

**WHITE LAKE TOWNSHIP
PLANNING COMMISSION**
7525 Highland Road
White Lake, MI 48383
SEPTEMBER 6, 2018 @ 7:00 p.m.

Mr. Anderson called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. and led the Pledge of Allegiance. Roll was called: Mr. Ruggles and Ms. Dehart were absent.

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

Also Present: Sean O'Neil, AICP, Community Development Director
Aaron Potter, DPS Director
Greg Elliott, McKenna (White Lake Township Planning Consultant)
Leigh Merrill (Transportation Manager, Johnson & Anderson)
Mike Leuffgen (Johnson & Anderson, Engineer for White Lake Township)
Sherri Ward, Recording Secretary

Visitors: 39

Approval of Agenda

Mr. Meagher moved to approve the agenda as presented. Mr. Fine supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote. (7 yes votes)

Approval of Minutes

a. August 16, 2018

Mr. Fine moved to approve the minutes of August 16, 2018 as presented. Mr. Noble supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a voice vote. (7 yes votes)

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

Public Hearing:

- a. **File No. 18-018 Preserve at Hidden Lake**
Location: Located on the west side of Union Lake Road and south of Hutchins Road, currently zoned (R1-D) Single Family Residential and (RM-1) Attached Single Family Residential to (PD) Planned

Request Development, identified as parcel numbers 12-36-101-001 (vacant), 12-36-101-003 (vacant), and 12-36-101-004 (vacant), consisting of approximately 38.33 acres.

Applicant: **1) Rezone properties from (R1-D) Single Family Residential and (RM-1) Attached Single Family Residential to (PD) Planned Development.**
2) Preliminary Site Plan Approval
Preserve at Hidden Lake LLC
Mr. Craig Piasecki
8225 Cascade Ave Suite 110
Commerce, MI 48382

O'Neil explained that the process tonight is to oversee the reviewers. The information to be reviewed is in everyone's packet.

Mr. Noble asked to excuse himself from File No. 18-018.

Mr. Meagher moved to allow Mr. Noble to abstain from participation and voting for File No. 18-018. Mr. Fine supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a roll call vote: Anderson – yes; Carlock – yes; Fine – yes; Grubb – yes; Meagher – yes; Seward – yes. (6 yes votes)

Greg Elliott from McKenna (White Lake Township Planning Consultant) was in attendance to discuss his report.

Mr. Elliott noted that as currently zoned there could be 8 dwelling units per acre. The proposed plan with the change to the zoning with gross acreage will result in just over 3 dwelling units per acre, and net of open space and existing rights-of-way it appears to be 4.51 dwelling units per acre.

It should be noted that a substantial amount of vegetation will be lost with the development. Units 42 and 43 have 40 feet and 37 feet of frontage on the street, respectively. Mr. Elliott noted a few issues with open space. The open space on Union Lake road near units 4-6, doesn't feel like its meaningful open space and he feels that merits discussion.

Mr. Elliott also noted that the Community Impact Statement should be updated. The statement didn't start from current taxable value of land but from zero, and seems to assume 80 single family homes which is not the current proposal.

McKenna is comfortable with the project assuming issues laid out above (and in the report) have been addressed.

Mike Leuffgen (Johnson & Anderson, Engineer for White Lake Township). The setbacks for the proposed development of 25 feet in the front yard puts the homes very close to utilities and warrants discussion. There is some work proposed by wetlands that require MDEQ permits. The developer needs to realize there may be extra costs associated with the high pressure in the water main. The intent is a gravity sewer system connected to the existing sewer on Union Lake Road.

J&A generally recommends approval.

Leigh Merrill (Transportation Manager, Johnson & Anderson) reported on the Traffic Impact Study performed on 7-13-18 by Fleis & Vandenbrink. The areas were evaluated and they completed an anticipated traffic count with a growth rate of .5 % per year for 5 years. The report indicates the study area of Union Lake Road and Akehurst Lane and Union Lake Road and Hutchins road will not be significantly affected by the development. The RCOC will require a left turn passing flare. The proposed site plan proposes a right turn lane for southbound Union Lake Road traffic at the northernmost Union Lake Road site drive. They are in agreement with findings by Fleis & Vandenbrink.

Aaron Potter (White Lake Township Director, Dept. of Public Services) reviewed the plan for a number of items. Most of the issues he sees are hydrant spacing along Southern loop, he recommends one more

hydrant. The pressure issue along Union Lake Road is the highest pressure in the Township. He is working with the developer to bring those pressures down to a safe level for this development. For community benefit the developers have been asked to extend the water main into the adjacent neighborhood. There doesn't seem to be any issues with the sanitary sewer. If site conditions prove to be different, a change from a gravity fed system can be made. Some street trees may need to be moved, a minimum of three feet must be maintained from mains.

