CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF LYON
PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES
May 27, 2003

Approved as submitted June 23, 2003.

DATE: May 27, 2003
TIME: 6:00 PM
PLACE: 58000 Grand River

Call to Order: Chairman Hemker called the meeting to order at 6:15 pm.

Roll Call: Present: Brent Hemker, Chairman
Michael Barber, Vice Chair
Laura James, Secretary
Ray Bisio, Trustee
Laura Williams

Absent: Richard Crook
Ted Soper

Also Present: Dave Gillam, Assistant Township Attorney
Chris Doozan, Township Planner
Megan Masson-Minock, Planner
Matt Wetli, Township Planner
Chris Olson, Township Superintendent

Guests: 63

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mr. Barber made a motion to approve the agenda as written. Ms. Williams supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
Nays: None
Absent: Crook, Soper

Motion approved unanimously.

2. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA: NONE

3. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS: NONE

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS: NONE

5. OLD BUSINESS: NONE

6. NEW BUSINESS:

<u>Master Plan Discussion (as time permits):</u>

a. Erwin Orchard Sub-Committee

Mr. Doozan gave an overview of where they are at with the sub-committee meetings. He briefly reviewed the comments that were given by the sub-committee to the developer. He stated that the sub-committee really did not reach a consensus on the plan and decided that the plan should be brought before the full Planning Commission to study, review and give

comment.

Larry Wilkinson, Beztak Company, introduced the following Consultants that were present this evening:

- Bob Leighton	Robert Leighton & Associates
- Paul Slavin	Reid, Cook & Michelski
- Kamran Qadeer	Beztak Company

Mr. Wilkinson stated that he believed that the five study sessions that they had with the sub-committee has helped develop the plan, which he feels is an excellent plan. He stated that this plan generates substantial benefits.

Bob Leighton gave an overview of the process they have gone through and the plans for the Commissioners.

Mr. Hemker stated that he was under the impression that this item was just going to be a report from the sub-committee and not a presentation. He stated that based on what was indicated on the agenda tonight, he is not prepared to ask questions or have a full blown discussion.

Mr. Qadeer briefly went over the benefits this development would bring.

There was discussion with regard to the path of the sewer. It was noted that by extending the sewer it will help with any threat of annexation to the City.

Mr. Hemker stated that he would like to hear from the sub-committee members now. It was noted that Mr. Soper, who was absent, was undecided.

Mr. Barber stated that the road is very important. He stated that they have to do something with the roads since they are putting in more homes and acquiring more traffic. He felt that this would be the time to do this with the developer's help. He stated that he is not happy with the amount of commercial. He felt that they don't need 100,000 square feet of commercial at this location. He also stated that he does not like the density that is being proposed.

Ms. James stated that the sub-committee had five meetings all together, three of which were public meetings. She stated that there was a lot of public input of which there was strong opposition to the plan, both the initial plan and the one that is here tonight. She stated that the developer keeps citing traffic problems, but the residents were not all that concerned with the traffic problems. She stated that the list of proposed benefits received in the packets is a very controversial list. She stated that virtually all of these items will happen even if it is developed as one acre lots. She questioned the accuracy of the list.

Ms. James felt that the request for a 230% density bonus is massive. She stated that in her mind it is unjustified as is the commercial use that is proposed. She stated that the commercial use goes against the Master Plan. She briefly discussed her thoughts with regard to the condominiums. She noted that they are not affordable condominiums.

Ms. James stated that with regard to the road re-routing, it is a great idea. She disagrees with the developer when they say that it has to be done now. She felt that this could be done at a later time.

Ms. James stated that the bottom line is that the public and the sub-committee raised a lot of concerns about the plans, i.e., traffic, school capacity, density, image. She stated that in her opinion the developer showed very little willingness to compromise. The final plan that was seen tonight is virtually identical to the very first plan that they saw at the sub-committee. She stated that after five meetings, they only knocked off 30 houses.

Ms. James stated that Mr. Wilkinson stated that if they develop this property at one acre, they may not be able to clean up the arsenic. She stated that they had four meetings with the developer before the word "arsenic" was ever brought up. She stated that the developer knew when they optioned the property that the arsenic was there. If they didn't, then they should have. She

further discussed the arsenic issue.

Ms. James stated that this is a strongly rural area. The orchard is a defining characteristic of this strongly rural community. This plan calls for a giant strip mall, 200 condominiums and 150 houses on tiny lots, which translates into suburbia. She stated that it completely and totally eliminates any semblance of the Township's rural character and it does so at the an entrance to the Township. She felt that this should not be approved.

Mr. Hemker stated that this is really just a sub-committee report to the full Planning Commission. He stated that they will not be taking public comments tonight. He stated that he did have a request from one of the Commissioners to ask for a show of hands of those who are in favor of this, opposed to this or those who are neutral.

Mr. Wilkinson stated that if these were one acre lots, it was mentioned that most of the benefits would have to be incurred. He noted that there would be no sewers with one acre lots. There would be no road improvements. He stated that the condominiums would be priced at $200,000 and not $300,000 as noted by Ms. James. He stated that in terms of the arsenic, this was indicated on the very first benefits list that was provided. He stated that they have gone from 546 lots to 360 lots since the first study session.

Mr. Bisio questioned what the 360 lots represent as far as density bonus. Mr. Doozan responded that it would be 69%.

