

**CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF LYON  
PLANNING COMMISSION  
MEETING MINUTES  
February 28, 2005**

Approved as corrected March 28, 2005.

DATE: February 28, 2005  
TIME: 7:00 PM  
PLACE: 58800 Grand River

Call to Order: Chairman Barber called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Roll Call: Present: Michael Barber, Chair  
Ted Soper, Vice Chair  
Jim Dome  
Jim Hamilton  
John Hicks, Trustee  
Laura Williams

Absent: Laura James, Secretary

Also Present: Philip Seymour, Township Attorney  
Chris Doozan, Township Planner  
Alexis Marcarello, Township Planner  
Chris Olson, Township Superintendent

Guests: 52

**1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mr. Hamilton made a motion to approve the agenda for Monday, February 28, 2005 as written.  
Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All  
Nays: None  
Absent: James

Motion approved unanimously.

**2. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA**

- Meeting Minutes of January 24, 2005
- Meeting Minutes of February 14, 2005

Mr. Soper made a motion to approve the minutes from the January 24, 2005 and the February 14, 2005 meetings as written. Ms. Williams supported the motion.

Voice Vote: Ayes: All  
Nays: None  
Absent: James

Motion approved unanimously.

**3. PUBLIC COMMENTS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:**

John Bell, 23113 Currie Road, discussed the status of Currie Road with regard to the Tanglewood development. He stated that it has been eight years since discussions began and nothing has been done yet. Mr. Doozan noted that Loren Crandell, Township Engineer, has worked on some cost estimates.

**4. PUBLIC HEARINGS:**

**AP-03-07, Meadowcreek of Lyon (Aspen Group) Planned Development**, South of Ten Mile Road, between Milford and Griswold Roads, Public hearing to consider the Preliminary Planned Development Plan (Public hearing tabled at the January 10, 2005 meeting)

Mr. Doozan reviewed the comments indicated in the McKenna Associates, Inc. letter dated January 31, 2005 regarding this issue.

David Goldberg, Aspen Group, gave a brief presentation of the proposed development. He stated that over the past couple years the project has gone through many changes based on the comments they have received from the Planning Commission, Township Board, Township Planners and the Township Engineers.

Mr. Goldberg briefly clarified some of the items that Mr. Doozan went through with regard to qualifying as a planned development. One item was the possible extension of Milford Road. He stated that it has come to their attention recently that the extension of Milford Road is not really something that the Township is interested in, but at one time there was interest in this from another Board. He stated that if the Township does not want the extension, they could leave the 60' wide strip there or they could add it to the lots making larger lots.

Mr. Barber questioned how many lots would be affected by this. Mr. Goldberg responded that there are nine lots.

Mr. Goldberg discussed the paving of Nine Mile Road. Using a displayed plan he pointed to the areas that they are proposing to pave. He stated that they have proposed from the beginning to pave 100' beyond their entranceway and go all the way to where the pavement ends now, which amounts to 1,402' of pavement along their property. He stated that they are also paving 830' of road that is not along their property. The total amount of paving is 2,232'. He stated that there is an additional 1,200' that they are not proposing to pave and hope that the upcoming proposal from Cattails would cover this portion. Mr. Soper noted that they have not seen Cattails proposal yet.

Mr. Goldberg stated that he is interested in hearing what the public and Commissioners have to say. He reserved the right to speak after the public hearing to address any questions that may be asked.

Mr. Barber opened the public hearing at 7:30 PM.

Brian Berry, 21822 Berry Lane, requested that the developer turn the displayed plan toward the audience and show them what he just showed the Commissioners. Mr. Goldberg did so.

William Greenway, 23360 Clarkshire Drive, stated that he would like to see the maximum amount of trees along the development border. He felt that this would minimize the impact on the neighbors. He discussed the current condition of Nine Mile Road. He indicated that Nine Mile

Road

is virtually impassable and feels the developer should pave it. He stated that Nine Mile Road can't handle the traffic it has today let alone any more.

Joe Raney, 24003 Raney Lane, concurred with the comments made so far. He stated that he is not sure if his father has a clear understanding of what is happening with this development.

