

warehouse, 53535 Grand River, southwest corner of Grand River and Haas Road.

Ms. Masson-Minock reviewed the comments indicated in the May 30, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letters with regard to the special land use request and the commercial site plan review.

John Sarkesian, Architect, gave a brief presentation of the proposed project. He displayed a color rendering of the proposed building. He noted that the nature of the business is family oriented and really does require an outdoor display. He stated that the fence will be a two-way safety feature. It will keep the kids who are trying out the playscapes inside the area and safe and it will help keep kids out of the area when the business is closed. He noted that they have used a lighting consultant to work on the lights for this project.

Mr. Barber questioned the height of the fence. Mr. Sarkesian responded that the fence will be 6' in height. He noted that it will be a wrought iron fence without spikes on the top.

Mr. Crooks questioned the number of structures that will be displayed in the fenced in area and how tall the structures will be. Mr. Sarkesian responded that he believed that the structures are 14' 2" to the very top of the canopy and he believed that there would only be enough room to display three of these structures.

Dave Byrum, Owner, gave a brief history of his company. He noted that they will have a 12,000 square foot showroom because the structures are large. He stated that the biggest structure that they have is 32' long and about 15' wide. He stated that to adequately sell the product they must display twelve to fifteen structures. He noted that there are over 100 different varieties of these structures. The majority of the structures that they will display will be inside the building. There will be either three or four structures attractively displayed in the fenced area. He noted that the structures displayed will be changed out in the fall and be sold as demo models. He stated that they do change them in order to keep them looking nice.

Mr. Crook stated that this is an attractive building and he would hate to see it totally cluttered with these 15' high structures. Mr. Byrum stated that the aesthetics are important to them, even when they install the structures in backyards. He stated that they will not be lined up straight in front, they will be angled and placed aesthetically pleasing in the fenced area.

Mr. Bisio questioned where the outdoor display area would face Grand River. Harold Remlinger, using a plan, indicated that the outdoor display would face Grand River.

Mr. Bisio questioned what is happening with the house. Mr. Byrum responded that at this time they don't have plans for that site. He stated that they would like to someday build another building. If they decide not to build another building they would like to split the property and sell that portion. This is why they decided to build on the western portion of the property. He stated that their intent, at this time, is to maintain the house and not use it for anything. He noted that they will be tearing down some of the old buildings behind the house and then seed for grass.

There was brief discussion with regard to the well and septic for the house. Mr. Byrum noted that when they did the Phase I and Phase II Environmental everything was good.

Ms. James questioned if the applicant would be open to the idea of having the displays on the side of the building rather than in front of the building. Mr. Byrum stated that he believed that their space would not allow this. He stated that they would have to move into the extra space and the value of the space would go down. He stated that they would rather have the display in the front rather than the parking.

Mr. Sarkesian stated that Mr. Byrum takes great pride in the fact that he sells the best product in this classification. He stated that they are attractive units and would nice in front of the building. He stated that they see this as a positive thing and not in any way as a billboard.

There was discussion with regard to the number of employees that would be at this facility and the hours of operation.

Ms. James stated that she does not have a strong opinion about the outdoor display. She stated that it seems to her that the display could have been placed on the east side of the property.

Mr. Barber questioned the lighting at this site. He questioned how long the lights would be lit. Mr. Byrum stated that he did not plan on the lights being on 24 hours a day. He stated that he does plan on having the lights on a timer. He stated that in the summer there is not a whole lot of need for the lights because it stays light outside until about 10:00 PM. He noted that the internal lights are more for security. He stated that his intent was not to leave the lights on overnight like a car lot.

Using a displayed plan, Mr. Sarkesian pointed out where the lights would be located. There would be two pole lights in the display area and two lights in the parking area.

Ms. Williams questioned if the applicant has ever had an issue with anybody playing on the structures unsupervised. Mr. Byrum responded that they have never had any problems. He stated that the only problem they had is in Utica because they are located downtown. He stated that there are about three bars downtown and some adults who were drunk got into the display area.

Ms. Williams stated that this is a much nicer building than the existing location in Northville. Mr. Byrum stated that the Northville location is one of the most productive location in the United States. He noted that his office is now in the storeroom. He stated that they have been at the Northville location for eight years and are literally busting at the seams.

Mr. Byrum briefly discussed some of the other locations in the United States. He stated that it is important to him for safety reasons to keep these units spaced far enough apart that they can be seen and tested safely. There was discussion with regard to the type of flooring that they will be using in the building.

Ms. James questioned if the applicant knew how old the farm house is and if it has any historical value. Mr. Byrum responded that he does not know. He stated that he would try to find this out. Ms. James noted that she would prefer to take the demolish option off the list of conditions outlined in the McKenna Associates, Inc. letter.

Ms. Masson-Minock stated that if the applicant wants to change the use of the house in any way shape or form, they would have to come back for site plan approval.

Mr. Hemker opened the public hearing at 7:45 PM.

Carmine Naccrarto, 29333 Haas Road, stated that he owns the building right behind. He stated that he would like to see the whole corner cleaned up. There is a lot of equipment and junk sitting there that needs to be removed. He noted the grass has not been cut.

