

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF NORTHVILLE  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
March 27, 2018**

**DATE:** March 27, 2018  
**TIME:** 7:00 PM  
**PLACE:** Northville Township Hall  
44405 Six Mile Road

**APPROVED:** April 24, 2018

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

**ROLL CALL:**

**Present:** Richard Allen, Lisa Anderson, Tim Guerriero, Eric Lark, George McCarthy, Jane Watson (7:34 PM), Tim Zawodny

**Excused:** None

**Staff:** Jennifer Frey, Township Planner

**Approval of Minutes:**

Planning Commission – February 12, 2018

Planning Commission – February 27, 2018

**MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy, to approve the February 12 and February 27, 2018 Planning Commission minutes as published.**

Voice vote: Ayes: All  
Nays: None

**Motion approved unanimously.**

**Other Minutes:**

Zoning Board of Appeals – January 17, 2018

Board of Trustees Regular – February 15, 2018

**MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy, to receive and file the minutes from the Zoning Board of Appeals meeting of January 17, 2018, and the Board of Trustees regular meeting of February 15, 2018.**

Voice vote: Ayes: All  
Nays: None

**Motion approved unanimously.**

**Correspondence:** Township Planner Frey said that correspondence had been received from Stantec Consulting Michigan. This letter would be discussed under New Business Agenda Item 2 JSKPR18-0002.

**Brief Public Comments:** None.

**New Business  
Public Hearing**

- |                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| <b>1. JRZ18-0002</b> | <b>Dewayne White, DW Development, Property Owner</b>                       |
| Location:            | Marilyn Avenue; North of 5 Mile Road (Vacant Land – ID#77-051-99-0002-701) |
| Request:             | Rezone from Multi Family (MF) to Single Family Residential (R-4)           |
| Action:              | Recommend to Board of Trustees   |

Referring to her review letter dated March 9, 2018, Township Planner Frey gave the background to this rezoning request. The vacant parcel was located on the west side of Marilyn, north of 5 Mile (behind the strip mall). The property was currently zoned Multiple Family Residential (MF). The parcel fronted onto the side road, and abutted a property that fronted on 5 Mile Road.

In approximately 2000, the property was rezoned from B-1 Local Business to MF Multiple Family Residential. At the time, the property owner was going to construct a four unit building. However, the current owner desired to build a single-family home. Single-family homes were not permitted in the MF zoning district and consequently the property owner was requesting to rezone the property to R-4 Single Family Residential.

Township Planner Frey reviewed the criteria for rezoning (43.5) as follows:

1. *Consistency with the Master Plan or if conditions have changed since the Master Plan was adopted, consistency with recently development trends in the area.*

Allowing this parcel to be rezoned to R-4 to permit construction of a single-family home would be consistent with the residential development to the north. The rezoning was also similar to the property on Fry that was recently rezoned from B-1 to R-4. The request was consistent with recent development trends in the area.

2. *Compatibility of the site's physical, geological, hydrological and other environmental features with all uses permitted in the proposed zoning district compared to uses permitted under current zoning.*

Construction of a single family home would have less impact on the trees than if the lot developed as a multiple family use.

3. *Evidence that if the current zoning is enforced, the consequent restriction will preclude the use of the property for any purpose to which it is reasonably adapted and that the application of the current classification amounts to confiscation of the plaintiff's property.*

At 90-feet wide, the property could better accommodate a single-family home than multiple-family residential, given the additional setbacks that multiple-family would require.

4. *Compatibility of all uses permitted in the proposed zoning district with the surrounding uses and zoning in terms of land suitability, impacts on the environment, density, nature of the use, traffic impacts, aesthetics, infrastructure and potential influence on property values compared to uses permitted under current zoning.*

A single-family residential use would have less impact than a low intensity multiple family residential use. Additionally, a single family home would continue the established development pattern of the single-family residential homes to the north.

5. *Capacity of the township utilities and services sufficient to accommodate all of the uses permitted in the requested district.*

The proposed R-4 zoning district would have less impact on utilities and services than the current MF zoning.