Bob Seccombe, 56888 Nine Mile Road, presented some facts that the Commissioners may not have considered. He stated that the proposed plan is a fairly attractive layout. He stated that it is his understanding that one of the major reasons for this is that the development is providing open space in conjunction with the significant amount of wetlands present on the property. He discussed the gift of the 68 acre parcel. He stated that the 68' acre parcel will only support 25 homes because of the extensive wetlands on the parcel. He stated that as tax payers, they do not feel that it would be economic for the Township to accept the gift of the 68 acres under the current conditions proposed by the developer, and listed several reasons why they felt this way.

Mr. Seccombe felt that density bonuses for the developers result in density penalties for the Township. Additional density increases the burden on the school system, police services, fire services and the road system, which is already greatly over burdened. He stated that when they developed the existing Master Plan, the Planners inventoried the Township's entire industrial and residential capacity and determined what that would be at build out. He stated that everytime they increase the density over what the Master Plan describes they throw the ratio out of balance.

Mr. Seccombe stated that in closing he wanted to make the Aspen Group aware of the fact that the residents of this Township are experienced at invoking the process which permits the voters to request a referendum and possibly overturn any Board decision which the community feels is not in their best interest and/or violates the Master Plan. He stated that the only time that the residents did this was when the Board was forced into a corner by a developer who demanded an unreasonable density bonus. He stated that this is not a threat and they really don't want to exercise this right again. He stated that the residents would much rather have the developer appreciate their position and come up with something that is reasonable and deal fairly with the Planning Commission and the Township Board.

Nancy Prena, 22940 Lazy K, stated that she may be in the minority, but she moved to this area because of the dirt roads and the rural atmosphere. She stated that she doesn't want to see Nine Mile Road paved. She felt that if Nine Mile Road is paved, the rest of the roads will follow. She stated that she is against the increased density, extension of Milford Road and the paving of Nine Mile Road. She stated that she does not want to see the whole Township as subdivisions, condominiums and paved roads. She stated that they have already lost many horse farms in the Township.

Al Razigan, 56414 Nine Mile Road, stated that he does realize that development is going to occur. He stated that the Planning Commission's job is to facilitate the development within the zoning regulations and Master Plan. He stated that one of the big concern with many residents is the continual density increase that is requested. He stated that development, itself, is not a real concern, if it stays within the existing rules. He stated that he does realize that the regulations do allow for bonuses or density increases, however, in looking at the regulations, it indicates that a density bonus should be allowed when a proposal has substantial benefit to the users in the community as a whole. He briefly discussed some of the comments that were made by the developer with regard to benefits to the Township.

Mr. Razigan stated that there has been a lot of discussion both ways with regard to paving of Nine Mile Road. He stated that he has lived on Nine Mile Road for 40 years and has never seen

the roads as bad as they are today. He stated that it is hard to comprehend that somebody would buy into a subdivision where they could not get to on a paved road. He questioned whether a paved road is a benefit or something that the developer needs to do to sell houses, is something that the Planning Commission needs to think about. He stated that it is the Planning Commission's job to determine if the benefits the developer is proposing are significant enough to warrant a density increase. He stated that he feels that there is such a strong desire to live in Lyon Township because of all the development that is going on. He felt that they should stick with the regulations that are in place and stick to the Master Plan.

Darcy Hollon, 24300 Martindale Road, requested that the Planning Commission should deny this application for the following reasons:

- It is out of character with the rural atmosphere.
- The density is too high.
- The developer could do a better job.
- It will exacerbate an already poor traffic situation.
- There is reasonable usage of the property under the current zoning.
- It is inconsistent with the Master Plan.
- There is strong public opposition.
- The developer has failed to work with the neighbors.
- There is insufficient screening.
- This is not a good transition – it should be consistent with the neighboring developments.

Tony Scappaticci, 56800 Nine Mile Road, discussed the condition of Nine Mile Road. He stated that they pay taxes and can't drive on the roads because they are so bad. He felt that there is too much density. He concurred with the other comments that were made this evening.

