Zawodny asked if the ball fields would have artificial turf. Mr. Stoepker said right now the proposal was to replace the ball fields in kind, which meant they would be constructed of dirt and grass. If necessary they would post a bond or a letter of credit. If turf became a possibility in the future they would look at that again.

In response to a further question from Commissioner Zawodny, Mr. Stoepker said the current fields were not sprinklered.

Noting that the applicants had addressed specific issues, Chair Lark asked the applicants if they felt they could resolve all the other issues in the Township Planner's review letter. They indicated they could.

Commissioner Guerriero agreed that the ball fields and the greater height of the building compelled additional landscaping both as an enhancement and as a visual buffer for the building and visual and noise buffer for the ball fields. Regarding the parking, requiring 325 parking spaces seemed high. On the other hand, providing 1.25 parking spaces per unit as the applicants wanted to do seemed low. He had wanted data regarding parking from a 3rd party, not from the other developments owned by the applicant. Intuitively he felt the required parking should be somewhere between the Township's requirement and the number stated by the applicants. Without further information, he was inclined to accept the parking as presented this evening, with off-site, banked, and on-site parking as stated.

Commissioner Allen was concerned that some of what was being discussed, including the additional landscaping, would be resolved during site plan discussions. Chair Lark suggested that the things talked about this evening should be included as conditions of a recommending motion. Township Planner Frey agreed that requiring additional landscaping or trading a permanent agreement regarding Township use of the ball fields for additional height of the building should be included in tonight's motion.

Chair Lark listed conditions for discussion:

1. No night games or lights.
2. The development would remain senior independent living only and could not be changed without subsequent approval of the Township.
3. Employees park off site, with language being worked out within the agreement providing for exceptions.
4. Outstanding issues in the review letter be resolved.
5. Parking spaces types and numbers would be as discussed earlier.
6. Regarding the landscaping, there would be increased landscape and additional berms. There was potential for additional berms on the west side. Add low growing vegetation

under the power lines.

7. Agreement into perpetuity on the usage of the fields by Northville Township.

Commissioner Watson was uncomfortable with the number of open and available spaces on site. 50 paid garage spaces were shown, leaving only 128 open spaces, 15 of which were for employees. This was not even 1 open parking space per unit. She suggested removing 6 banked parking spaces and adding those to the open spaces.

Discussion followed. Township Planner Frey explained that the ordinance did not differentiate between paid garage spaces and open spaces. The ordinance required 2 spaces per unit for senior independent housing, with 1 of the 2 spaces allowed within a garage, and .5 spaces per unit for visit parking.

Commissioner Watson said she was suggesting a compromise between the number of spaces required by the ordinance and the number stated by the developer as necessary for this development. She suggested 1 open available non-paid space per unit on site.

In response to a question from Commissioner Guerriero, Township Planner Frey said the parking agreement would be part of the HPUD amendment, and needed to be decided this evening. The applicants were asking for consideration for ordinance deviations including taller buildings and reduced parking. Additionally, the applicants would need to provide an exhibit with a schematic plan showing the parking as part of the Agreement.

Commissioner Guerriero summarized that Commissioner Watson had proposed 130 open and available free spaces in addition to any banked parking or paid garage spaces.

In response to a question from Chair Lark, Mr. Lewis said that their experience with their current communities was that the garages were rented at almost full capacity within about 18 months of opening.

Commissioner Allen supported Commissioner Watson's proposal. The Township Attorney could come up with the specific language regarding constructing the banked parking if necessary.

After further discussion, Commissioner Watson proposed that 6 spaces be moved out of banked parking to actual parking.

Chair Lark asked why the applicants were not showing the shared parking as the furthest parking area to the east. The applicants explained that those spaces furthest east were utilized by Ward Church maintenance personnel, to store snow removal equipment and to access the existing maintenance shed. The location of the shared parking as shown had employees using the same sidewalk to get to the building.

The consensus of the Commission was to accept the parking modification as stated by Commissioner Watson.

Commissioner McCarthy questioned the proposed condition that employees be required to park off site, even if exceptions were allowed. This required unnecessary policing by the

Township. The employee parking spaces were part of the total required spaces. He felt the senior living facility could deal with employee parking without it being a condition of recommendation.

Commissioner Zawodny said he could see both sides of this issue.

Chair Lark asked the Commission's direction regarding including a condition requiring employees to park off site. Commissioner McCarthy reiterated that he felt that condition should be eliminated. Employee parking would take care of itself.

In response to a question from Chair Lark, Commissioner Zawodny agreed that the condition regarding employee parking could be eliminated. He accepted the applicants' argument that there would be times employees could park in the open spaces by the building.

Chair Lark indicated he was ready to entertain a motion.

