

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF NORTHVILLE
PLANNING COMMISSION
May 26, 2020**

DATE: May 26, 2020 **APPROVED: June 30, 2020**
TIME: 7:03 PM
PLACE: Meeting held remotely via video/teleconference

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, pursuant to Executive Orders issued by Governor Whitmer, participation in the Planning Commission meeting was held remotely via zoom webinar video/teleconference. Members of the public body and members of the public participating electronically were considered present at the meeting and could participate as if physically present, as outlined on the Township website and posted per Open Meeting requirements.

CALL TO ORDER: The meeting was called to order by Chair Zawodny via video/teleconference at 7:00 p.m. Chair Zawodny explained process for tonight's remote meeting.

ROLL CALL:

Present: Lisa Anderson, Timothy Guerriero, Eric Lark, George McCarthy (joined 7:06 pm), Fred Shadko, Jayne Watson, Tim Zawodny

Excused: None

Staff: Jennifer Frey, Township Planner
Bob Belair, Deputy Director of Public Services

Approval of Minutes:

Planning Commission – May 5, 2020

MOTION by Zawodny, support by Anderson, to approve the May 5, 2020 Planning Commission meeting minutes as presented.

Roll call vote: Ayes: Anderson, Guerriero, Lark, McCarthy, Shadko, Watson, Zawodny
Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

Correspondence:

Chair Zawodny acknowledged correspondence regarding PCRZ20-0001, as noted during the public hearing portion of that item.

Brief Public Comments: None.

New Business/Public Hearing:

- 1. PCRA20-0001 Conditional Rezoning
 - Representative: Schafer Development – Steven & Spencer Schafer
 - Property Owner: Carolyn Gall/Mashni Trust/William and Kathleen Phillips
 - Location: 15709 N. Haggerty Rd., 77-052-99-0003-001
15709 N. Haggerty Rd., 77-052-99-0002-001
15709 N. Haggerty Rd., 77-052-99-0017-001
 - Request: Conditional Rezoning from R-3 (Single Family Residential) to RM-1 (Multiple Family Residential)
 - Action: Recommend to Board of Trustees

Township Planner Frey said the Planning Commission had seen a conceptual presentation for this project in December 2019. Tonight's request was for conditional rezoning of the parcel located on the east side of Haggerty, north of 5 Mile, from R-3 (Single Family Residential) to RM-1 (Multiple Family Residential). The project included three lots that fronted on Haggerty Road, for a total 11.31 acres.

Michael Noles, Umlor Group, 49287 West Road, Wixom MI was present on behalf of this application. Schafer Development was the contract purchaser, and Pulte Homes of Michigan would be the builder and developer of this project. Representatives of Schafer Development and Pulte Homes of Michigan were also present.

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation shown on the Zoom screen, Mr. Noles said that since the December Planning Commission meeting, they had modified their proposal to incorporate input received at that meeting, as well as add a third property to the overall parcel. A letter from Mr. and Mrs. Phillips – owners of the third parcel – noted that the area had changed significantly over the years, and the Phillips were pleased that all three parcels could be developed together in a coordinated development.

As outlined in the Umlor Group letter, since December the applicants had met with the Board of Woodside Village Association (to the north) and also had an open meeting with the Woodside HOA at Township Hall. Those homeowners had indicated a preference for tonight's layout as opposed to the original concept shown in December, since the revised layout offered enhanced buffering and open space aspects, as well as smaller unit footprints.

Additionally, the applicants had met with the pastor and executive members of the Metropolitan Seventh-day Adventist Church to the south, and had multiple meetings with the owner of Hidden Cove Estates to the west.

The revised plans had been reviewed by Township staff and consultants, and Mr. Noles pointed out that OHM Advisors had recommended approval, as had the Township Fire Department. Pulte Homes would be providing fire suppression systems within all the units. The Township's traffic consultant also had no issues with this proposed plan. Township Planner Frey's review had concluded that this proposal was consistent with the Master Plan, was consistent with rezoning criteria, and that the conditional rezoning

was the best option to ensure compatibility with adjacent properties as well as a coordinated development on the three separate parcels.

The property was contiguous to several zoning districts, and the proposed development offered a sensible transition among the diverse surrounding uses and did not create spot zoning.

