

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF NORTHVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
January 30, 2018**

DATE: January 30, 2018
TIME: 7:00 PM
PLACE: Northville Township Hall
44405 Six Mile Road

APPROVED: February 27, 2018

CALL TO ORDER: 7:00 PM

ROLL CALL:

Present: Richard Allen, Lisa Anderson, Tim Guerriero, Eric Lark, George McCarthy, Tim Zawodny
Excused: Jane Watson

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

Approval of Minutes:

Planning Commission – October 3, 2017
Planning Commission – December 5, 2017
Planning Commission Study Session – December 18, 2017

MOTION by Guerriero, support by Allen, to approve the October 3, 2017, December 5, 2017, and December 18, 2017 Planning Commission minutes as published.

Voice vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

Other Minutes:

Zoning Board of Appeals – October 18, 2017
Board of Trustees Regular – November 16, 2017
Board of Trustees Special – December 14, 2017

MOTION by Allen, support by Guerriero, to receive and file the minutes from the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting of October 18, 2017, and the Board of Trustees regular meetings of November 16, 2017 and December 14, 2017.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

facility allowed dogs to socialize with each other in a controlled environment. Noise and odors were controlled through special technologies. The boarding aspect of the business was virtually invisible.

Mr. Premo introduced franchisees Nick and Shelly Mills, who presented together.

DogTopia had 65 locations in the US and Canada, with four in Michigan: Commerce, Birmingham, Utica and Bloomfield. DogTopia provided day care, boarding and spa facilities. Their facilities were immaculately kept, had special processes for cleaning and air purification, and required all employees to have extensive training regarding dog behavior. Dogs themselves went through an evaluation before they were allowed to participate at DogTopia.

The facility included 2 rooms for play, sleeping quarters, a lobby area, etc. Webcams were used so dog owners could check on their pets during the day.

Hours of the dog day care were 7 a.m. to 7 p.m. Dogs that boarded overnight were also part of the general day care population. Boarded dogs were fed at 7 p.m., let out to use the bathroom, and put to bed. The last employee left at 9:30 p.m., the earliest came at 6:00 a.m., when boarded dogs were fed and let out from 6 – 7 a.m.

During the night when no employee was present, motion detectors and security cameras were in place.

Regarding the number of dogs, the Birmingham facility, which had been open for 2 years, provided an example. On an average week Birmingham had about 60 dogs Monday through Friday, 10 of which were boarded. On a normal weekend, 15-20 dogs would be in daycare, the same number would board overnight. During holiday seasons, the numbers could be greater.

In response to questions from Chair Lark, Mr. Mills said the Birmingham location was industrial. Commerce, Bloomfield, and Utica were all in retail locations. As far as Mr. Mills knew, there were no complaints at any of the locations, all of which boarded dogs. No noise traveled to neighboring businesses, and odors were controlled by HVACS provided for each room.

Mr. Mills pointed out that they were already approved as a dog day care in their current location; boarding would add no greater impact in terms of noise, odors, or use.

Mr. Guerriero asked the maximum number of dogs that could be handled for overnight boarding. Mr. Mills said the estimate was to allow 30 square feet of play space per dog. Suite and home-style crates were provided for the boarding aspect. The maximum capacity would be 82-85 dogs.

Chair Lark asked if the outdoor play area was part of the previous approval. Township Planner Frey said it was. Mr. Mills said the dogs were let out in a fenced area with synthetic grass 15 minutes out of every hour, and were constantly supervised while they were outside. Dogs that boarded slept through the night.

Commissioner Guerriero asked about the policy of not having an employee stay overnight, and also emergency protocols for the overnight use. What would happen if there were a fire?

Mr. Mills explained that DogTopia had motion detectors and applications to ensure dog safety. Having no one in the building diminished interruptions dogs experienced when they heard someone moving about.

Mr. Mills continued that if a dog got out of a crate, a motion detector would trigger a call to the closest employee. In the case of fire, the system would notify the Fire Department immediately. Dogs slept through the night and didn't need anyone with them; dogs were actually more peaceful when no one was around, as even the smallest noise could wake a dog that might then start barking, etc.

Commissioner Zawodny asked if the applicants would be willing to set an upper limit on the number of dogs that could be boarded. He was concerned that in the case of fire or other emergency, how would emergency responders deal with 2 rooms full of dogs that had to be evacuated? Was there a maximum response time required of staff who were on call? Also, what happened if a dog got sick in the night?