MOTION by Allen, support by Guerriero, that JPUD18-0003, a request for HPUD Amendment #6, to allow independent senior living on 10.85 acres of Ward Evangelical Presbyterian Church property be recommended to the Board of Trustees, with the following conditions:

- 1. Night games and lighting of the ball fields are prohibited.**
- 2. Ball field orientation and location may need to be further adjusted toward the east during site plan review. The optimal orientation is the same as the existing fields.**
- 3. The applicants will provide additional landscape material and/or additional berm as needed along the west property line to further buffer the relocated ball fields from the adjacent neighborhood. If possible low growing trees and shrubs will be added under the power lines.**
- 4. An agreement shall be defined for Township use of the ball fields into perpetuity.**
- 5. The use will remain senior independent living only unless an application for modified use is made to and approved by the Township.**
- 6. Parking shall consist of the following: 228 spaces on site to include 134 open non-paid spaces, 44 banked spaces, and 50 garage spaces, as well as 97 shared parking spaces on the Ward Church property as shown.**
- 7. In return for the consideration of additional height for the senior housing building, additional landscaping shall be provided on the senior housing site in order to visually reduce the scale of building.**
- 8. Compliance with all review comments contained in the planning review letter dated June 7, 2018.**

Commissioner Zawodny noted that in addition to the required extra landscaping, all plantings required by ordinance would have to be accommodated on the individual senior housing and ball field sites, including required tree replacements.

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

Motion approved unanimously.

- 3. JRZ18-0003 Michigan International Technology Center Corridor (MITC)**
Representative: Jennifer Frey, Charter Township of Northville
Location: Approximately 153 acres, NE corner Five Mile & Napier Roads (Parcel ID#77-071-99-0002-000)
Request: Rezone from Industrial to Office, Research and Technology (ORT)
Action: Recommended to Board of Trustees

Township Planner Frey provided the background for the Township's request to rezone approximately 153 acres at the northeast corner of Five Mile and Napier Roads from I-1 (Industrial) to ORT (Office, Research, Technology), The primary reasons for the rezoning request were:

- 1) To align with the goals and objectives of the Michigan International Technology Center (MITC) Corridor. All of the property to Ridge Road on the north side of Five Mile Road in the Township was zoned ORT; from Ridge to Napier it was Industrial. The Township was asking that the Commission be proactive and align the zoning with the goals and objectives of the target market for the Michigan International Technology Center Corridor.
- 2) There was a utility consideration because as the Township was considering expanding utilities in the area, there was a more expensive rate and a higher level of utility development in an Industrial zoning district vs. an Office, Research and Technology zoning district.

Township Planner Frey affirmed that all the criteria were met for the rezoning request, based on the planning that had taken place over the last 2 years, the branding of the MITC Corridor, and the momentum that was occurring with parcels not only in Northville Township but also in Plymouth Township. The Township anticipated that as properties developed further west there would be more demand in the near term for the subject property.

Township Planner Frey noted that there was a letter of support supplied to the Commission from Advanced Disposal.

Chair Lark opened the public hearing.

Joseph Kohn, 42955 Whitestone Court, Northville Township, and Advanced Disposal representative, spoke in favor of this rezoning proposal.

Seeing that no one else came forward to speak, Chair Lark returned the matter to the Commission.

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

Voice vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously

Chair Lark noted that this proposal had been discussed previously before it was placed on the formal agenda.

MOTION by Guerriero, support by Allen, that in the matter of JRZ18-0003, the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Trustees the rezoning of Parcel ID #77-071-99-0002-000 from Industrial to Office, Research and Technology for the reasons set forth in the staff materials provided to the Commission.

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

Motion approved unanimously.

Other Business: None.

Department Reports:

Township Planner Frey

- A submitted site plan from Zhongding was the first submission in the MITC Corridor; this was going through administrative review. The site was located on Five Mile Road between Beck and Ridge, just west of Community Park.
- DTE had purchased approximately 3 acres from the Township on Napier north of Five Mile, in order to build a substation to serve the MITC area. That site plan would also come before the Commission when it was submitted.

Director of Public Services Casari

- The Township was working with the DNR regarding additional contamination found on the former State Hospital property site.

Zoning Board of Appeals Liaison Lark

- Provided a recap of the ZBA meeting held June 20, 2018.
- Opened a discussion regarding outdoor sales as accessory to an established use, such as at Kroger's and Cantoro's, as well as various businesses on Haggerty Road. Kroger's had received a variance for additional time for outdoor sales: ZBA granted them 6 months to cover the spring until the fall time period. The ZBA had requested that the Planning Commission and Board of Trustees take a look at the outdoor sales ordinance for possible modification.

Extended Public Comments: None.

Adjournment: 10:00 P.M