Mr. Wilkinson stated that with regard to the comment of doing the road improvements at a later date through the wetlands, he would say that the likelihood of this would be near zero.

Mr. Bisio stated that at a 70% density bonus was proposed and he would never vote for this.

Mr. Hemker asked for a show of hands for the following:

- in favor of this as it stands in the conceptual plan	there were a few hands
- neutral or undecided	there were a few hands
- against this plan	a lot of hands were raised

Mr. Barber stated that he believed that the density is going to have to be decreased. Ms. James stated that the developer is going to have to get a copy of the Master Plan.

Mr. Doozan stated that they have to give the developer some direction as to where they go from here. He questioned if the Commissioners felt that the sub-committee's work completed at this point. Mr. Hemker stated that he would like to see them do further work and for them all to get on the same page. Ms. James stated that she believed that the only way this could happen is if the Planning Commission expressed their comments with regard to the density and whether or not the commercial is going to be there.

Mr. Bisio stated that he feels that the sub-committee days are over on this one. He feels that the Planning Commission needs to hammer this one out before it goes to the Board. He asked for comments from Ms. Williams and Mr. Hemker.

Mr. Hemker stated that the density is too high. Ms. Williams stated that she also believes that the density is too high. She stated that she is not sure that all the benefits listed are true benefits to the Township. Some of them are benefits to the development. She discussed the road improvements that are proposed. She felt that the commercial section is too large.

Mr. Doozan stated that the traffic problem in this location will happen whether or not the Erwin property is developed. He noted that this road will eventually be overburdened because it is one of two roads that takes traffic to the freeway.

Mr. Doozan stated that he respectfully disagrees with the statement that when the problem gets bad enough, they can do the road themselves. He stated that the money just isn't there. The Township doesn't have the money for road improvements. Mr. Bisio stated that the money is there, it is up to the Board and elected officials to delegate the money to where it is needed in the

Township. He stated that they try to do this by keeping fringe benefits down and by prioritizing.

Ms. James stated that there is already talk about putting something on the ballot in order to preserve some of the open land of the Township. She briefly discussed the millage that might be put on the ballot.

Ms. Williams questioned what the next step is. Mr. Doozan responded that there is really two alternatives. The developer can come back with a revised plan with lower density to present to the sub-committee or this could possibly be put on the next agenda, as it was suggested by Mr. Hemker.

Mr. Hemker stated that since everybody has given their comments, he would rather not have it on the next agenda. He stated that he likes the road re-route but does not feel that it is worth a 70% density bonus or commercial.

Ms. James stated that the developers know where they stand. She asked the developer how they want to proceed from here. Mr. Wilkinson responded that it might make sense to go back to the study group. Mr. Hemker stated that they should return to the sub-committee only if some significant changes can be made to the plan. Mr. Wilkinson stated that they need a few days to look at the plans and think about it. He stated that he would disagree that there is not a market for the commercial at this location. He stated that they will contact Mr. Doozan in the next couple days.

b. 10 Mile Commercial Development

Mr. Wetli stated that two months ago they discussed commercial development as it relates to the Ten Mile corridor. He stated that at that time they were asked to come back with a more refined map. He reviewed a couple of the key issues that were discussed at a prior meeting. He displayed the map that they have prepared and briefly explained it.

There was discussion with regard to the two commercial nodes indicated for Ten Mile Road. Mr. Bisio stated that he doesn't see the need for these. Ms. Masson-Minock stated that the Future Lane Use Map indicates two commercial nodes along Ten Mile Road, one at Milford Road and the other at Johns Road. Mr. Bisio stated that he has been told by members that this is written in stone. He noted that this is in the Future Land Use Map and it can be changed.

Ms. James questioned what decision does the Planning Commission have to make tonight. Mr. Hemker responded that they need to decide where and if a commercial node should remain on Ten Mile Road.

Ms. James stated that neither developer of the two commercial nodes are present tonight and there are two Commissioners absent. She questioned if they should be making this decision tonight. Mr. Hemker stated that they have been trying to make this decision for two months now. He felt that the debate tonight is not whether or not a commercial node should be at Johns Road or Napier Road. He stated that the debate should be whether or not any commercial nodes should be located on Ten Mile Road to fill a gap, and if so, where. There was further discussion with regard to the commercial nodes along Ten Mile Road.

After further discussion, the consensus of the Planning Commission was to leave the Master Plan alone with regard to the commercial node along Ten Mile Road.

c. 10 Mile Design Plan

Mr. Doozan displayed a board with many pictures of landscaping adjacent to roads from other areas, which he explained and discussed. After discussion, the consensus of the Planning Commission was that they preferred random plantings, no fences and berms with gentle slopes in the suburban areas and natural grasses, wild flowers and deciduous trees and winding paths in the rural areas. Mr. Doozan asked Ms. Masson-Minock to make note that they need to possibly come up with some standards for this.

d. Road System

Ms. Masson-Minock distributed a memo dated May 27, 2003 with regard to road network priorities. She briefly explained what was contained in the memo and asked the Commissioners to review this and prioritize the road network improvements that are indicated.

7. DISCUSSION AND COMMUNICATIONS: NONE

8. ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Hemker adjourned the meeting at 8:55 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Deby Cothery

Deby Cothery
Recording Secretary