Mr. Mills said that an emergency protocol had just been completed by DogTopia's corporate office. He could submit that to the Commission.

Commissioner Zawodny asked if there were minimum requirements in building standards for sound and noise transmission.

Mr. Mills explained that each room was soundproofed to completely eliminate sound travel from one room and one building to the next. Commercial grade HVAC/air filtration systems controlled odors.

Commissioner Anderson asked how many dogs were outside at a time. Mr. Mills said 30-35 dogs were outside at any one time, for 10-15 minutes each hour.

In response to a question from Commissioner Guerriero, Mr. Mills showed the orientation of the building in relationship to the parking lot, street front, etc. They would share the old Trader Joe's space with an urgent care.

Chair Lark asked if the business would sell anything, since they were describing themselves as "retail." Mr. Mills said they didn't actually run a retail operation, just day care, boarding and spa. Other locations were located inside shopping centers such as strip malls.

Commissioner Allen said he was inclined to agree to the boarding use as a special land use.

Township Planner Frey outlined process if the Commission wanted to move this request forward. Draft language could be ready for a public hearing in February, and then if the Commission recommended approval, it could be scheduled for the Board of Trustees meeting in March. She reviewed 2 similar uses in the B-3 District, one at a 7 Mile and Northville strip

center that had dog training but not boarding, and the Petsmart at 6 and Haggerty that also didn't board but did have a veterinary clinic on site.

Discussion followed as to research that needed to be done regarding standards if the use were allowed in the B-3 District. The consensus of the Commission was that any boarding facility should not be close to a residential district, and Township Planner Frey was charged with researching how other communities regulated this use. She noted that certain conditions, including times when dogs could go out in the evening and morning, could be site specific.

Commissioner McCarthy said he would support a special land use.

Commissioner Guerriero also supported a special land use approach, and agreed that research should be done regarding how other communities regulated dog boarding.

Township Planner Frey noted that she had included the ordinances from Bloomfield, Birmingham and Commerce, where there were existing DogTopia facilities, and would research others.

Chair Lark summarized that standards could include location of outside runs and screening, maximum number of dogs that could be boarded, maximum number of dogs that could be outside at any one time, and how far away from residential such facilities should be.

Township Planner Frey thought some standards could be site specific; others such as a prohibition against abutting a residential district could be District-wide.

Commissioner Allen was concerned about nuisance barking.

Commissioner Anderson agreed that boarding and dog day care facilities should not be near residential districts. She used a dog day care facility, and while she could not hear the dogs in the lobby, she could hear them from the outside of the building. She felt the entire use, including day care and dog training, belonged in industrial districts, with possible permission in B-3 Districts via special land use only.

Mr. Mills said that in the case of DogTopia, extra care was taken to contain noise and odor, as already described.

Commissioner Zawodny also asked for additional research. Standards should include such things as maximum number of boarded animals, a cross reference to building codes relative to occupancy, where animals would be taken if they had to be removed in an emergency, and controls for sound and odor transmission. He noted that an HVAC system could move odors out, but once the air was discharged, there should be standards/minimum distances in order to keep the discharged air from being sucked into an adjacent HVAC unit.

Chair Lark supported the use as a special land use in the B-3 district.

Township Planner Frey summarized that 3 Commissioners supported having the entire use – canine day care, training, and boarding – be a special land use. Three Commissioners supported only the overnight component being a special land use.

Commissioner Allen suggested that the process be 2-step: first look at amending the ordinance in order to allow overnight boarding as a special land use, and then look at the overall use (canine day care and training) being included as a special land use only.

Commissioner Zawodny indicated he was ready to offer a motion.

MOTION by Zawodny, support by McCarthy, that staff prepare a draft ordinance amendment for the February 2018 public hearing, that would allow canine boarding as a special land use in the B-1 and B-3 Zoning Districts, with a prohibition against locating adjacent to a residential district, and other conditions as appropriate.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
 Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

2. JSKPR18-0001 PARK PLACE APARTMENTS CLUB HOUSE

Representative: David Mielock, Mielock Associates
Location: 43001 Northville Place Drive
Request: Site Plan Amendment – Clubhouse – Exterior Improvements
Action: Approve, Approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny

Township Planner Frey gave the background for this request for a site plan amendment to update the appearance of the clubhouse at the Park Place Apartments. The applicants were proposing changes to the east and west building elevations in response to proposed interior renovations. The building footprint would remain the same. New brick and shingles would match the existing materials.

