Charter Township Of Lyon
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
February 27, 2006

Approved on March 27, 2006

Date: February 27, 2006
Time: 7:00 PM
Place: 58000 Grand River

Mr. Barber called the meeting to order at 7:01 P.M.

Roll Call

Present: Barber, Mike (chair)
Dome, Jim
Hamilton, Jim
James, Laura (Secretary)
Soper, Ted (vice-chair)
Williams, Laura

Absent: Hicks, John (Board Liaison)

Also present: Philip Seymour, Township Attorney
Michelle Aniol, Township Planner
Al Hogan, Township Building Official
Chris Olson, Township Superintendent
Guests: 2

Approval of Agenda
Mr. Hamilton added the item of electing officers to new business.

Ms. James made the motion "to approve the agenda." Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice vote:
Ayes: all
Nays: none
Motion approved unanimously.

Approval of Consent Agenda:

Mr. Soper made the motion "To approve the meeting minutes for January 30, 2006." Mr. Hamilton supported the motion.

Voice Vote:

Ayes: all
Nays: none
Motion approved unanimously.

Comments from public on Non-Agenda Items: None

Public Hearings: None

Old Business:

1. AP-04-39, New Hudson Plaza, Site Plan Review of revised site plan for site plan approval extension of previously approved development on the west side of Milford Road north of Lyon Center Drive.

Ms. Aniol reviewed the comments indicated in McKenna Associates, Inc. letter dated February 20, 2006.

Ms. James asked Ms. Aniol if the Red Maple was a protected tree under the Townships tree protection ordinance. Ms. Aniol commented that the Red Maple was protected. Ms. James clarified that there was an error on page 2 on the tree list. It says that they will be removing a maple. Ms. James suggested that the Planning Commission make it a condition of approval to add one more 2 1/2-caliber replacement tree to the requirements. Mr. Wiggins said that he was agreeable to that condition.

Ms. James also had a question in respect to the lighting. She asked if the old fashion lighting fixtures had any shielding at all.

Mr. Bryan Wiggins architect for Lakeside Oakland Development – He replied that he was not real familiar with the specific fixture, but it was a request by McKenna that they use that light fixture. That is why they picked the light fixture. He commented that generally the downward shielding is not the primary concern with that. He also commented that there is not a lot of light with the fixtures. It is decorative lighting. The area of lighting is around the poles and shielded downwards. Mr. Wiggins suggested that they investigate and find out if there is a different bulb they could put in the fixture.

Ms. James replied that it was purely decorative. It has no purpose other then to illuminate the building. Mr. Wiggins answered yes. Mr. Dome asked if it matched the balance of the development. Mr. Wiggins also answered yes.

Mr. Barber commented that the other streetlights they were using were 1000 watt and the other were 250 watts, so they will not be as bright.

Mr. Dome asked how the berming worked. He said that it did not appear to be possible. The top of the curb is at 550 and the parking lot is 559. The drawing is showing a berm with a steeply sloped plain along the entire perimeter. Along Milford Road and Lyon Center Drive. He commented that he wished there was a way that when one came in from Milford Road, they only saw the bumpers of the cars. Mr. Dome liked the idea of screening the property so that the building was more prominent and not the cars. Mr. Wiggins replied that the intension of the berm was to hide the cars. Mr. Dome suggested that they check that out and look over the berm. Mr. Wiggins said that the builder tends to prefer not putting a berm in. Therefore, Mr. Wiggins thought that they had the berm in the drawing because it was required.

Mr. Soper commented that now that there was an access on Lyon Center Drive, he had a problem with the way semi trucks were designed to come in from Milford Road. Looking at the dotted line that shows the curb, if the cars were stacked, that could be an issue. “Since there is an entrance on Lyon Center Drive, could we make this fire lane one direction? Meaning the trucks will come further down Lyon Center Drive and come in north around only. To make it a one way back there.” Mr. Wiggins said he did not think that would be an issue. “The only problem would be that they envisioned that most of the trucks would be coming off the freeway and making a right turn in and then they could go out at the light and make a left. If they wanted to get back to the freeway going left, they would have to go out somewhere different and then turn around and come back.”

Mr. Olson commented that he did not think the trucks were going to get trapped in the back for the purposes of fighting a fire.

Mr. Soper suggested that they move the entrance on Milford Road to the Northern portion of the property so they are not swinging around; they are just making a left straight into the back. Move the entrance up to avoid the swing around. Mr. Wiggins commented that the entrance is at the visual entrance point for the building and it could be confusing to have people passing the building to go into the entrance.

The Planning Commission continued to discuss the fire lane issue.

Ms. James asked what the Road Commission said about it. Mr. Wiggins answered that Road Commission approved it the way it was. They would have to go back to square one with them to get it fixed. From the standpoint of customers entering, the driveway is well located. In order to meet the 60 percent coverage, they have taken out any unnecessary asphalt. It is right at 60 percent.

