

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58

**WHITE LAKE TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION**
Regular Meeting
7525 Highland Road
White Lake, MI 48383
March 7, 2019 @ 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Fine called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll was called: Ms. Carlock, Ms. Dehart and Mr. Meagher were excused.

ROLL CALL: Steve Anderson
Merrie Carlock – Vice Chairperson - Excused
Debby Dehart - Excused
Mark Fine - Chairperson
Rhonda Grubb – Secretary
Anthony Noble
Peter Meagher - Excused
Scott Ruggles – Board Liaison
Joe Seward

Also Present: Sean O’Neil, AICP, Community Development Director
Mike Leuffgen, J&A, Township Engineer
Greg Elliott, McKenna, Township Consultant
Lynn Hinton, Recording Secretary

Visitors: 9

Approval of Agenda

Mr. Ruggles moved to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Anderson supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote. (6 yes votes)

Approval of Minutes

a. February 21, 2019

Mr. Seward moved to approve the minutes of February 21, 2019 as submitted. Ms. Grubb supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote. (6 yes votes)

Call to the Public (for items not on the agenda)

Mr. Fine opened the discussion for public comment on items not listed on the agenda, but none was offered.

Old Business:

Trailside Meadow
Location: Located on the south side of Elizabeth Lake Road, consisting of

59 approximately 73 acres. Identified as parcel numbers 12-25-251-001 and
60 12-25-201-004
61 Request: 1) Preliminary Site Plan Approval
62 Applicant: M/I Homes of Michigan, LLC
63 1668 S. Telegraph, Suite 200
64 Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302
65

66 Mr. O'Neil indicated that the commission is considering preliminary site plan approval tonight that was
67 tabled at the public hearing.
68

69 Mr. Elliott of McKenna reviewed his report. He stated there were issues at the last meeting with density.
70 The applicant has lowered the number of proposed units to 184, which would be achievable with the
71 parallel plan of R1-D designation. They also did things with the layout to achieve a less dense impact to
72 some of the neighboring uses. Proposed now is 91 active adult units and 93 single-family units. They
73 moved the storm sewer away from the east property line and grading is now consistent in terms of
74 vegetation that might be there. There will still be substantially steep slopes on the north corner and
75 around the detention pond, but this was previously discussed. Overall, the applicant has a nominal
76 density of 2.5 units per acre, 3.2 per acre excluding the detention pond. The commission needs to decide
77 if it's comfortable with new density.
78

79 The applicant is showing a sidewalk along the road now, across the two parcels for which they have
80 frontage. McKenna has suggested a loop through the other easterly parcel. The commission's previous
81 discussion was to forego the loop if they could do something meaningful to the east.
82

83 Provisions were made to the impact statement. They now project 475 additional population based on the
84 new density. They revised the approach to calculating revenues to expenses. Township revenue is
85 \$254,000. Mr. Elliott is recommending approval of the preliminary site plan, subject to the commission
86 being comfortable with the density.
87

88 Mr. Anderson stated that he doesn't have a problem with this, but he questioned what the concern is with
89 the 3.2 acres density. Mr. Elliott indicated that he just wants them to understand what is involved with this
90 plan. It's 2.5 acres, but effectively it's 3.2. This is reasonable consistent with the language in the Master
91 Plan.
92

93 Mr. Fine asked how close the units would be to one another. The applicant, Brad Bothom, responded
94 there would be a 20 ft. separation.
95

96 Mr. O'Neil noted that the applicant removed 7 units per the commission's direction at the last meeting and
97 4 units were moved, which is also what the commission asked them to do. They reduced the number of
98 units, but they are also proposing clustering 3 units and leaving open space on either side by shifting
99 units up. He personally doesn't think this looks very good. He would rather see them flop a house and
100 leave the corner of the property open. There was also previous discussion on putting a pathway through
101 the woods to the adjoining subdivision.
102

103 Mr. Leuffgen of J&A reviewed his report. He indicated that the majority of his items have been
104 addressed. With regards to item #5 Grading & Paving as it pertains to sidewalks, he asked if it meets the
105 commission's intent since there is no connectivity. Items regarding storm water may need clarification as
106 it pertains to detention basins and the steepness of the slopes on the basin. He added that they are not
107 showing any fencing around the basin right now. J&A asked for information regarding the emergency
108 overflow drainage path for detention water should that ever occur. They need to protect the 4 properties
109 to the north of the detention basin. He feels these comments can be addressed on the final site plan and
110 he is recommending approval this evening of the preliminary site plan.
111

112 Mr. Seward asked if there is still a concern with the detention pond. Mr. Elliott stated that it's a
113 maintainable slope, but it can't be used for recreation purposes.
114

115 Mr. O'Neil noted that there was previous talk about a 20 ft. landscape buffer and the confusion is they are
116 not building within 50 ft. of some units, but the final landscaping will be done later in the process. They
117 would still maintaining 50 ft. behind buildings. The vegetation will be concentrated within the 50 ft. buffer,

118 which they are proposing trees and shrubs. They will put more significant buffering beyond this and in
119 many areas, there will be heavier vegetation planted to buffer from existing homeowners.
120