George Gross, 57050 Nine Mile Road, stated that he doesn't really have a problem with the development other than the fact that he feels that there is too much density.

Mr. Hagman, 22851 Clarkshire Drive, stated that he concurs with the comments that have been made with regard to the road conditions. He stated that he would like to know what kind of setback there is going to be from the property line to the houses since his property abuts the proposed development.

Brian Berry, 21822 Berry Lane, stated that one thing that was not brought to the attention of the Commission is that Nine Mile Road and Briar Meadow is a very dangerous intersection. He felt that if the traffic is increased on these roads the risk of a serious accident is also increased. He stated that with increased density he is very concerned that someone is going to be seriously hurt at this intersection. He stated that he knows that this intersection is 1/4 mile east of this property, but felt that this is something that should be taken into consideration especially if they are giving a density increase.

Mr. Barber closed the public hearing at 8:19 PM.

Mr. Goldberg addressed some of the concerns that were expressed by the public. He stated that as he mentioned in his opening comments, this project has gone through many changes. He stated that they initially had a plan that had open space corridors behind all the lots and open space pathways. He stated that they were told to make those go away. He stated that they were told to move the open space corridors because people tend to use them as extensions of their lots, to the open space areas. He stated that it is difficult to satisfy everybody, all they can do is take direction from whoever is giving direction.

Mr. Goldberg stated that they could certainly accommodate the concerns with regard to the buffers in the rear. He stated that they initially had a plan that allowed buffers along the property

line, but were told to make them go away. He stated that some Board members did not like this.

Mr. Goldberg stated that with regard to Joe Raney's comments, he has met with Mr. Raney and Tony Raney several times, the last time was three weeks ago. He stated that at that time they discussed the status of the project and discussed different builders for the project.

Mr. Goldberg addressed Mr. Seccombe's comments. He stated that he disagrees with some of the comments that were made by Mr. Seccombe. He stated that with regard to the wetlands on the property, there is approximately 30% and that he does not believe that there is significant wetlands.

Mr. Goldberg stated that with regard to the sewer and water, they have owned this property for over six years and have been intricately involved with Giffels-Webster and the Township in working with the sewer and the water assessments. He stated that they pre-paid with another party over \$150,000 to get the engineering started. He stated that they may not live here as residents but they have been involved here. He stated that they do understand what is being developed in the area and that they are not the only developer in Lyon Township.

Mr. Goldberg stated that Mr. Raney is losing patience. He stated that Mr. Raney is not a developer and doesn't understand the whole process. He stated that Mr. Raney keeps asking why it is taking so long. He stated that they are doing their best to hold the development together.

Mr. Goldberg stated that if their project does not happen, it will have a significant impact on the sewer project. He stated that the sewer project design is to go through their property. He stated that without their project he believed that there would have to be three more pump stations that would have to be built. He stated that by going through their property with the sewer it is a public benefit because everybody benefits from this, not just their development. He stated that he was disappointed that the Township Engineers were not here tonight.

Mr. Goldberg stated that they did not completely design this project. He stated that one thing that they were told is that they need to get from Nine Mile Road to Ten Mile Road. He noted that there are a lot of stretches of road that have no houses on them. He apologized for not communicating as much with the Raney's and the residents on Clarkshire. He stated that they will do their best to put as much screening up along the property line bordering Clarkshire. He noted that they had a landscape plan for along Milford Road, but since the extension of Milford Road is going away, they could probably shift some of this landscaping over to be used as screening.

Mr. Goldberg stated that they have had three public hearings and have yet to get a direct answer with regard to the density. He asked the Commission to give them some direction as to what they feel is a fair density. He stated that based on the comments that they heard tonight

and

if the project were to stay the same, they would pave the remaining portion of Nine Mile Road. There was further brief discussion regarding the paving of Nine Mile Road. Mr. Goldberg stated that they are willing to pave the additional 400' that is not part of the original proposal.

There was discussion as to the steps of a planned development. Mr. Doozan explained that this is the preliminary stage and then there will be the final stage at the Planning Commission. Once these stages are complete then the plan goes onto the Township Board. Mr. Olson noted that the large issues, such as the layout and the density, are decided at this stage under the current PD ordinance.