The project offered 48 townhouse units, or just under 5 units per acre. Under straight zoning in the MR district, 8 units per acre or up to 90 total units would be allowed. Based on suggestions at the December meeting, several changes to site circulation and parking had been implemented, providing an interior road that meandered slightly, and adding visitor parking to the site. Units were relocated so that no units were located north of the interior road in the northwest portion of the site, thus improving buffering to the north. With the help of the addition of the third parcel that allowed the development to consolidate the detention basin and move it to the south, the entry configuration was enhanced and modified, minimizing left turn conflicts. Pedestrian sidewalks had been provided on both sides of the interior road, providing a walkable community.

Proposed landscaping would comply with Township regulations. The existing conditions had been mapped and 398 regulated trees were identified; 43.7% of those would be preserved. Between 650-750 replacement trees were being provided, with additional monies paid into the tree fund for required replacement trees that would not fit on the site. The wetlands had been delineated and an avoidance strategy had been implemented.

Mr. Noles reviewed site plan data and calculations in terms of open space and required parking. 120 parking spaces were required; 216 effective parking spaces were provided. The effective open space was 308,514 square feet or 7.08 acres. The calculated open space was 89,391 square feet, or 2.05 acres. The Township required 25,000 square feet for this development.

A traffic study was done by Rowe Professional Services and reviewed by the Township; no significant change in level of service was anticipated.

Mr. Noles showed representative elevations of this development, which included a variety of design and architectural elements, including roof dormers, gables, mix of brick and stone, shutters, and attractive transitions between the units in terms of materials and design.

Chair Zawodny asked for Township Planner review.

Referring to her March 9, 2020 letter, Township Planner Frey gave the background and review for this proposal. The conditional rezoning request offered a cap on the project density of just under 5 units per acre, as described.

Conditional and traditional rezoning criteria were both evaluated:

Conditional rezoning:

1. The request was consistent with the intent of Article 43 (amendments to the zoning map).
2. The proposed conditions on density and open space were appropriate for the property and the scale of the development. The density would be tied to the proposed plan.
3. A limitation on the density would limit potential impacts on adjacent properties. The provision of additional open space at the entrance to the development provided a separation from Haggerty Road as well as a buffer to the adjacent homes to the north.
4. The conditional rezoning request, if approved, would ensure the property developed as "low density multiple family" as identified by the future land use map and ensure the development was consistent with the concept plan.
5. This was an infill development. If the three parcels were developed independently, there would be significant limitations for any kind of development. Therefore the conditional rezoning was the best option to ensure compatibility with adjacent properties as well as a coordinated development on the three separate parcels.

Rezoning criteria:

1. Due to the small parcel configurations and location on Haggerty Road, the future land use plan identified the redevelopment of the subject site and surrounding area to the south and west as low density multiple family residential. The subject parcel then served as a transition to the smaller lot single family residential development to the north.
2. Development of the parcel would require preservation of the wetlands for both the existing single family zoning and the proposed multiple family zoning designation.
3. Over time, as road and land use conditions had changed, the desirability and long term sustainability of homes fronting on Haggerty had decreased. Individually, each of the subject parcels would be difficult to retain or redevelop as single family. For those reasons the Township's future land use plan identified redevelopment as low density multiple family.
4. Without a conditional rezoning, the RM-1 zoning district permitted up to 8 dwelling units per acre. The condition to cap the number of units helped to address the compatibility on adjacent uses.
5. The development could be served by public utilities.
6. The provided traffic information indicated the proposed plan would create four additional vehicle trips during the morning peak hour, eight additional trips during the afternoon peak and 75 additional trips each weekday over the existing zoning. The application materials, including documentation from the applicant's and Township's traffic engineers, further indicated the proposed project would not likely be discernable to the operation of Haggerty Road.
7. Single family residential is the primary type of residential in the township. There was a need for different types of residential, particularly for young people and people looking to downsize from their single family homes and stay in the

Township. The future land use map designated the subject area as a location to meet the need for multiple family housing choices.

8. The proposed development would need to meet all applicable zoning ordinance requirements.
9. Multiple family zoning was the most appropriate zoning for the subject properties.

Concept plan comments:

The following comments should be incorporated into a revised concept plan, which would become an exhibit to the conditional zoning agreement.

