

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF LYON  
ERWIN PROPERTY SUB-COMMITTEE  
MEETING MINUTES  
April 9, 2003**

Approved as corrected July 28, 2003.

DATE: April 9, 2003  
TIME: 7:00 PM  
PLACE: 58000 Grand River

Call to Order: Chris Doozan, Planner, called the meeting to order at 7:02 pm.

Roll Call: Present: Mike Barber  
Laura James  
Ted Soper

Chris Doozan, Planner  
Megan Masson-Minock, Planner  
Tracey Balint, Township Engineer  
Chris Olson, Township Superintendent

Present Representing

Erwin Property: Bill Erwin

Larry Wilkinson, Beztak Company  
Kamran Qadeer, Beztak Company  
Bob Leighton, Robert Leighton & Associates  
Paul Slavin, Traffic Engineer

Guests: 39

Mr. Doozan reviewed the agenda for this meeting. He explained that this is the third meeting in the process. The purpose of the meeting this evening, based on all the input the applicant has received thus far, they have prepared a number of alternatives to show.

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

- February 25, 2003
- March 19, 2003

Ms. James made a motion to approve the minutes of the February 25, 2003 and the March 19, 2003 Erwin Sub-Committee Meeting Minutes as submitted. Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All  
Nays: None

Motion approved.

**2. PRESENTATION OF ALTERNATIVES:**

- a. Parallel Plan without Sewer
- b. Parallel Plan with Sewer
- c. State Open Space Plan
- d. Conceptual Alternative #1
- e. Conceptual Alternative #2
- f. Conceptual Alternative #3
- g. Conceptual Alternative #4

**(For each alternative, the uses, traffic impacts, utility impacts and benefits to the**

## **Township will be discussed.)**

Larry Wilkinson, Beztak Company, introduced the members of his team that were present.

Bob Leighton gave a brief overview of what they covered at the past two meetings for the residents who were not able to attend those meetings. He stated that he would briefly go through the various alternatives and then have discussion.

Mr. Leighton displayed and briefly explained the following alternatives:

- a. Parallel Plan without sewer
  - 184 units
  - Based on one acre lots
  - No road improvements
  - No open space
- b. Parallel Plan with sewer
  - 35,000 square foot lots
  - 230 lots allowed (There was discussion and it was determined that this figure was too high and that only 198 units would be allowed.)
- c. Michigan Open Space Plan Preservation Regulations
  - Reduced lot size
  - 50% of site open space
  - All homes would be built on 50% of the property
- d. Conceptual Alternative #1
  - 629 units (173% bonus)
  - Mixed use development
  - Attempts to resolve some of the road problems
- e. Conceptual Alternative #2
  - 742 units (223% bonus)
  - Partial solution to road improvements
  - Park or open space through middle of development
- f. Conceptual Alternative #3
  - 711 units
  - Variation of road work
  - Mixed use development
  - Commercial use included
  - Very similar to Alternative #2
- g. Conceptual Alternative #4
  - 464 Units (100% bonus)
  - Mixed use development
  - Commercial use included

A resident expressed concern with the water run off. Mr. Leighton stated that they cannot put any more water than what already goes there onto other properties. They must contain the water on site and it must be released at an agricultural rate. He noted that they have not gotten to the stage in the process yet of determining how to manage site drainage.

Mr. Leighton reviewed the benefit charts for each alternative. He stated that they need money in order to do improvements. They need to make a profit in order to do the things they would like to do.

Paul Slavin, Traffic Engineer, gave a brief presentation with regard to the traffic impact of this proposed development. He noted that they did a preliminary traffic count and discussed the numbers they came up with for the peak and non-peak hours of the day.

Mr. Soper stated that Alternative #4 indicated that there would be 245 AM trips and 316 PM trips. He noted that this alternative indicates that there would be 454 units. He stated that every home should have at least one working resident, if not two. He questioned how they could only have half the amount of trips than residents. Mr. Slavin responded that the figures are taken out of a trip generation book. Some homes may be retirees who don't go out during peak hours and some homes may have people who work different shifts and don't go out during peak hours. He stated that they still look at the peak hours because this is a great concern.

A resident questioned if a study was done on Pontiac Trail going west. Mr. Slavin responding that he was not able to do this with the time constraints he had. The resident felt that this should be done. Mr. Slavin stated that when a plan is decided on, there will be further studies done. What they have done for tonight's meeting is just an overview of traffic.

### **3. PUBLIC INPUT:**

Residents expressed concerns about the following issues:

- Traffic
- Impact on Schools
- Density
- Drainage Issues
- Commercial Units
- Road Conditions and Improvements

Mr. Soper discussed the sewer situation. He stated that in order to improve the roads, the developer needs an increase in density. He stated that doing the calculations, he is not sure how they are going to handle any increase. He stated that he needs to be convinced on how they are going to handle the capacity.

Mr. Wilkinson stated that he did not feel that it is an equitable way to allocate sewer capacity by holding capacity for someone who will not be developing their land for many years to come.

Mr. Qadeer stated that to reserve capacity for something that is going to happen, maybe ten years from now, is not equitable.

There was further discussion with regard to the sewer capacity. Ms. Balint noted that they will be meeting with the Planning Commission and McKenna Associates, Inc. to discuss the options available for the sewers on April 28, 2003.

Ms. Masson-Minock stated that the next step is for the developer to bring a preferred alternative before the full Planning Commission. She stated that they need to come to some kind of consensus from the Sub-committee in terms of direction.

Ms. James stated that there is still a lot of information that has not been addressed yet, i.e., schools, sewer, etc. She stated that she does not have enough information to support these plans. She stated that they don't have the information they need to make an educated and informed decision in support of a plan. She further discussed the information that she needs in order to make a decision.

Ms. James discussed the commercial development as it relates to the Master Plan and the Township Ordinances. She quoted several sections of the Master Plan.

Mr. Barber stated that this is the entry into the Township and wants it to look good. He stated that he does not feel that a grocery store belongs there, as the first thing you would see entering the Township.

Richard Erwin discussed the commercial planned for Grand River Avenue. He felt that it would never be filled. He stated that there would probably be faster action on the rezoned commercial on Milford Road, if the Township wasn't charging exorbitant prices for sewer taps. There are a lot of people who have pulled out for this reason. He stated that personally, he has no problem with

this commercial. He felt that they had to be a little more open minded.

Mr. Soper stated that he never said that he wasn't open for talking about increased density. He stated that he is not in favor of 500 homes, it is too much. With regard to commercial, his concern is if they build a big beautiful building and the company goes under, then it is left vacant.

Mr. Barber stated that if they change the Master Plan for every developer who comes in, then it would not be defensible in a court of law. He stated that he would like to see them stay with the Master Plan.

Ms. James stated that they have spent the past several months going over the Master Plan. She noted that no one has indicated that they should re-visit where commercial is located.

#### **4. ADJUSTMENTS TO THE PROCESS:**

There was discussion as to whether or not this is ready for the whole Planning Commission on April 30, 2003. It was determined that they would have another Sub-committee meeting rather than to before the whole Planning Commission on April 30th.

#### **5. FUTURE MEETINGS:**

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, April 30, 2003 at 7:00 PM.

#### **6. ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting adjourned at 9:25 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Deby Cothery

Deby Cothery  
Recording Secretary