The White Lake Township Fire Department requirements for hydrant spacing appear to be met. The White Lake Township Assessing Department noted that the three lots will need to be combined. The White Lake Police Department noted that road improvements need to be made to allow traffic to move well and safely.

The developer, Craig Piasecki stated that they have made quite a few changes since last time. One of the big changes that was made was creating three larger park areas. Another change that was made was to propose a screen fence in an area close to the road. For community improvement they extended four hydrants into the area near Julia, Funston and two other streets. O'Neil pointed out that these added hydrants will help with fire safety. Water tankers have to be filled at hydrants at a different location which adds time.

Mr. Anderson asked Mr. O'Neil if he had the old plan to compare to the new plan, he would like to look at it for density purposes. Mr. O'Neil brought up the older plans from March for comparison.

Mr. Anderson opened up the public hearing at 7:57 and laid out the guidelines for the public hearing.

Devin Wertz, 9080 Gladys, asked when the traffic study was done, it was done in July. He feels that was flawed because school was out.

Peter Piccinato, 8771 Townsend Drive, has a question about density. How many more families will be there compared to current zoning? He feels no one has looked at how the traffic will start moving over to Williams Lake Road through Akehurst Lane to avoid Cooley and Union and that's going to get worse.

Matthew Fournier, 9001 Millward, stated that all of the traffic studies were done prior to development and wants to know if an additional traffic study will done once built. What kind of fence will be built near his property?

Jean-Philippe Loew, 247 Rosario, asked about the type of fencing. He suggested pedestrian passages into adjacent neighborhoods. He also suggested pedestrian crossings along Union Lake Road. He feels there is some window washing with the lake, he thinks it's a pond. Loew asked if all utilities will be buried, and sized for the future. Loew also asked if there is potential for houses to get flooded with the elevation. He feels the houses could be flipped so everyone could access the whole lake.

Dave Raymond, 908 Cedar Oaks Trail, asked what type of value they are putting on these homes.

Mrs. Bologa, 738 Golden Shores, also stated that the traffic study is flawed. The highest number of vacations taken at this time.

Mark Zahnow, 9062 Ashdown, is concerned with the traffic in that area. The other concern he has is traffic and population noise.

Penny Davis, 8800 Cove Court, asked about the emergency vehicle fence and wondered why this location was chosen as a private road. Is there a guarantee that this is only for emergencies?

Ron Baloga, 738 Golden Shores, asked how far down Union Lake Road did the study go? The study was done in the immediate area. A comment was made that the main issue lies with the RCOC, who hasn't done anything for this area in many, many years.

Mr. Anderson closed the public hearing at 8:14.

Piasecki answered some of the questions from the public. There was a second traffic study done. The first counts were taken April 24th. The extent of the traffic study is at Hutchins and Akehurst Lane. They aren't sure how to address cut through traffic. The fence will probably be a six foot wolmanized material. It will be placed at the natural grade of the ground. As many trees as possible will remain along the perimeter. They have not thought of pedestrian passages yet for adjoining neighborhoods. For DEQ definitions anything over 5 acres is considered a lake, and this is 6 acres. The location of the emergency gate was chosen because there was one way in. There can be a gate with a Knox key that allows Fire Department access. The existing zoning allows for 8 units per acre. The planned density is 4.5, which is less. The single family homes will start around \$ 300,000 with access to the lake around \$ 400,000.

O'Neil stated that the new standard for the fencing would be a vinyl fence for maintenance purposes. O'Neil pointed out that a sidewalk to the north will need to connect across to St. Patrick's, it can just be a pad across the street at a minimum. O'Neil stated that the developer may want to think about 100' of sidewalk to connect to the St. Patrick's parking lot.

Piasecki noted that there are 37 townhomes planned and the ground there is flat and treeless. There are no driveways along the front of all of those units, the garages are in the rear.

Mr. Seward stated that it still seems a little tight, and would it be possible to take a few units out. The southern portion looks great, but the northern parts looks too compacted. Piasecki stated that they are trying to meet a price point in the Township with the townhouses. Mr. Seward would like to see the opening of sidewalks to the adjacent neighborhoods for walking, Mr. O'Neil suggested installing a 10 foot sidewalk while the hydrants are being installed in the area. Mr. Anderson agrees, it would be a nice aesthetic appeal.

Ms. Carlock wanted to question the setbacks from the 100 year storm line and she's concerned about the proximately to the pond. She is hoping there is a more natural buffer around the lake. Piasecki noted that there will be a natural wetland buffer around the lake. She asked about the sideyard setbacks and they will be 10' off the side yards. The minimum standard for lot width Mr. O'Neil felt they could support was 70'. It is negotiable, but then can become a safety issue. Mr. O'Neil has concerns about the water quality and wetlands infringements that needs to be addressed. Wetland markers should be used to delineate those wetlands. Ms. Carlock stated that we are trying to improve pedestrian connectivity.