1. Prior to site plan approval, the three existing parcels would need to be combined into one parcel via the land combination process.
2. For the density calculation, only 25% of wetland and detention areas can be used; it did not appear any area for wetlands or detention were excluded from the site's overall density calculation. The density calculation should be updated and potentially the density decreased in order to keep the project in the low density range.
3. The permissible deck area must be identified behind each unit.
4. The location(s) of non-buffer open space must be clarified to verify it can be counted as additional open space, beyond the minimum requirement.
5. The street name should be removed; this would be reviewed and approved during site plan review.
6. For the site plan submission, the size of the replacement trees could be increased to 3"-4", which would reduce the total number of tree replacement.
7. During site plan review there might be opportunities to preserve individual trees near the edge of the grading limits, such as the southeast corner of the site.

Township Planner Frey summarized other staff and consultant comments as follows:

March 20, 2020 OHM letter, Engineering Consultant George Tsakoff listed outstanding items that would need to be shown on the plans. OHM did feel this application met the Township engineering requirements for rezoning.

May 19, 2020 Fire Department review by Fire Marshal Thomas M. Hughes, who recommended approval based on the applicant's offer to provide sprinkler systems within the units for enhanced protection; this should be a condition of approval.

March 11, 2020 Progressive/ae letter, Traffic Engineer Peter LaMourie stated that when fully occupied, the proposed townhouses were expected to generate approximately 24 weekday morning peak hour trips, 31 afternoon peak hour trips, and approximately 322 daily trips (total inbound and outbound). In comparison, if the site were to be developed as currently allowed with up to 21 single-family homes, the projected total trips during the morning and afternoon peak hours and on a daily basis would be 20 trips, 23 trips, and 247 trips, respectively. the difference from a traffic standpoint between the existing and proposed rezoning would likely not be discernable on the adjacent street operations.

In response to a question from Chair Zawodny, Township Planner Frey said the applicants had addressed her final concept plan comments as listed during tonight's presentation. However, a formal submission showing those items would need to be made before presenting the application to the Board of Trustees.

Chair Zawodny opened the meeting to Commission discussion.

Commissioner Watson appreciated the applicant's response to Commission comments made at the December meeting, especially regarding layout, buffering of residential properties to the north, and changes to the road, and supported the request this evening.

Commissioner Shadko also liked the changes since the December meeting. He appreciated the preservation of some of the larger trees, and asked that care be taken during construction to protect the roots of surviving trees.

Commissioner McCarthy supported the project.

Commissioner Lark asked what the density had been when the concept plan was presented at the December meeting. Mr. Noles said that plan had presented fewer units with bigger footprints. Tonight's application did show an overall increased density, with an overall decreased footprint per unit. The current plan provided more open space and also provided an opportunity to address some of the other comments made by the Commission in December, including meandering the road. The units would be approximately 1800 square feet, starting in the low \$300,000's.

In response to questions from Commissioner Lark, Township Planner Frey gave the following information:

- One side of the road would be designated as a fire lane, and the other side would be available for on-street parking. The shared parking – which provided guest parking - was off-street and would not impact the fire lane.
- The buffers to the north, south and west were all 50 feet because of the abutting residential zoning classifications.
- Decks were permitted encroachments in the rear yard setbacks. The concrete walk behind the units was permitted as an open space improvement.

Commissioner Lark said he also supported the plan, which was not too dense and provided significant open area. He pointed out that a basketball court to the north appeared to be encroaching on this property.

Commissioner Guerriero also supported this project as the best solution for a difficult group of properties. In response to questions from Commissioner Guerriero, Township Planner Frey further explained how the traffic study determined additional trips compared to existing zoning.

Commissioner Guerriero asked if there were going to be any improvements on Haggerty Road at the entrance to this development. Mr. Noles said they were

anticipating adding acceleration/deceleration lanes at the entrance. That improvement would be in the right-of-way and would not impact the open space.

Commissioner Anderson pointed out that the applicants' corporate documents had lapsed on the licensing and regulatory affairs website; those should be brought up to date. The site plan should be labeled a concept plan so that there would be no confusion moving forward; a full site plan review would be required.

Commissioner Anderson also liked this proposal, and the fact that the applicant had been responsive to Commission and neighbor comments. She summarized the offered conditions as part of the conditional rezoning agreement, as stated in the letter from The Umlor Group (undated) included with the application materials, and as discussed this evening:

- The property would be rezoned from R-3 to RM-1, with the understanding that the RM-1 would be used for townhomes only, with a density of just under 5 units per acre, with no more than 48 units.
- Sidewalks would be constructed on both sides of the development's interior road.
- Open space would exceed the requirement, as shown on the concept plan.
- Landscaping would meet or exceed Township requirements with enhancements such as birdhouses and butterfly gardens.
- Sprinkler systems would be provided within the units for fire suppression.