The only outstanding issue was whether new exterior lighting was planned, and if so, would it comply with the Township's lighting standards.

Sean Finnegan, JRK Property Holdings, 11766 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1500, Los Angeles CA was present on behalf of this application. David Mielock, Mielock Associates, 114 Rayson Street, Suite 20, Northville MI was also present.

Mr. Finnegan explained that they had purchased Park Place Apartments in August 2017 and were upgrading the property, including the clubhouse.

Utilizing overhead slides, Mr. Mielock explained changes to the clubhouse interior, which included an enlarged fitness facility and game room.

Regarding the east elevation that faced the pool, the configuration of the bay window would change, along with opening up roof lines, adding new doors, new columns, etc., in order to allow more natural light into the building and modernize the appearance.

Regarding the west elevation that faced the pool, a gable and full height glass would allow more natural light.

Outdoor lighting would not change.

In response to a question from Commissioner Zawodny, Mr. Mielock explained that the glass was shown dark in the renderings in order to clearly define it, but the glass in reality would be clear. Exterior materials would match what was already there. No changes were planned to the landscaping; if any landscaping were damaged during the project it would be replaced.

In response to a question from Commissioner Anderson, Mr. Mielock affirmed that no change was being made to the building envelope.

Chair Lark asked if any public wanted to speak on this agenda item. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Lark indicated he was ready for a motion.

MOTION by Allen, support by Guerriero, that the Planning Commission approve JSKPR18-0001 as requested.

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

Motion approved unanimously.

3. JPUD 18-0001 RIDGE HILL ESTATES

Representative: Brad Batham, Pinnacle Homes
Location: 49209 7 Mile Road
Request: Planned Unit Development Agreement – 1st Amendment
Action: Recommend to Board of Trustees

Township Planner Frey gave the background to this request to amend the Planned Unit Development for Ridge Hill Estates, in order to reduce the number of side entry garages from 72% (28 of 39 units) to 46% (18 of 39 units).

There was an inconsistency between the application and the graphics provided. The application was limited to reducing the number of side entry garages/increasing the number of front-entry garages. But the graphics showed 3-car front-entry garages, which were not a part of the original request.

Township Planner Frey explained that the site layout that identified the approved locations for front and side entry garages was an exhibit to the PUD. If the proposed amendment was endorsed, a revised site layout that identified the locations of side and front-entry garage units was required and must be attached as an exhibit to the proposed PUD amendment. The

revised layout must be reviewed to verify compliance with required setbacks and that spacing between units was maintained.

Chair Lark noted that when the PUD was approved, there had been significant discussion regarding the number of front and side entry garages.

Commissioner Allen said he would find it difficult to move this forward without a drawing showing which units would be a front-entry garage.

Chair Lark invited the applicant to speak.

Howard Fingerroot, Managing Partner of Pinnacle Homes, 1668 South Telegraph, Bloomfield Hills, reviewed the history of this age-targeted development. Sales were going very well, and most of the buyers were from nearby communities. These were high-end 2,000 square-foot homes that were selling in the \$600+ range.

Mr. Fingerroot showed photos of a front-entry 2-car garage, and a front-entry 3-car garage. He asked that 10 additional front-facing garages be approved.

Township Planner Frey asked Mr. Fingerroot to clarify his request. Mr. Fingerroot said they were asking for:

- more front-facing garages
- with a percentage of the additional front-facing garages being for 3 cars

In response to a question from Chair Lark, Mr. Fingerroot said of the homes that had been sold, they had one front-entry garage left, and 13 side-entry garages.

Commissioner Anderson said the website showed more front-entry garages than were originally allowed. Township Planner Frey said the Building Department would verify that the PUD requirements were followed.

In response to questions from the Commission, Mr. Fingerroot said the side-entry garages were priced \$10-\$15,000 more than the front-entry garages. Those homes had a larger driveway and had added cost in the front elevation. They were requesting 10 additional front-entry homes, and would like to have 6 of those be 3-car garage. Setbacks and footprint would not change for homes with 3-car garages.

Commissioner Anderson noted that the 3-car front-facing garages resulted in more of the front elevation being garage, something the Commission had tried to get away from.

Mr. Fingerroot pointed out the stone and brick on the front elevation, and the high-end decorative garage doors. The garage was recessed from the front porch, basically flush with the balance of the house. He said they were trying to accommodate buyers who wanted 3-car garages.