6. *Capacity of the street system to safely and efficiently accommodate the expected traffic generated by uses permitted in the requested zoning district.*

Traffic would be less with the proposed single-family zoning district than an MF residential district.

7. *Apparent demand for the types of uses permitted in the requested zoning district in the township and surrounding area, in relation to the amount of land in the township, and surrounding area, currently zoned and available to accommodate the demand.*

The parcel had not developed as MF in almost 16 years and the current property owner believed there was a demand for a single-family home on this property.

8. *Whether the boundaries of the requested zoning district are sufficient to meet the dimensional regulations for the zoning district.*

The size of the property could accommodate a single-family residential unit.

9. *If a rezoning is appropriate, the requested zoning district shall be more appropriate from the township's perspective than another zoning district.*

The R-4 zoning district was more appropriate than MF, given the parcel did not have frontage on 5 Mile Road. Also, if the parcel had not been zoned MF, it would have been considered to be rezoned to R-4 when the R-4 district was created and the parcels to the north were rezoned from R-3 to R-4.

Township Planner Frey concluded her review.

Dewayne White, 18782 Marble Head Drive, Northville, was present on behalf of this application. He explained that a single family home would have no adverse impact on the utilities, that he was already working on two homes on the street, and that people were



Mile Road. Consumer's Energy planned to upgrade the current facility by removing 2 small buildings and constructing a 40' x 60' pole barn, move ballasts inside the building, and replace valves and some of the other plumbing associated with the site. There would be a new filter separator and a heater along with the new building.

Township Planner Frey summarized the comments in her March 7, 2018 letter. Outstanding issues included:

Landscaping:

- The height of the evergreens along the Napier Road frontage should be increased to 8 feet, to meet the minimum height required by ordinance.
- Additional landscaping should be considered along the west side of the fence that enclosed the equipment on the site, in order to diminish the appearance of the new building.
- As this was a small expansion on a large site, the Planning Commission could discuss waiving the ordinance requirement to bring the entire site into compliance.

Building elevations:

- The color of the building and roof should be specified.
- As the building was not visible from Napier, the Planning Commission had the discretion to modify the 80% masonry requirement for the building.
- A small material sample board was required.

Regarding lighting, Stantec Consulting had noted that the light fixtures would not meet ordinance requirements because they were required to be explosion-proof. However, given the location of this project 900 feet from the road, 550 feet from the adjacent property line to the south, where there was no residential structure, and with Mayberry State Park to the north, Stantec felt that the lighting would not have an impact on adjacent areas or be in conflict with the ordinance. In any event, the lighting type presented was required for this facility.

Township Planner Frey concluded her review by saying that the site was zoned residential, but essential public services were a permitted land use in the residential district.

Commissioner Guerriero asked if the site would be staffed. Mr. Lawson said this portion of the site was hands-free unless people were on site for specific tasks.

Regarding landscaping, Mr. Lawson said that they would increase the evergreens along Napier to 8 feet. They couldn't place them precisely on the plan until they were sure they would not be over pipelines. They would also increase the landscaping on the west side of the fence.

Township Planner Frey advised that the Commission needed to indicate if they were content with the landscaping improvements described.

In response to a question from Commissioner Anderson, Township Planner Frey said the property 550 feet to the south was the nearest residential property. Commissioner Anderson wondered if additional trees should be planted along that property line. Township Planner Frey said that the Township would revisit the site and see if planting trees in that area would be more appropriate than placing them closer to the western fence.

The consensus of the Commission was that the landscaping described in the review letter and further discussed this evening would be sufficient improvement for the site and the landscaping could be approved administratively.

Chair Lark asked if parking was required for the site. Mr. Lawson said parking would not be required for this portion of the site. Township Planner Frey pointed out that a turnaround would access the building, and there was parking on the greater site.

Regarding the building, Mr. Lawson said the color would match the existing structures, and they would specify the exact colors on the plans. They were requesting that the 80% masonry requirement be waived, due to the building's distance from the road and the fact that it was a utility building. A small material sample board would be provided to the Building Department.

The consensus of the Commission was to waive the 80% masonry requirement.

Mr. Scott said that they would meet with the Township's Civil Engineer and resolve any outstanding engineering issues.