Mr. Soper discussed the setback from the road. It was noted that there is 120' in most areas.

Mr. Soper stated that he does not like to see houses right up to the road. He stated that he would like to see the developer work with all the residents bordering this property. He stated that he likes

the idea that the developer left some decent open space areas. He noted that he likes the side entry garages. He feels that the donation of the land is a real benefit for park land. He stated that he does not want Milford Road extended, but felt that the possibility should remain open.

Mr. Soper stated that he does not want to see this developer pave all of Nine Mile Road. He stated that they would negotiate that with the next developer. He stated that he does not want to give extra density because, if Cattails does come before the Commission, they are going to ask for extra density.

Mr. Soper felt that it is better to have this as one big development rather than several small ones. He stated that he likes having the continuity but does not feel that it is worth a 25% density bonus. He noted that the average density bonus awarded was about 10%.

Mr. Hicks stated that this could adhere to the Master Plan and still have 181 homes. He stated that he feels that most of the people are in favor of improving and paving Nine Mile Road. He stated that the Township has no money to improve the roads and the only chance of getting the roads improved is through developers. He felt that the paving of Nine Mile Road would be a significant benefit to everyone and not to just the developer. With regard to the density issue, he felt that the 25% is too much to pay for the paving. He stated that he would like to see considerable less density and would like to see larger setbacks with a lot of vegetation along the main roads.

Mr. Dome stated that he wants it all, he wants the paving all the way and no density increase at all. He stated that he is new on the Commission and this is the biggest turn out of residents that he has seen. He felt that they need to listen to the people that live along the road and listen to what they have to say. He felt that the developer should pave all the way along their property line and should meet a zero density increase. He stated that he is not in a position to horse trade and be fair about it because he does not know what the profit per lot is or what was paid for the property.

Mr. Doozan noted that with a conventional subdivision, the developer would not be required to pave anything.

Mr. Olson noted that the Township Engineers typically do not come to the Planning Commission meetings unless they are specifically requested or if there is a specific issues that they need to address. He stated that they were not asked to be here tonight. He stated that this project is an integral part of getting sewers down to the southwest corner of the Township. He noted that there is always a danger of annexation without sewers. He stated that the Engineers have worked on a design to get sewer to this area for a significant period of time. He noted that Mr. Goldberg is correct in the fact that there has been a lot of prepaid engineering to get the design done before the SAD begins.

Mr. Olson noted that without public sewer the lots would have to be one acre, 43,560 square feet, and the frontages have to be 150' wide. With sewer the minimum goes down to 135' of frontage and 35,000 square foot lots. He stated that the big question is whether or not the land will development without sewer. He stated that not knowing the soil composition, but the typical soil composition in the southern part of the Township does not support heavy development. He stated that there is not a lot of sand in those areas.

Mr. Dome questioned what would happen if the developer gets mad and walks. Mr. Olson explained that the sewer is specifically planned to get from an area north of Ten Mile Road down through the intersection of Milford Road and Ten Mile Road down through the development and then goes to approximately the 9-1/2 Mile Road point to get to Griswold and then goes up. He further discussed the route of the sewer lines.

Mr. Hamilton stated that he does not like the 25%, it is too high. He stated that he does like the size of the lots and the layout design of the project. He stated that with regard to the property on the south side of Nine Mile Road, if it was cleaned up, as proposed, he would like to see a fence to keep the clutter out. He stated that he would like to see the outside edges buffered, as talked about, and as much as possible open space be preserved in the middle. He stated that he would like to see the easement remain for Milford Road.

Ms. Williams stated that she would like to see larger setbacks along Ten Mile Road. She felt that there should be more of a setback along Nine Mile Road also. She stated that she would like to see the developer work with the neighbors with regard to landscape buffers along their property lines. She stated that she would like to see the entire frontage of this development paved. She stated that she would prefer not to have the easement for Milford Road. She felt that 25% density increase was too much.