Mr. Fine had concerns about the traffic study. Police are called regularly out to Trenton for people cutting through the neighborhood. Mr. Fine also reported that there is always a large backup with student drop off at St. Patrick's.

Mr. Anderson wanted to state that there was an email sent by Pauline Wentworth-Smith. Wentworth-Smith was in attendance in the meeting and read from her email. Ms. Smith is on Cooley Beach Drive and read her email aloud. She apologized about being emotional about the property. She is in agreement about the mixed use but noted she had been to Ann Arbor and toured a Green home and wondered why the Township can't take into consideration building green homes like Ann Arbor does.

Mr. Meagher asked about the rear yard setback and wetland buffer. White Lake Township wants the wetlands to be protected and off limits. The wetland buffer area is a protected area. Mr. Meagher also noted that planned neighborhoods require pathways and parks. Public parks within the development could be part of this discussion. Residents could be able to walk paths, etc.

Ms. Dehart was disappointed at first in the plans. She thought the townhomes were too dense at first, but that has changed. She would like to see pedestrian connections to adjacent neighborhoods.

Mr. Anderson wanted to say thank you to the developers for coming back with the changes. They took good notes and he feels this could enhance the curb appeal and provide three different price points.

The developers have been in contact with RCOC for many months to get their opinion on the traffic impact, they're very busy and it takes a long time for them to get back with anyone.

Mr. Anderson noted that a lot of these communications can be added to the site plan as they are developed and invited the public to feel free to come to future meetings.

Mr. O'Neil noted that these recommendations go to the Township Board for approval at their next meeting. Mr. O'Neil stated that anyone is welcome to contact him at any time for additional questions or discussion.

Mr. Meagher moved to recommend approval of File No. 18-018 Preserve at Hidden Lake to rezone properties from (R1-D) Single Family Residential and (RM-1) Attached Single Family Residential to (PD) Planned Development to the Township Board of Trustees subject to the comments and input made by our independent engineering, traffic and planning consultants. Mr. Fine supported and the motion carried with a roll call vote: Anderson – yes; Carlock – yes; Fine – yes; Grubb – yes; Meagher – yes; Seward – yes. (6 yes votes)

There was some discussion about the number of townhomes being reduced. Piasecki would not like to reduce the number.

Mr. Meagher moved to recommend approval of the Preliminary Site Plan for File No. 18-018 Preserve at Hidden Lake to the Township Board of Trustees subject to the comments and input made by our independent engineering, traffic and planning consultants and the developers consideration for reduction of density in the Townhouses portion up to four units. Mr. Seward supported and the motion carried with a roll call vote: Anderson – no; Carlock – yes; Fine – yes; Grubb – yes; Meagher – yes; Seward – yes. (6 yes votes)

b. Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) 2019-2024

Mr. O'Neil read the updates to the plan. It's a 6 year plan that's updated every year. Each department contributes to this plan. Any townships who have municipal water and sewer are required to have this plan. This is not a budget, but a wish list for projects. This has been publicized in the paper and on the website. Mr. O'Neil reported that Jason Iaconangeli deserves a lot of credit for the updates and saves the township a lot of money by not having to outsource any updates to this document.

Mr. Anderson opened the public hearing on the **Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) 2019-2024** at 9:22 p.m. There wasn't anyone in attendance from the public who wanted to comment on the plan. The public hearing was closed at 9:23 p.m.

Mr. Fine moved to approve the Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) 2019-2024 to the Township Board of Trustees. Ms. Carlock supported and the motion carried with a roll call vote: Anderson – yes; Carlock – yes; Fine – yes; Grubb – yes; Meagher – yes; Seward – yes; Noble - yes. (7 yes votes)

New Business:

No new business.

Liaison's Report:

Mr. Ruggles was not present to give a report.

Ms. Grubb reported that the Parks and Recreation Board will meet next Wednesday evening to discuss the millage proposal at 6:30.

Mr. O'Neil reported that there was a second reading for the Mohave restaurant.

There was no ZBA report.

Director's Report:

Mr. O'Neil reported that Four Corners is moving ahead, with some issues with the DEQ. The Animal Care Ordinance will be modified to clarify some items within the ordinance. The RV Ordinance will be

amended and on the agenda at the September 20, 2018 meeting. The Ravines project may be coming down the pike for discussion.

Communications:

Next meeting dates:

- Regular Meeting – September 20, 2018
- Regular Meeting – October 4, 2018

Adjournment

Mr. Meagher moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:36 p.m. Mr. Fine supported and the MOTION CARRIED with a unanimous voice vote. (7 yes votes)