In response to a question from Chair Lark, Township Planner Frey said adult active zoning limited homes to 2-car garages.

Commissioner Allen agreed that front-facing 3-car garages resulted in front elevations that were predominantly garage. He reiterated that he would like to see a drawing that showed the locations of the proposed changes.

Mr. Fingerroot said he would get a drawing to Township Planner Frey showing the proposed locations, and there would be no 3-car garages next to each other.

Chair Lark pointed out that side entrance driveways used more pavement. Mr. Fingerroot said they proposed a 16-foot 2-car driveway for the front-entry garages, narrow at the street and wider next to the garage.

In response to a question from Commission McCarthy, Mr. Fingerroot said that the garage doors were high-end sectional fiberglass.

In response to a comment from Commissioner Anderson, Mr. Fingerroot said the community was age-targeted, but there was not a specific age requirement in the PUD agreement. So far the buyers all fit the desired demographic.

Commissioner Allen remained opposed to 3-car garages in this development.

Commissioner Zawodny agreed. The design of the 3-car garage resulted in the single bay garage door becoming the main focus of the front elevation. He also felt the submittal was incomplete, with no site plan and no supporting data behind the requested change. He felt people would skew toward front-entry garages not because of aesthetics or desire, but simply as a way to save the \$10-\$15,000 premium the side-entry garages cost.

Chair Lark didn't have a problem with a few 3-car garages, because the change mixed it up a bit. He was inclined to approve some additional front-entry homes, but less than requested.

Township Planner Frey summarized the discussion thus far. Some commissioners supported the 3-car garages, and some didn't. Several commissioners wanted to see a site plan with proposed locations of the additional front-entry garages.

Commissioner Anderson said she was not opposed to having a few 3-car garages, perhaps up to 5, and she was fine with having the locations reviewed administratively. She also was not opposed to having a few more front-entry garages, but not as many as were being requested.

Mr. Fingerroot asked for administrative review of the locations. He reduced his request for additional front-entry garages from 10 to 9, and asked that 4 of those have 3-car garages.

Commissioner Zawodny expressed concern that the Commission was continually asked to step aside from portions of original PUD agreements. The original agreement was the result of a public process, including comments from adjacent neighborhoods. He felt they owed it to those who were part of the original discussion to continue to take their comments into consideration. Part of the original discussion included density, the image of the community as

you drove down the street, and the neighborhood aspect generally – all of that factored into the decision regarding how many front-entry and side-entry garages were planned.

Chair Lark commented that a significant number of the homes in Ridge Hills Estates were purchased by Township residents, and he was willing to accommodate their desires to an extent. He supported allowing 6 more front-entry garages, with 4 of those being 3-car.

Mr. Fingerroot said that would be acceptable.

Commissioner McCarthy said that the entire project had been approved, and like Commissioner Zawodny, he was leery of it coming back to the Commission with a request to step aside. He could agree with adding additional front-end garages, but he opposed 3-car garages in this development.

Commissioner Allen agreed. He also felt Township Planner Frey could approve the locations of the new front-facing garages administratively. With the curved streets in this development, judicious placement of the homes with front-end garages could yield an attractive result.

Commissioner Anderson noted that this development was across from Mayberry Park, and she felt some of the homeowners would need a place to store their recreational equipment that they would use in the park.

Chair Lark reiterated that 3-car garages would add a little variety to the development. If four 3-car garages were added, that would be 10% of the total homes.

Township Planner Frey asked for clarification of the request, which originally had been for 21 front-entry garages and 18 side-entry. How many 3-car garages were being proposed?

Mr. Fingerroot said he had reduced his request in order to get some 3-car garages.

Chair Lark asked for the questions of more front-entry garages and the addition of 3-car garages be considered separately.

Commissioner Allen indicated he was ready to offer a motion.

MOTION by Allen support by McCarthy, in the case of JPUD18-0001 Ridge Hills Estates, that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Trustees that the number of front-entry garages be increased by 6, with the following condition:

- **Before presenting this amendment to the Board, the site plan be reviewed administratively to determine which home sites would be the most aesthetically pleasing to the neighborhood in terms of front-entry garages, specifically so there wasn't a row of front-entry garage door openings.**

Commissioner Zawodny said it was important that when someone drove into the subdivision they weren't immediately greeted by four front-entry garages.

Commissioner Allen reiterated that because the roads were curved, the front-entry garages could be arranged so as not to predominate.