Mr. Hamilton questioned what type of homes will be built on these lots. Mr. Goldberg responded that his company does not build homes, they develop the land. He stated that they are looking to bring in one prominent builder. He stated that the characteristics of the homes will be side entry garages, first floor stone or brick, second floor some type of hardy board or siding. He stated that he does not see vinyl for these homes. He stated that the homes will probably start in the range of mid to high \$300,000 and work its way up from there depending upon the options added to the homes.

Mr. Barber stated that he does not like the 25% density increase. He felt that they should leave the easement in for Milford Road. He felt that they should pave Nine Mile Road all along the frontage of their property. He briefly discussed the need for sewers in this area. He stated that he would like to see some homes taken out. He liked the amount of open space throughout the development.

Mr. Dome stated that it is a nice plan and the developer should be proud of the plan.

Mr. Goldberg stated that if they were to remove ten lots they would be a 19.8%. He stated that it is generally \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000 to pave a mile of road. He stated that they are proposing to pave approximately 3/4 of a mile. Mr. Olson questioned the total length that they are proposing to pave. Duane Bennett, D. Bennett Enterprises, responded that if they were to pave their entire frontage, it would be 2,658' with 813' off-site. Mr. Goldberg stated that they are currently proposing 2,200'. Mr. Olson stated that this is about 2/3rds of a mile.

Mr. Goldberg stated that he can lose ten lots, still have a 19.8% density increase and that they will still pave the entire Nine Mile Road frontage. He stated that he is not sure where the lots will be removed, but that by pushing and squeezing they can pull the homes back along the borders. He stated that what they have really gotten out of the discussions is the same as before, density and open space. He stated that they have gotten mixed direction with regard to the open space. He stated that he is hoping that if he loses ten lots and comes back that it will get them closer to an approval.

Mr. Soper stated that if they removed lots 82 to 105, 23 lots, it would bring the density increase down to 13%. He felt that this would get the numbers closer to what he feels they should be. He also noted that there would be quite a bit of road that would not have to be constructed, if these lots were removed.

After further discussion with regard to the density issue, it was determined that a sub-committee be formed to work with the developer. The sub-committee will be comprised of Chris Olson, Loren

Crandell, Chris Doozan, Ted Soper, Jim Dome and John Hicks.

Mr. Soper made a motion to table AP-03-07, Meadowcreek of Lyon (Aspen Group), for up to sixty days. Mr. Hicks supported the motion.

Voice Vote:           Ayes: All  
                              Nays: None  
                              Absent: James

Motion approved unanimously.

Mr. Soper made a motion to amend tonight's agenda by moving AP-04-40, Johns Sanitation and AP-5-02, Quadrants Industrial Building to the next available meeting. Mr. Hamilton supported the motion.

Voice Vote:           Ayes: All  
                              Nays: None  
                              Absent: James

Motion approved unanimously.

John Measel, Johns Sanitation stated that he is here and would like to discuss his issue tonight rather than moving it to another meeting.

**AP-05-01, North River Properties**, 54500 Grand River Avenue, Public Hearing to consider request for a rezoning from R-1.0, Residential-Agricultural to B-3, General Business.

Ms. Marcarello reviewed the comments indicated in the McKenna Associates, Inc. letter dated February 17, 2005 regarding this issue.

Tim Hader explained that they are requesting a zoning change from R-1.0, Residential-Agricultural, to B-3, General Business to allow them to construct the new headquarters for General RV. He stated that the current location is on Twelve Mile Road in Wixom, but because of tremendous growth of the business, they have out grown this location. He stated that the Grand River parcel is double the size of the current location. He stated that Rob Baidas, Owner of General RV, and Mark Szerlag, Thomas Duke Company, have gone through a rigorous search of commercial properties throughout the area. He briefly discussed the reasons why they have selected this particular parcel for this project.

Mr. Hader stated that according to the ordinances, General RV could build, purchase, occupy and build their building as proposed and meet the I-1 requirements. He stated that I-1 does allow for the service and it allows for the sales. He stated that what it specifically does not allow for is the parking of the RV's on the site. Other than this, the entire use of the property is consistent with the I-1 zoning.