121 Brad Botham of M/I discussed plan changes made at the advisement of the board and community
122 members. He also showed a graphic layout and agreed with Mr. O'Neil that the clustering of units in two
123 areas give a better aesthetic.
124

125 Since the last meeting, they removed 7 units per the contention of the board, and they've committed to
126 \$10,000 to the SEV. They understand it is their responsibility and their share to the roads. They will work
127 with the staff to come up with some sort of estimate to install sidewalks across the frontage on the south
128 side of Elizabeth Lake Road. He noted that currently there is not sufficient right-of-way, but they can
129 install sidewalks along the entire frontage in the future.
130

131 The yellow areas on the graphic will be completely undisturbed. They will augment with landscaping as
132 needed. They will not clear the vegetation, they will supplement. This allows the ability for lot size and
133 site design. They will protect neighbors and maintain the integrity of the site itself. They are doing 3
134 fitness courts on the site and he showed six different elevations they are proposing.
135

136 Mr. O'Neil said when there is a project that will preserve woodlands, they will go out and stake areas with
137 J&A so it's not cleared. One question that arose at the last meeting is that the neighbors have asked
138 about the water main connection at the south corner. Mr. Bothom stated that it has since been moved to
139 the center of the property. He added that there will not be any grading within 30 ft. of a resident's
140 property.
141

142 Ms. Grubb questioned how it is that Allen Lake won't get more water. Mr. Bothom stated that per state
143 regulations, when they develop a property they have to maintain water on the site and discharge it to a
144 detention basin at a rate the same or less than what it is now. It's likely they will improve the drainage.
145 Water is held and released at a slower rate over 24 hours. Mr. Elliott added that the volume decreases
146 but rate stays the same.
147

148 Mr. Fine accepted comments from the public:
149

150 Dave Hockstein, 402 Dakota Lane, stated he was representing his mom and aunt, who live in the condos
151 abutting the proposed development. He feels this has been a useful meeting for them, as there were
152 concerns regarding the perimeter. He thanked the commission for working with developer to ensure the
153 natural boundary will be staked out and marked. Knowing that the developer is taking time to have
154 concern for the residents means a lot and also that the township will ensure oversight with staking. He
155 just wanted to say thank you, it means a lot to them.
156

157 Ken Taylor, 363 Melinda Circle East, asked for clarification in the grey area border on the graphic. Mr.
158 Bothom stated that area would be graded and landscaped. He asked if they could move a unit and the
159 proposed road. He would like as much buffer as possible. Currently it looks like he is getting a small
160 buffer. Mr. Bothom stated there has been a lot of discussion about a buffer. He noted that The Bluffs
161 went right to the property line in most areas and they did not replace the landscaping. Mr. O'Neil
162 indicated that this developer is proposing above and beyond what other developers have done. There
163 will be 20 ft. untouched buffer. Mr. Noble added that he feels the developer has done a great job and
164 offered a suggestion to Mr. Taylor that he could always plant additional trees on his property to add
165 additional buffer. He personally has done this on his lot.
166

167 Mr. Anderson feels that what the developer has done to protect the residents around is commendable
168 and more than other developments have done. He apologized for the residents at the public hearing. Mr.
169 Fine added that this developer has taken a lot of care to ensure the community is taken care of and this
170 board does make an effort to address concerns from the residents also.
171

172 Aaron Potter of the Water Department reviewed his report. He stated that the developer has addressed
173 most of his comments. Fire hydrant spacing is an issue that he will work with them to move to final site
174 plan. The sanitary extension is required across the frontage and the site currently has a flagpole section
175 that protrudes out. Additionally, there are neighbors asking to extend to this sanitary connection. The
176 200 ft. rule may come into play. If they have a failure, they will have to connect. The developer has

177 stated a concern that there is no right-of-way dedicated and properties extend into the road. In this case,
178 easements would be required, and he is ok with multiple easements. There will be a lift station and
179 forced main on the west side of their approach to the next available manhole. It seems like the flagpole
180 may be more trouble than its worth.

181
182 **Ms. Grubb moved to recommend to Township Board approval of the Preliminary Site Plan as**
183 **revised for Trailside Meadows, including all the benefits being offered, with Cluster Option B**
184 **being selected as an alternative layout proposed tonight. They will temporarily barricade off the**
185 **road so only construction traffic would come off Elizabeth Lake Road, and not come off Colony**
186 **Heights. Mr. Noble supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a roll call vote: Seward – yes;**
187 **Noble – yes; Fine – yes; Anderson – yes; Grubb – yes; Ruggles – yes. (6 yes votes)**
188

189 **New Business:**

190
191 **Centerpointe Plaza**

192 Location: Located on the north side of Highland Road, between Dolane and Tranquility
193 Drive, consisting of approximately 1.27 acres. Currently zoned (LB) Local
194 Business. Identified as parcel numbers 12-21-276-020 and 12-21-276-002

195 Request: 1) Preliminary Site Plan Approval

196 Applicant: RSI Holdings
197 Rob Pope
198 75 Jesswood Lane
199 White Lake, MI 48386
200

201 Mr. Elliott reviewed his report and noted that this is their second review. The proposal is to construct
202 a 11,400 sq. ft. commercial building. This time around they added two additional sheets, showing
203 landscaping and photometrics. The site is surrounded by property on north (single-family), east (LB),
204 south (AG) and west (single-family). They are proposing a one-story multi-tenant building. They
205 provided elevations in the packet and the outside of the building will be vertical metal siding with half
206 high masonry.