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

Motion approved 5-1 (Zawodny opposed)

MOTION by Anderson, support by Lark, in the matter of JPUD18-0001, Ridge Hills Estates, that the Planning Commission recommend to the Board of Trustees an amendment to the PUD to allow 4 of the additional 6 front-entry garages recommended in the preceding motion be 3-car garages, with the following conditions:

- **Before presenting this amendment to the Board, the site plan be reviewed administratively to determine the location of the 3-car garages, and**
- **No home with a 3-car garage be adjacent to another home with a 3-car garage.**

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

Motion failed 3-3 (Allen, McCarthy, Zawodny opposed).

4. JSC18-0001 VILLAGE AT NORTHVILLE

Representative: Brad Batham, Pinnacle Homes
Request: Concept Plan Review – Phase II Site Condos
Action: Recommend to Board of Trustees

Township Planner Frey gave the background to this concept plan review – Phase II Site Condos. Phase II included the remaining 61 single-family lots and the remaining 140 new parking spaces at Community Park. The parking spaces replaced the spaces that were lost due to the construction of the shared access road at Beck. The City's Engineer, Building Department, Fire Department and Traffic Engineer had also provided review comments.

Referring to her letter of January 23, 2018, Township Planner Frey outlined outstanding issues as follows:

- Revised plans must be submitted and approved by all reviewers prior to placing the project on the Board of Trustees meeting agenda for final approval; the earliest this could be heard by the Board was March.
- On-street parking on Main Street south of Park View had been changed from parallel parking as approved on the PUD concept plan to angled parking. Traffic Engineer Lamourie had suggested limiting any approval of that portion to the entrance drive between Beck and Park View, because there were some proposed changes to the loft component. The appropriateness of the angled vs. parallel parking would be considered when that was reviewed.

Layout:

- A lot detail showed 12-foot deep decks. However, lots 48-72 only had about 8 feet from the back of the building envelope to the edge of the easement. The size of the building

envelope must therefore be reduced to match the detail on sheet 4, so that a 12-foot deck could be accommodated on those lots. This change would be consistent with what was done for several lots with a similar situation in Phase I.

Landscape

- The street trees along Main Street west of Beck were identified as woodland replacement. However, those trees were required street trees. The graphic and the woodland replacement calculations needed to be corrected accordingly.
- A screen wall of evergreens was proposed on the edge of Community Park, along the rear lot lines there. Consideration should be given to switching some of the evergreens for canopy or ornamental trees to allow filtered views and pedestrian access to the park.
- The plant material list on sheets LS-3 and LS-4 should be corrected to show the upright deciduous shrubs being a minimum 30" tall and spreading evergreens with the minimum 24" spread, as required by ordinance.

Pedestrian Circulation

- A sidewalk should be added on the west side of the Community Park parking lot, between Main Street and the sidewalk on the north side of the cell tower enclosure.
- At the intersection of Main Street and the driveway into Community Park, the sidewalks should be extended from the north side of Main Street (on each side of the park driveway) to the south side.

Township Planner Frey acknowledged that the applicants were concerned about crossing safety due to sight distances at this location, and the applicants felt the pedestrians would know to go 150 feet south and cross over at that location. She would defer to the Traffic Engineer regarding this issue; if he felt the crossing at Main and Community Park was safe it would be required.

- The decorative concrete/paver area of Main Street and Park View Lane should be labeled as "Decorative Concrete/Pavers"; the word "future" should be removed.
- If there was an entrance at Community Park as described above, the paver crossing detail should be repeated so that pedestrians and vehicles were aware of the pedestrian crossing lane. The decorative concrete/paver detail should be provided at the intersection of Main Street and the entrance into Community Park.

Township Planner Frey summarized staff review letters as follows:

- In his January 23, 2018 letter, Traffic Engineer Lamourie instructed that the inbound lane at the Beck Road access should be widened an additional 15 feet, and the driveway into the parking on the north side of Main Street should be wider to accommodate turning movements there.
- In their January 22, 2018 review letter, the Fire Department made the following comments:
 - The water main shall be looped.
 - Re-iterations of street names that were not approved previously and needed to be revised.
 - The access to Beck Road needed to allow room for turning movements for Fire Department and fire apparatus.

- Hydrant configuration modifications were required.
 - Fire lane signage was required as noted.
- In her January 16, 2018 review letter, Civil Engineer Rickard listed several requirements, some of which needed to be met at this time and some deferred to engineering plan submittal.