Mr. Hader stated that with regard to the traffic comments, they would love to do a traffic study pending rezoning. He stated that there will be approximately 70 employees on the property (30 – sales, 40 – service department). He stated that the corporate headquarters would have a training facility in order to train the customers and educate the employees. He noted that Mr. Baidas has four other dealerships in Michigan and that those employees would come to this location for training as necessary.

Mr. Hader briefly discussed some of the uses that would be allowed in a I-1 district, many of which

would be of a far greater intensive use than what they are proposing.

Rob Baidas, Owner, General RV, briefly discussed why they selected this location. He also briefly explained what General RV is and does.

Mr. Barber questioned if General RV does a pump out of sewage. Mr. Baidas responded that they do empty holding tanks on occasion, but it is very expensive. He stated that this is not something that they generally do. He noted that they do have propane on site but do not sell it to the general public.

Mr. Hader stated that they are very familiar with the requirements of the MDEQ and the County with regard to what goes into the sewer.

Mr. Soper questioned if private RV's would be stored on this property during winter months. Mr. Baidas responded that they do have a storage facility at Seven Mile Road and Currie Road.

Mr. Soper stated that coming from Grand River you would be looking at the back of the building. He stated that he is not sure that he likes this concept. He stated that there is an awful lot of paving on this site.

Mr. Baidas stated that driving down Grand River you really won't see much of the building because there will be RV's parked in front as well as landscaping. Mr. Hader stated that there is a grade change on the parcel.

Mr. Hamilton questioned how many RV's will be parked on this site. Mr. Baidas responded that there would be approximately 400 to 500 units. He stated that they have approximately 250 units on site at their current location.

Mr. Barber opened the public hearing at 9:53 PM.

Mark Szerlag, Thomas Duke Company, stated that building that is being proposed will be 70,000 square feet. He stated that 50% of the building will be shop space, 30% office space and the remaining 20% would be showroom space. He stated that the building is very compatible with the light industrial zoning. He stated that truck, tractor and trailer sales and repair are a permitted use within the light industrial district subject to a special use approval. He stated that the weight of a commercial truck starts at 5,000 pounds and the RV's start at 10,000 pounds. He further discussed how this use would fit into this area.

Mr. Szerlag stated that General RV is a quality company. He stated that they are hoping for the Planning Commission's help in figuring out this square peg into a round hole.

Mr. Barber closed the public hearing at 9:56 PM.

Mr. Soper noted that there is almost 1,000 parking space on this site according to the copy of the plan that was distributed. Mr. Hader stated that he did not believe that there were that many. Mr. Olson stated that there are 791 parking spaces indicated.

Mr. Olson asked the applicant if they are aware of the Township's impervious surface standards. Mr. Hader responded that he does know that the Township has them.

Mr. Doozan briefly discussed the Conditional Rezoning Article, that will be discussed next. He noted that this may be a viable alternative and that might satisfy a lot of the concerns of the Planning Commissioners. He stated that another alternative would be to seek an amendment to the I-1 district, but it would take more time than going through the conditional rezoning process. There

was further discussion as to the different alternatives that could be taken and generally agreed that conditional zoning would be appropriate.

Mr. Barber questioned how far along the applicant is with their site plan. Mr. Baidas responded that they are fairly close and could put something together. Mr. Olson noted that a big concern is with the amount of impervious surface proposed. He also noted that there are no acceleration or deceleration lanes shown on the plan.

Mr. Dome stated that he would like to see the building shifted more toward Grand River with the product in front. He stated that he does not feel that anybody would know that there is a building there, if it is so far back.

Mr. Soper made a motion to recommend to denial of the rezoning request from R-1.0 to B-3 for AP-05-01, North River Properties, to the Township Board. Ms. Williams supported the motion.

Voice Vote:           Ayes: All  
                              Nays: None  
                              Absent: James

Motion approved.

**Public hearing to consider the creation of Article 42.00, Conditional Rezoning,** for the purpose of providing a procedure and standards for allowing a property owner to propose, and the Township to approve, a site specific development, including conditions in conjunction with a proposed rezoning.