Mr. Lawson said Fire Department requirements would also be met, with the one exception that the access road was unlikely to be paved. Those roads were consistently all gravel throughout Michigan, and Consumers did plow them in the winter. If necessary, they would meet with the Fire Department regarding this requirement.

Regarding lighting, Mr. Scott said that the pole-mounted fixtures would be LED. The fixtures on the building would not be LED, and would only be on when someone was on site working.

Commissioner McCarthy asked if the applicants should be asked to participate in the costs of constructing a sidewalk along Napier, should that construction occur in the future.

Mr. Lawson said he could not commit to that this evening.

Township Planner Frey said that the plan for a sidewalk along Napier was in the long-term future. When the time came that the sidewalk was planned for construction, they would have a conversation with Consumer's, especially if the sidewalk was part of a larger project.

Commissioner Watson joined the meeting at 7:34 PM.

**MOTION by Allen, support by McCarthy, that the Planning Commission approve JSKPR18-0002, a Sketch Plan for a new 40' x 60' building, petitioned by Consumer's Energy, with the condition that a revised plan be submitted and approved administratively by all relevant City Departments, including Fire, Engineering, and Planning, and that the Lighting Plan also be 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, Zawodny  
Nays: None  
Abstentions: Watson

**Motion approved 6-0-1 (Watson abstained).**

**Other Business:**

**1. Ordinance Discussion – Pet Care Facilities**

Township Planner Frey gave the background for this discussion item, explaining that this was a follow-up from the February 27 meeting when the Planning Commission recommended amending the Ordinance to add overnight boarding at pet care facilities as a special land use in the B-1, B-3 and NRMU Districts. There had been discussion at that meeting regarding the appropriateness of allowing pet care facilities as a use by right in those zoning districts, because a use by right did not allow the Commission to apply any discretionary standards such as additional buffers or setbacks. Also, there were locations within those districts where pet care facilities were perhaps not appropriate at all. If all pet care facilities, whether or not they had overnight boarding, were required to be a special land use, the Commission could look at each application on its merits.

Discussion was held whether there were any districts where pet care facilities should be a use by right. The consensus of the Commission was that that pet care facilities should be a special land use in any district where they were permitted. The B-1, B-3, NRMU, Industrial, and Consumer Industrial Districts could all allow pet care facilities, but only as a special land use.

It was noted that the previous Dogtopia application would not be affected by this change.

Township Planner Frey said she would make the appropriate changes to the Ordinance, and set the matter for public hearing at the next available meeting.

**Department Reports**

**Township Planner Frey**

- A proposal had come in for 2 casual restaurants at the former Aubree's Pizza space at the Three Generations Plaza.
- The Subcommittee had met with representatives from the Village at Northville. The pizzeria was relocated to the northwest corner of the commercial site. The drive-through coffee shop had been eliminated. The hotel had been brought closer to the corner buildings. The grocery store had been scaled back and a designated area for the outdoor patio area was now shown. All of these and other changes would be shown on a new concept plan that would go before the Board of Trustees. The site plan would then be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Zawodny added that the open space had not yet been officially calculated. Township Planner Frey added that the Village at Northville would have to bring the open space up to the 20% or ask for a modification.

**Richard Allen, Board of Trustees Liaison**

The Village at Northville multi-family component was not well received by the Board, and that part of the plan was also being revised. Options for the loft structures were presented, including the more spread-out footprint of multiple buildings with surface parking and carports, a podium structure with grade level parking under the structure itself, and a parking deck with the inhabited buildings wrapped around it. The buffer along Beck Road had also been discussed. Again, a new plan would be brought to the Board of Trustees.

Commissioner Anderson asked Commissioner Allen to report Board of Trustees comments regarding the new VAN submission to the Commission.

**Zoning Board of Appeals Liaison Lark**

- The cell tower request at 6 Mile Road and Winchester was unanimously denied.
- A rear yard setback variance request in order to construct an addition was denied.
- A variance for lot width was granted for 2 lots in a 4-lot development, in order to mitigate impact on natural features including a wetland.

**Extended Public Comments:** None.

**Adjournment:** 8:04 PM