In response to a question from Chair Lark, Township Planner Frey explained that the pedestrian crossing was suggested at the intersection of Main and the driveway into Community Park because there was a sidewalk on the other side of the street; people going between the two projects would cross there whether there was a pedestrian connection or not.

Commissioner Allen noted that there was access to the park between lots 65 and 66. Would there be a sidewalk there?

Township Planner Frey said the applicants should address that issue.

John Ackerman, Project Manager, Atwell, 2 Town Square, Southfield MI was present on behalf of this application. Howard Fingeroot, Managing Partner of Pinnacle Homes, 1668 South Telegraph, Bloomfield Hills, was also present.

Referring to the park access between lots 65 and 66, Mr. Ackerman explained there was a capped Consumers' well there. Consumers' required that nothing be put within 10 feet on either side of the well's location. The applicants were not going to show that area as an access, because they didn't want to encourage pedestrian traffic there. They would entertain putting a split rail fence or something similar there.

Mr. Ackerman addressed the request for a pedestrian access at the intersection of Main and the driveway into Community Park. They felt a pedestrian access there would have safety issues, and pedestrians should be directed to the 4-way intersection with pedestrian crossing 150 feet to the southwest.

There would be a 10-foot bike path along the Beck Road frontage that would cross over at the first road and move into the single-family area.

Mr. Ackerman said he could not commit to reducing the building envelopes for lots 48-72. No decks would be built into the easements regardless. They would discuss this situation internally and address it fully when they resubmitted.

Discussion followed. Township Planner Frey reiterated that in Phase I some building envelopes were reduced in order to accommodate 12-foot decks, and the same should be done here. It put the Township in a tough situation when people could not install a deck and the house was not built to have patio. People thought they could construct a bigger deck like everyone else, and when they discovered they couldn't, problems ensued. Again, it was the Township that was put in a difficult situation regarding enforcement.

Chair Lark asked what the developer would do if they didn't reduce the footprint, and the 12-foot decks could not be constructed.

Mr. Fingerroot said homeowners were explicitly shown what they could and couldn't do when they purchased a lot. He thought paver patios could be installed.

Township Planner Frey pointed out that even patios could only be 8 feet deep. Again, the Building Department said that in Phase 1 adjustments were made so that each house could have a 12-foot deck. The applicants needed to review the plans with Atwell as right now a significant number of lots were only allowed an 8-foot deck or patio, even though the detail showed 12-foot decks.

Mr. Fingerroot said he did not feel comfortable reducing the building envelopes because the houses were designed specifically for the site. Mr. Ackerman said they would find a solution.

Commissioner Zawodny said that for purposes of enforcement, notes on the plan should make it clear there was currently no room for 12-foot decks.

Chair Lark asked if the applicants had any issues with any of the other review comments. Mr. Ackerman said they did not.

Commissioner Anderson spoke to the many comments in the reviews. There seemed to be a lot of loose ends to tie up. Township Planner Frey emphasized that with the number of comments, it was not possible for the application to be heard by the Township Board until March. While there were details to be addressed, no significant site or design changes were being made, and she felt the corrections and comments could be handled administratively.

Commissioner Zawodny asked about Sheet A-1, where the street view perspective of the elevations didn't seem to correspond with the front facades. Mr. Ackerman gave some clarifying details, and said that was the same plan sheet that was approved as part of Phase I. Also, in response to a question from Chair Lark, Mr. Ackerman said that there were elevations labeled B and C, but not A,

In response to a question from Commissioner Guerriero, Township Planner Frey said the Traffic Engineer would look at the sidewalk issue. If the Traffic Engineer agreed that sight distances presented a safety issue, the pedestrian crossing at Main and Community Park would not be required. However, if the Traffic Engineer felt sight distances were not a problem, a sidewalk connection would be required. People would cross in that area whether or not a sidewalk was provided; it was better to provide one.

Mr. Fingerroot affirmed that if the Traffic Engineer thought the sidewalk was safe, they would build it.

Chair Lark asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak on this matter. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Lake indicated he was ready for a motion.

MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy that the Planning Commission recommend approval of JSC18-00901 to the Board of Trustees, subject to the following conditions:

- **The applicant resolve all comments contained in the review letters.**

- **The applicant follow the recommendation of the Traffic Engineer regarding extending the sidewalks from the north side of Main Street to the south side at the intersection of Main Street and the driveway into Community Park.**

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

Motion approved unanimously.