Mr. Doozan introduced this issue. He stated that the amendment that is before the Planning Commission is basically intended to allow the Township to use this Act to its benefit in dealing with developers.

Mr. Barber opened the public hearing at 10:14 PM.

Susan Sabota, 61501 Silver Lake Road, questioned if she were to come to the Board as a property owner who wants to rezone from one acre to 0.3 minimum and there is direct opposition to what sub-committees, Planning Commission and Board's have said and it is not on the Master Plan, is this a leg up to her as a property owner. Mr. Olson responded that it is not.

Mr. Olson stated that on page 7 they go from a to b to e. Mr. Seymour stated that there are some typographical errors that still need to be corrected. Mr. Olson stated that he just wanted to make sure that there wasn't a c and d that might have been dropped out accidentally.

Mr. Olson noted that in a conditional rezoning the Township is purely in a reactive mode. He stated that it really is not a give and take before the Planning Commission or the Board. Mr. Seymour stated that it is his understanding that this is an entirely new zoning classification called CR.

Mr. Dome questioned how they would handle parking, setbacks, density, etc. Mr. Doozan responded that these would be identified as the conditions. He cited a few examples of this.

Brian Stoy, RBS Company, stated that he would like to go through this process and are kind of excited about this. There was discussion with regard to the steps in the process that they would have to go through.

Mr. Barber closed the public hearing at 10:31 PM.

Ms. Williams stated that on page 7, item 3, "approved bona fide development". She questioned if they could provide a definition of "bona fide". Mr. Seymour stated that "bona fide" in that sense would mean good faith effort to develop the property. Ms. Williams noted that someone's definition of "bona fide" could be different than someone else's definition.

Mr. Olson requested that on Page 7, Section E.1 they add the Township Engineer and Building Official/Zoning Administrator and/or their designees as part of the preliminary review.

Ms. Williams made a motion to recommend approval of Article 42.00, Conditional Rezoning, to the Township Board subject to the following modifications:

- Page 7, Item E.3 – a definition of "bona fide" be created
- Page 7, Item E.1 – that Township Engineer and Building Official/Zoning Administrator and/or their designees be added as part of the preliminary review

Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice Vote:           Ayes: All  
                              Nays: None  
                              Absent: James

Motion approved.

**5. OLD BUSINESS:**

**AP-04-40, Johns Sanitation**, West of Griswold, on Oasis Drive, Site Plan Review for outdoor storage (Site Plan was tabled at the January 10, 2005 meeting).

Ms. Marcarello reviewed the comments indicated in the McKenna Associates, Inc. letter dated January 27 2005 regarding this issue.

John Measel, owner, stated that he does not have any problem with the issues cited in the McKenna Associates, Inc. letter.

Mr. Soper made a motion to approve AP-04-40, Johns Sanitation, site plan subject to the conditions cited in the McKenna Associates, Inc. letter dated January 27, 2005. Mr. Hamilton supported the motion.

Voice Vote:           Ayes: All  
                              Nays: None  
                              Absent: James

Motion approved.

**6. NEW BUSINESS:**

**AP-05-04, Carriage Trace**, West side of Pontiac Trail at Coach House Lane, Schedule a public hearing to consider Special Land Use approval for an Average Lot Size development proposal.

There was brief discussion as to a possible date for this public hearing.

Mr. Soper made a motion to schedule a public hearing for AP-05-04, Carriage Trace, for Monday, March 14, 2005. Ms. Williams supported the motion.

Voice Vote:           Ayes: All

Nays: None  
Absent: James

Motion approved unanimously.

**AP-05-02, Quadrants Industrial Building**, KMF Industries, Helene Drive, south of Grand River,  
Conceptual Industrial Plan review.

No representative from Quadrants was present. This issue was tabled and moved to the next available agenda.

7. **MISCELLANEOUS DISCUSSION**                      **NONE**
8. **ADJOURNMENT:**

Mr. Barber adjourned the meeting at 10:48 PM.

Respectfully Submitted,

*Deby Cothery*

Deby Cothery  
Recording Secretary