207
208 Off street parking is required to be 20 ft. off right-of-way, based on where they show the front setback,
209 he concludes it is not set back 20 ft. There are alternative approaches available. Spaces are
210 properly dimensioned.

211
212 The parking calculations showed are not consistent with zoning ordinance. They are showing 47
213 spaces and 11 land banks, or 58 spaces. Office retail is 1 space per 200 ft. The plan is compliant if
214 you accept land banking of some of the parking. Zoning requires an 8 ft. wide public sidewalk which
215 the applicant proposes, and it's connected to 5 ft. sidewalks around the building. Landscaping buffer
216 along parking does not appear to be sufficient width. The applicant does show plantings which is
217 required, but the width is not sufficient. There is also no screen wall on the plans as proposed.

218
219 The applicant met the interior landscaping requirement and the parking lot landscape requirement.
220 The site abuts land technically zoned residential. In that case, the ordinance requires a buffer strip or
221 obscuring fence or screen wall. Nothing is proposed, but there is substantial landscaping along north
222 line, without a berm. Photometric plans appear to comply with ordinance.

223
224 The applicant has conceptual wall signs shown and those specifics would be reviewed at time of
225 permitting. They show a trash enclosure on the plan at the northwest corner of the site. McKenna
226 has found the preliminary site plan could be approved, but you would also be approving the parking
227 layout with the preliminary.

228
229 Mr. O'Neil stated that Auto Zone has a flair to the west towards Mr. Pope's site. There is an easement
230 on file obligating them to allow easement on their site. Mr. Pope will also sign that. They will have
231 cross access to each other's parking lots. He talked with Mr. Pope and his only concern with his
232 layout is that the driveway comes into the site and curves west. The neighbor next to him has AG
233 property and there is a question on whether that site will be developed as residential. There is also
234 wetland property. They will work with the neighbor to put a driveway in and try to center it so half on
235 Mr. Pope's property and half on the other. This frees up property and MDOT likes to see shared

236 driveways. There is a lot of wetland that sometimes is a stream. This can be tweaked in the final.
237 This project is clean, and he does not want to hold back from going to the board. Mr. Pope will either
238 put in the driveway in shared fashion, or the neighbor will come back in the future asking for shared
239 access and create problems for Mr. Pope.
240

241 Mr. Leuffgen reviewed his report dated February 28, 2019. The plan meets engineering feasibility,
242 and approval should be contingent upon the drive location. The site layout would be affected if they
243 can't put it there. Most other comments have been addressed as this was their second review.
244 Storm management storage devices can be accessed and maintained. MDOT will need to permit
245 storm water discharge.
246

247 Aaron Potter reviewed his report. Most comments have been addressed. The applicant has added
248 detail on a 2" water service, possible horizontal water issue, but this can be addressed on final. On
249 another note, Manhole 1 may not be necessary. Regarding the REU calculations it appears the
250 engineer removed bathroom spaces from units. This is not going to be something we can use and
251 recalculate. He recommends this be approved. The outstanding balance is being worked on.
252

253 Mr. Pope appreciates everyone's time. He feels this is moving along great. They took possession of
254 the property this week. Mr. O'Neil stated that it's been a pleasure working with Mr. Pope.
255

256 **Mr. Noble moved to recommend to the Township Board approval of the Preliminary Site Plan**
257 **for Centerpoint Plaza, subject to review comments offered by staff and consultants. Mr.**
258 **Seward supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a roll call vote: Seward – yes; Noble – yes;**
259 **Fine – yes; Anderson – yes; Grubb – yes; Ruggles – yes. (6 yes votes)**
260

261 **Liaison's Report:**
262

263 Mr. Ruggles reported that the Township Board has not had a meeting since the last Planning Commission
264 meeting. He did note that the Fire Chief is retiring, and the Board will appoint a temporary Chief for 90
265 days. This will go out to Civil Service for recommendation to bring to the Board.
266

267 Ms. Grubb reported Parks and Rec has not met in the past two weeks but will meet again next week. The
268 Township will seek funding for the "Triangle Pathway Project", at which half is in already.
269 Ms. Dehart was not present to give a report.
270

271 **Consultant's Report:**
272

273 None
274

275 **Director's Report:**
276

277 Mr. O'Neil reported there would not be a meeting on March 21.
278

279 **Communications:**
280

281 **Next meeting dates:**

- 282 • March 21, 2019 (cancelled)
 - 283 • April 4, 2019
- 284

285 **Adjournment**
286

287 **Mr. Anderson moved to adjourn the meeting at 8:45 p.m. Ms. Grubb supported and the MOTION**
288 **CARRIED with a voice vote. (6 yes votes)**