5. JSKPR18-0001 CANTORO MARKET – SITE PLAN AMENDMENT

Representative: Kevin Hart, Kevin Hart Associates
 Location: 15550 Haggerty Road
 Request: Site Plan Amendment – Building Addition
 Action: Approve, Approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny

Referring to her review letter of January 22, 2018, Township Planner Frey gave the background to this request to construct a raised terrace above the existing outside patio, to provide for additional dining, and to enclose the ground level outside the patio for year-round use. The parking required for the modifications was considered during Phase I (parking lot expansion).

Outstanding issues included:

- The configuration of the enclosed patio was slightly different than the existing ground level patio. It appeared that the length of the enclosed patio would occupy more of the front façade extending further south than the existing patio and would be about 4 feet shallower in width. The drawings should be consistent from what there was now and what was being proposed. Also, the applicants had indicated that no landscaping would be removed, but clearly all the landscaping there would be affected when the foundations were dug for enclosing the patio and reconfiguring the enclosure. At a minimum, the landscape plan should replace what was shown in the August 30, 2017 letter of approval for the parking lot expansion.
- A graphic should be provided that illustrated the footprint of the proposed enclosed dining overlaid on the existing patio.
- The size of the raised terrace and lower level patio must be identified on sheet SP-1 as usable floor area or gross floor area, as parking calculations were based on that figure.
- Sheets A-2, A-4 and ME-1 were not required for site plan approval and should be removed. Those sheets would be required later for Building Department submission.
- The two lines between the south side of the enclosed patio and the curb were unclear and needed to be labeled.
- All site plan changes must be completed and signed by the Township prior to the Township accepting engineering and building plan submittals.
- A material sample board needed to be provided.
- A note must be added to the elevations to indicate that the proposed stone and brick would match the existing materials.

Township Planner Frey noted that Township Civil Engineer Rickard had pointed out in her January 10, 2018 letter that prior to the approval of the plan, the applicant should finalize the past construction project which included as-built recorded drawings, punch list completion,

providing a letter of credit for outstanding work, and providing the township with an executed storm water maintenance agreement.

Township Planner Frey explained that the January 25, 2018 lighting review from Stantec had noted that compliance with lighting standards could not be verified due to the lack of information provided.

Commissioner Zawodny asked about the Civil Engineer's requirement to finalize the past construction project. Township Planner Frey said those comments related to Phase I, which included the parking lot expansion.

Commissioner Zawodny said that while it appeared that a relatively complete set of construction documents had been submitted, the Commission was missing some key components needed for site plan approval.

Kevin Hart, Kevin Hart Associates, 700 East Maple Suite 101, Birmingham MI was present on behalf of this application. He distributed a handout that addressed some of the outstanding issues.

Mr. Hart explained that the project would construct a raised terrace that would be devoted to the existing inside restaurant. The lower area would be fully enclosed, air conditioned and heated. However, its primary function was to provide an open area during the summer and it would not likely be air-conditioned. Walls along the perimeter were designed to open completely and stack against each other. The lower section had been added to the site plan, and the gross square footage of the raised terrace and the lower enclosed area were now shown on the plan.

The structural components of the finish would match the existing exterior finishing. The sample board showed the galvanized metal that would be the primary portion of the structure for columns, beams, and decking that would be visible inside the building. The exterior would have the same stacked ledgerstone and reclaimed antique brick that was there now. Anodized aluminum sheet metal would also match existing materials.

The open mezzanine level was 1668 square feet and would be devoted to seasonal dining and gathering, open from late spring to early fall.

Mr. Hart explained that the application's geometry had been changed in response to conversations with the Building Department. There was concern about egress on the 2nd floor, and they were proposing an exterior staircase on the south side of the proposed structure and a catwalk that opened up in the northwest corner of the existing building. The catwalk would allow for an emergency door and exit to the upper lobby, giving access to an elevator and staircase that exited the building. The area would be fire suppressed and conform to all emergency egress requirements. Both levels would be ADA compliant.

In response to the review comments, Mr. Hart had included in the A-5 packet the furniture layout and interior construction. Galvanized coated I-beams and metal decking would simplify the interior and shield the exterior of the building from any light pouring out.

Regarding the photometric study, they were trying to provide minimal lighting in order to give an outdoor affect. There would be negligible foot-candles along the perimeter of the building on both floors, with zero foot-candles along the property line; the plans would be corrected to show this. There were lighting fixtures inside the landscaped areas.