Other issues included:

- As mentioned, the basketball court to the north did appear to be encroaching on the property; this should be cleared up.
- Parking in the front should be screened from Haggerty Road.
- Woodlands should be maintained and preserved in their natural state; this could be part of the condominium documents.

Commissioner Anderson agreed that this application met the criteria for conditional and regular rezoning, and she supported the project.

Mr. Noles reiterated that the math in the Umlor letter for the 4.2 units per acre was incorrect. Density would be just under 5 units per acre per Township calculation requirements. They would screen the parking, probably with replacement trees. They believed the appearance of the basketball court across the property line was an optical illusion caused by the Google aerial map, and would confirm this was the case.

Commissioner Anderson said it would be important to clearly state the conditions the applicant was offering when this application went to the Board of Trustees.

Commissioner Anderson asked if there was a gap in the Haggerty Road sidewalk. Township Planner said if there was a gap, they would reach out to the neighbors to see if that gap could be filled.

Chair Zawodny agreed that tonight's proposal reflected many of the comments offered by the Commission last December. He asked that the landscape plan clearly

show the buffer to the northern neighbors, especially in terms of the road as it undulated toward the north.

Chair Zawodny asked if planting was allowed in the sewer easement that paralleled the road toward the northwest corner of the property. Deputy Director of Public Services Belair said that smaller plantings were allowed within the easement, including small trees. Larger trees that had potential for growth were kept 5-10 feet away from the easement.

Chair Zawodny said that one or two fewer units would allow tree growth to develop, especially toward the front of the development where driveways were very close together and could become just strips of concrete. He would like more landscaping of height as cars drove the boulevard. He did appreciate the articulation between the units of this development. Materials and final landscape design would be addressed at site plan approval.

Chair Zawodny opened the public hearing at 8:05 pm.

Chair Zawodny read correspondence from:
Bill and Mary Ann Rojewski, 16170 Maplewood Court, opposed this development.

Bill and Kathy Phillips, 15655 Haggerty Road, owners of the third parcel of this proposed development, supported this proposal.

Rick Danes, 39821 Pinewood Court, Woodside Village Lot #3, utilized the Zoom chat function to ask: *"How far can the decks encroach into the setback? What are the drainage zones and topography to guarantee storm runoff does not move to the north of the development? What care will be taken to maintain the natural wooded area between the development and woodside village? Thank you Mr. Zawodny for commenting on the importance of preserving the natural buffer."*

Township Planner Frey explained that the decks could encroach up to 12 feet into the required 50-foot setback. Drainage would be analyzed in greater detail during site plan review. The Township required that drainage be maintained on site; Township engineers would verify that that requirement would be met. Drainage would also be verified during the construction review and site construction processes to ensure this development would not negatively impact abutting properties. Regarding maintenance of natural wooded areas between the development and Woodside Village, any area within the wetland buffer on the plans or areas that would not be graded would be preserved during construction with temporary fencing and demarcations to stay out of the areas. Any other areas would be allowed to be disturbed during construction but any regulated trees that were removed would be required to be replaced, and the landscape plan would re-establish vegetation in those areas.

Deputy Director of Public Services Belair said that Engineering review would include a soil erosion plan that was required by the County.

Representative: Paul Karmo
Property Owner: Kaepa, LLC
Location: 47450 5 Mile Road (Village at Northville)
Request: Change Approved Stone to a Different Stone Product
Action: Approve, Approve with Conditions, Postpone, Deny

Chair Zawodny explained that this request was for a material modification for the hotel at 47450 5 Mile Road, at the Village of Northville.

Township Planner Frey showed a photograph of the previously approved stone product and proposed new stone product on the Zoom screen. The proposed new material when installed would have the same variation, shadow lines, and depth as the approved stone.

When the hotel elevations were approved, there had been significant discussion about the materials and the amount and type of stone being used. The development team had returned to request the change as shown. The change was proposed for two reasons: the proposed stone was a structural product and the larger size modules were a better scale given the size of the hotel and the amount of stone used for the building.