Mr. Hemker closed the public hearing at 7:48 PM.

Mr. Sarkesian stated that he believed what Mr. Naccrarto is speaking about is the previous owner's equipment. He stated that they have an agreement with the previous owners to leave the equipment there until they begin construction and then all the equipment will be removed.

Mr. Byrum stated that their intent is to begin cleaning up the site immediately because they have a certain time frame that they need to adhere to in order to be in the building.

Mr. Byrum briefly discussed how the structures would be displayed and the type of material that will be used for the flooring inside the building. He noted that they don't let the kids play on the swings, they are hung up high.

Mr. Crook made a motion with regard to AP-03-11, Rainbow Recreation, that they recommend to the Township Board grant special land use for this site to allow a minimal of outdoor structures on this site (minimal being 3 to 4) provided that the applicant follows their own safety regulations when they do the set up inside the building. This recommendation would be subject to site plan approval and the conditions indicated in the May 30, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. review letter.

Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
 Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

Mr. Crook made a motion with regard to AP-03-11, Rainbow Recreation, that the site plan be approved subject to the conditions cited in the May 30, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. review letter with condition one being amended to remove the word "demolished". The lawn and landscaping on the property where the house is located must be maintained. Ms. James supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
 Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

5. OLD BUSINESS:

AP-02-23, Sunoco Gas Station and Convenience Store, Lyon Towne Center, review of architecture per condition of site plan approval.

Mr. Doozan reviewed the comments indicated in the June 2, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter.

Steve Swartzendruber, CDPA Architects, submitted a sample of the proposed roof color. He noted that when they were at the last meeting there was some concern with the color. He stated that the color they are proposing is more of a brick color than a bright red. He stated that this color will coordinate with the Sunoco Corporation colors. He stated that the owner's business colors are red, white and blue.

Mr. Swartzendruber stated that they are using the brick that has been approved for the planned development. He stated that the color they have selected for the roof will compliment the color of the brick.

Mr. Swartzendruber stated that with regard to the sign, they would like to present the Commission with some schematics.

There was discussion with regard to the roof color. The Commissioner's determined that they did not care for the color. They felt that it would stand out too much. The Commissioners felt that a charcoal gray roof would look much better. After further discussion, the applicant agreed to take another look at the roof color and come back to the Planning Commission at a future meeting.

Mr. Barber made a motion made a motion to table AP-02-23, Sunoco Gas Station and Convenience Store, for up to 30 days. Mr. Bisio supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All
 Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

6. NEW BUSINESS:

AP-03-12, Misty Ridge Extension, private road review, south of Pontiac Trail.

Mr. Doozan reviewed the comments indicated in the May 7, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter.

Mike Dunn, 54900 Misty Ridge, stated that they have new signed road easements from the people that are served by Misty Ridge currently and that they have revised drawings. He

stated that they do have legal descriptions on all of the properties. He submitted these to Mr. Doozan.

Mr. Crook discussed the length of the road, 1,100 feet, and the fact that there is only one way in and one way out. He questioned if there are any plans for a second means of egress. Theresa Dunn, 54900 Misty Ridge, noted that this is a private road and it is actually shorter than the road next to it.

Mr. Hemker stated that normally for a private road longer than 600' feet there has to be an easement for a parallel easement. Mr. Doozan stated that in this case there is really no opportunity for this. He noted that Thomas Lane is right next to Misty Ridge and could be used in case of an emergency.

Mr. Dunn noted that there are several areas that are large enough for a big vehicle to cross between Thomas Lane and Misty Ridge.

Ms. James made a motion to recommend that the Township Board approve the extension of Misty Ridge Road, AP-03-12, pursuant to the conditions outlined in the May 7, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter. Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice Vote:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion approved.

AP-03-17, Coyote Court, private road review, north of Lee Drive, west of South Hill Road.

Mr. Doozan reviewed the comments indicated in the June 9, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter.

Mr. Gillam stated that in terms of documents being approved by his office, they have seen the documents in form and have approved them. He stated that the only thing they need is the documents that reference the earlier maintenance agreement for Lee Road. He stated that the document that they have in their files is not signed and there is no indication that it has been recorded.

Marshall Blau, Progressive Properties, stated that the documents that Mr. Gillam is referring to dates back to 1990. He stated that when Lee Road was developed he was not involved in this. At that time there was a maintenance agreement. He stated that he would research this and provide a copy.

Mr. Blau noted that they have executed a new maintenance agreement for Coyote Court.

Mr. Crook questioned if the 60' easement is for the secondary means of ingress/egress. Mr. Blau responded that this is actually an easement that was dedicated at the time that Lee Drive went in. He stated that it made sense to put the easement all the way to the property line even though the road, itself, was not going to be constructed. There was further discussion with regard to the proposed future connections.

Ms. James questioned if this property would be serviced by water and sewer. Mr. Blau responded that they would have well and septic on each of the lots. The largest lot is 8-1/2 acres and the smallest lot is 1-1/3 acres.

Mr. Soper made a motion to recommend approval of AP-03-17, Coyote Court, private road to the Township Board subject to the road documents final approval by the Township Attorney. Ms. Williams supported the motion.