Emergency lights were not included in the photometric study, but if there was an alarm, lights would light the way to get off the raised terrace area, and the staircase would also be lit appropriately.

In response to a question from Commissioner Zawodny, Mr. Hart explained that the emergency illumination would be linked to the fire alarm. Tables would also have low-level battery powered light

Mr. Hart said they had provided a landscape plan that had significantly more product than what was now at the site, including larger caliper deciduous trees along the western side. The two phantom lines mentioned earlier signified a loosely laid grindstone retaining wall that would soften the slope.

Mr. Hart provided a sample board and also samples of the brick and ledgestone. The folding operable window walls were a clear anodized aluminum that matched the columnar storefront at the main front of the building.

Mr. Hart concluded his presentation.

Commissioner Allen said that trees planted during Phase I had not been staked, nor had the burlap around their root balls been removed; they had eventually fallen over.

Mr. Hart said the landscape plan was extensive; and included a staking diagram for the trees and for the boxwoods and bushes.

In response to a question from Chair Lark, Mr. Hart said he would submit the overlay of an outline of the terrace showing the existing and proposed configuration. There was no change in the actual square footage. They had changed the geometry to accommodate the catwalk as a second means of egress.

Township Planner Frey said that the square footage needed to be verified in order to assure parking still met requirements of the approved PUD.

Chair Lark asked about the outstanding items from Phase I as noted in the Civil Engineer's review. Department of Public Services Director Casari explained that some things weren't completed because of weather; other items were simply lagging. The Township wanted to make sure the outstanding items were completed before building permits were issued for the work being discussed this evening.

Township Planner Frey explained that after the site plan was approved, the applicant would need to submit building and engineering drawings prior to starting construction.

In response to comments from Commissioner Zawodny, Mr. Hart explained further details of the emergency lighting. The building and fire departments would review and inspect this aspect of the project.

Chair Lark asked if anyone in the audience wished to speak on this matter. Seeing that no one came forward to speak, Chair Lark indicated he was ready for a motion.

MOTION by Zawodny, support by McCarthy, that the Planning Commission approve JSKPR18-0001, subject to the following condition:

- **Compliance with all the staff comments that were presented as part of our review, including comments made during this meeting regarding the supplemental information that was provided by the applicant tonight, including but not limited to verification that the square footage of what is proposed matches the square footage of the approved PUD, that the issues relative to as-builts and site work documentation, as well as maintenance agreements and other outstanding issues from Phase I are completed properly and turned in before any building permits are reviewed and issued, and that the documentation for emergency lighting and for zero foot-candles at the property line be provided.**
-

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

Motion approved unanimously.

Other Business:

1. Annual Report

Township Planner Frey presented the 2017 Planning Commission Annual Report.

MOTION by McCarthy, support by Anderson, to approve the Planning Commission Annual Report 2017.

Voice vote: Ayes: All
 Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

2. Election of Officers

MOTION by Guerriero, support by Allen, to re-nominate and re-elect the current slate of officers: Erick Lark as Chair and Tim Zawodny as Vice-Chair.

Voice vote: Ayes: All
 Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

Department Reports:

Township Planner Frey:

- Reminded Planning Commission of February 12 Special Meeting for Village of Northville. Regular February meeting would be February 27th.

Director of Public Services Casari:

- Demolition and remediation at the Northville Psychiatric Hospital site update. Asbestos remediation was waiting on warmer weather, as the work needed water. All floors had been secured with Visqueen, and the universal waste had been removed. The project was on schedule.
- MITC meeting update. DTE was moving forward with purchasing land from the Township for setting up a substation on Napier Road just south of the railroad tracks.
- Permits were issued for 90 new homes in 2017.
- CMAC funding, Phase II. Phase I funding for 5 Mile and Beck was approved and was under design. Phase II funding would apply to additional road improvements at 6 Mile and Beck and 5 Mile and Sheldon.

Zoning Board of Appeals Liaison Lark:

Update from the January 17 ZBA meeting included:

- Decision regarding 41620 Six Mile Road cell tower (T-Mobile) was postponed.
- Variance granted for 18695 Fox Hollow Court, to permit a swim pool on vacant land, with the condition that the pool could not be separated from the owner's house in any sale of the property.
- Variance granted for 9250 Napier Road, permitting a gated entry and decorative fence.

Extended Public Comments: None.

Adjournment: 10:07 p.m.