During a site visit on May 15, when the proposed sample and the previously approved sample were viewed side by side, there was concern about the cool color, "dusk." "Steel grey" was suggested as a warmer alternative that would be more compatible with the overall building design, and samples of that color would be available on site tomorrow for review.

The applicants were seeking for approval to change the stone material at the base of the building, with the condition that the color would be chosen once the "steel grey" sample was on site for review.

Paul Karmo, 305 N. Eton Street, Birmingham, was present on behalf of this application. Scott Bowers, architect, was also present.

Mr. Karmo explained that when the hotel building was being planned under a PUD agreement, the neighboring 2-building retail development was also planned. The hotel was a large imposing structure within the greater development. Selecting the right material for this building was critical.

The hotel had an approved stone which was intended to complement the neighboring retail development. However, the retail development had changed their accent stone. Therefore, in 2019 conversations began regarding how to better blend and complement the hotel materials with the retail development, based on the retail development's change of material.

As already mentioned, a site visit was held on May 15. The site visit included Supervisor Nix, Township Planner Frey, Chair Zawodny, and Council Member/Commissioner Shadko. During that visit concerns were raised about the proposed color of the new

material, and based on Chair Zawodny's familiarity with this material, "steel grey" was suggested. Again, samples of the "steel gray" stone would be on site tomorrow.

The thought was if the depth variation could be preserved while offering the warmer "steel grey" color, "steel gray" might be a better choice, both for construction purposes and to match the feel of this commercial building. The 13-foot first floor of the 4-story building would have this material.

Scott Bowers, Bowers Associates, Ann Arbor MI, said he also felt the scale and color of the new proposed product improved the façade of the building. Additionally, the structural stone was an improvement over the previously approved applied stone product in terms of application.

Chair Zawodny commented that he was familiar with the Arriscraft product, a man-made limestone product that was as durable as limestone. He had provided links to Township Planner Frey showing some product images and applications.

Commissioner Lark asked if there was a price difference between the previously approved product and the proposed product. Mr. Karmo said the proposed product was a more expensive product to purchase, but was less expensive to install, because it was a structural product. Chair Zawodny agreed that the new material was not a lesser product than the previously approved stone product.

Commissioner Lark asked why the change was coming before the Commission now, in the "11th hour", instead of earlier. Mr. Karmo said that the change was first considered when the retail building was being constructed and the applicants noticed the different product on the façade of that building. Discussions began last November regarding this issue, and the Covid-19 pandemic had slowed everything down.

Commissioner Lark said that when the Commission studied commercial buildings last year, one of the most important conclusions was that the Township should get away from concrete block.

Mr. Karmo assured the Commission that the proposed product would not have a concrete block appearance.

Commissioner Shadko said that based on his observation on site the product did not look at all like concrete block. He preferred the new material over the originally approved material, and supported this request.

Township Planner Frey agreed that the proposed product would not look like concrete block, and that when installed she felt the proposed material would have many of the same qualities as the originally approved material.

In response to further comments from Commissioner Lark, Township Planner Frey said the elevations for this project were approved in 2018, and construction started summer 2019. The building had 3 different brick colors, and with the amount of stone and brick

Motion approved 7-0.

Department Reports:

Jennifer Frey, Township Planner

- The June ZBA meeting is cancelled as there were no applications.
- The June Planning Commission meeting was to be determined.
- Gave update regarding Planning activity during building closure due to Covid-19 pandemic.

Fred Shadko, Board of Trustees

- Summarized the May 21 Board of Trustees meeting. Language was finalized for the August election for a request for renewal and .5 MIL increase of police and fire public safety and shared services operating millage for August 2020 election (previously approved in 2014). For a \$400,000 home, the increase would be about \$100/year.
- Encouraged everyone to use absentee ballots for August and November elections.

Eric Lark, Board of Zoning Appeals

- Summarized the May 20 ZBA meeting. Four requests granted.

Bob Belair, Deputy Director of Public Services

- Gave a roads update, including Wayne County residential road repairs (5 locations). Work on Sheldon between 6 and 7 Mile Roads, and the 5/Haggerty intersection is planned for this year.
- Reported on Mill Ridge Phase II preconstruction meeting.

Extended Public Comments:

None.

Adjournment:

Motion by McCarthy, support by Guerriero, to adjourn the meeting at 9:07 pm.

Voice vote: Ayes: All.
 Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.