Voice Vote:

Ayes: Barber, Bisio, Hemker, James, Soper, Williams

Nays: Crook

Motion approved.

AP-03-13, Flagstar Bank, site plan review, commercial building, Lyon Crossing, Milford Road, south of Interstate 96.

Mr. Doozan reviewed the comments indicated in the May 29, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter.

Stephen Pawlaczyk, Atwell Hicks, stated that Mr. Doozan summed up the project well. He stated that there was some miscommunication with regard to the cross-access easement. He stated that Flagstar Bank does not have a problem doing this.

Steve Harvey, Flagstar Bank, stated that they tried to accommodate suggestions from the Township Planner without changing the intent of the building with regard to architecture. He stated that they have changed the signage letters to single letters in order to comply with the planned development agreement. He reviewed some of the other suggestions that were made by the Planners that they incorporated into to the building.

Mr. Barber questioned the lighting on the overhang. Mr. Pawlaczyk responded that they are a flat lens approximately 12" x 12".

Mr. Hemker stated that he is not a fan of the upper half of the building whether it is EFIS or stucco. He doesn't care for the look. He noted that the other two competitors in the area have all brick buildings. Mr. Harvey stated that he believed that it would be overpowering to have the building all brick.

Mr. Soper questioned the location of this site in reference to Chili's and Applebee's. Tony Antone, Kojaian, responded that this is on the west side of Milford Road. This is the only one that they have on the west side so far.

Mr. Antone stated that from a developer's standpoint, they loved this. He stated that stucco is a very durable material and EFIS is not durable. He stated that they felt that this would be a nice addition to the center.

Mr. Barber made a motion to approve the site plan for AP-03-13, Flagstar Bank, subject to the Planning Commission getting another look at the architecture for a better color and the conditions cited in the May 29, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter. Also, that there needs to be a cross access road across the back of the property. Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice Vote:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

AP-03-16, Applebee's, site plan review, commercial building, Lyon Towne Center, Milford Road south of Interstate 96.

Ms. Masson-Minock reviewed the comments indicated in the May 29, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter.

David Hunter, Civil Engineer, stated that they have tried to comply with all the issues of the planned development. He displayed a chart showing the elevations of the building.

Ms. James questioned if all the Planner's concerns in the May 29, 2003 letter have been addressed. Ms. Masson-Minock responded that they have not received complete plans reflecting all of these. She stated that they have received a letter from the applicant stating the things that they are willing to do. She stated that she would recommend that if the Commission is looking at approving this, that they should include all the conditions cited in the review letter.

Ms. James discussed the lighting, which is indicated to be more than twice of what is allowed. Mr. Hunter stated that they will bring back a lighting plan using 400 watt luminaires. He stated that they will comply with the planned development agreement.

Ms. Masson-Minock stated that they could amend condition two cited in their letter to include: "the lighting will have 400 watt bulbs and there will be no more than 9.2 foot candles".

There was discussion with regard to the signs. Mr. Hemker noted that there is one "To Go" on the awning and one on the building. He questioned if this is part of the overall signs allowed. Ms. Masson-Minock responded that they are included in the calculations.

Mr. Hemker questioned the hours of operations for this location. Jim O'Keefe, Applebee's International, responded that the hours of operation will be typical of the rest of the Applebee's here in the market and the kitchen will be closed at 11:00 PM seven days a week.

Mr. Barber made a motion to approve the site plan for AP-03-16, Applebee's, subject to the conditions cited in the May 29, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter and that a new photometric plan be submitted for the lighting and evaluated Administratively. Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Mr. Barber amended his motion to include that there be no more that 9.2 foot candles, as allowed by the Lighting Ordinance of Lyon Township. Mr. Soper supported the amendment to the motion.

Mr. Gillam stated that Ms. Masson-Minock raised the issue of the access easements. He stated that they are in the process of taking a look at the planned development agreement. He suggested that a condition including the access easements, if Legal Counsel's office determines that additional easements are necessary based upon their review.

Mr. Barber amended his motion to include Mr. Gillam's condition with regard to the access easements. Mr. Soper supported the amendment to the motion.

Voice Vote:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

AP-03-05, Liberty Chevrolet, site plan amendment, commercial building, Lyon Towne Center, Milford Road, south of Interstate 96.

Ms. Masson-Minock reviewed the comments indicated in the June 2, 2003 McKenna Associates, Inc. letter.

Mark Drane, Rogvoy Architects, stated that he is available to answer any questions. He noted that the McKenna Associates, Inc. letter did a great job describing the amendments.

Mr. Crook made a motion to approve the site plan as amended for AP-03-05, Liberty Chevrolet, provided that the recommendations in the McKenna Associates, Inc. letter dated June 2, 2003 are met. Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice Vote:

Ayes: All

Nays: None

Motion approved unanimously.

7. DISCUSSION AND COMMUNICATIONS:

NONE

8. ADJOURNMENT:

Mr. Hemker adjourned the meeting at 9:04 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

Deby Cothery

Deby Cothery
Recording Secretary