Mr. Soper also commented that with the future roundabout, they do not want those trucks being forced to go through that.

Mr. Wiggins said that most of the trucks that come in will not be shipping tractor-trailers it will mainly be straight trucks.

The Planning Commission continued to discuss the fire lane with Mr. Wiggins.

Ms. James suggested that they have ingress for semi traffic only on Milford and an egress on Lyon Center Drive. Mr. Wiggins said that suggestion would only work for trucks coming from the expressway. If someone was coming from Grand River that would be a problem.

Mr. Soper commented that he did not think that the Planning Commission could do anything about this situation.

Ms. Williams commented that she noticed that the bike path was 5 feet and not the Townships normal 10-foot bike path. Ms. Williams asked if that was compatible with the other bike paths in the area.

Mr. Dome commented that the parking lot is going to be elevated about 6 feet over the road. Some areas are 8 feet. Mr. Wiggins commented that most of that is in the retaining wall. Mr. Olson and Mr. Dome questioned if the sight should be shaved down. Mr. Olson explained that the site is high and goes down to the road. The site slopes down and the berm comes into it and the plants will be on top. The question is where is the level of the headlights going to be and maybe the sight should be lowered instead of at the current elevation.

Mr. Soper asked if it would help to create a smaller retention basin.

Mr. Wiggins commented that in his opinion the berm will screen the parking well and because they are high up, the plants will be better protected. Ms. James suggested that the landscape architect put plants that do not require a large amount of water.

Mr. Dome also commented that there is no drainage on the back part of the sight. The sight is going to be holding water. The sight is an inclined plain with a bump in it. Mr. Dome suggested that they look at the plan again. He also commented that he would rather see a stonewall with landscaping on the high side of the wall. Mr. Wiggins commented that the retaining wall does give the site a similar look. The berm is sitting up on top of the retaining wall.

The Planning Commission continued to discuss the retaining wall and berm.

Mr. Dome said, as a business, they need to be sure that the stores can be seen or they will not stay in business.

Ms. Williams asked if there was 8-foot sidewalk on Lyon Center Drive and Milford Road. Ms. Williams was concerned about making the sidewalk match and asked if Mr. Wiggins had any objections to that. Mr. Wiggins answered that he would have to check on that. She was also concerned because 5 feet is narrow and the sidewalk will be connected to the bike path. That is a narrow space for a biker and a walker to fit. Ms. Aniol clarified that it was a 5-foot sidewalk on the other side of Milford Road. Ms. Williams said that as long as it matched she did not have a problem with it.

Mr. Soper made the motion "To approve AP-04-39, The New Hudson Plaza, with the exception of the Maple number three on page two be added to the replacement trees and with all items mentioned in the McKenna letter dated February 20, 2006." Mr. Hamilton supported the motion.

Voice Vote:
Ayes: all
Nays: none
Motion approved unanimously.

New Business

2. AP-05-52, American Tower/Metro PCS Michigan Site Plan. Proposal to co-locate a new wireless carrier on an existing wireless tower at 58100 Grand River Avenue.

Ms. James made the motion "To table the item for up to 60 days." Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice Vote:
Ayes: all
Nays: none

3. Discussion regarding notification of property owners impacted by changes to the Future Land Use Map.

Ms. Aniol showed the Planning Commission an overhead that included a map indicating the properties in the area that would be impacted by changes due to the Future Land Use Map.

Ms. Aniol commented that Mr. Doozan and Ms. Marcarello remembered that the Planning Commission had concerns about notifying property owners about changes in the Future Land Use Map. Ms. Aniol further explained that before they went ahead and made the notification for the public hearing, she wanted to show the Planning Commission exactly what part of the Township was going to be impacted. The areas of change are around the Milford area, the New Hudson area by the Township Hall, Kent Lake school, and then a little piece by where the Sprint Office Building is.

Ms. James asked if there was an objection to notifying the people. Ms. Aniol answered no, everyone gets notified through the paper and anyone within three hundred feet also gets notified. There is a time element and cost element involved. Ms. James suggested that they narrow down the areas that they mail too. Ms. Aniol replied that they could do that; McKenna just needs direction in what the Planning Commission would like them to do. Ms. Aniol also told the Planning Commission that the Public is notified through the paper, at the Township, and on the Website.

Mr. Dome asked how other communities handled this situation. Ms. Aniol answered that it depends and can sometimes go either way. If a community is operating under a significant financial constraint they will just use the paper. Mr. Dome asked how much money it would cost to send out the letters. Ms. Aniol commented that she could not answer that question because she does not know the number of parcels or the number of people within the 300-mile radius.

The Planning Commission continued to discuss their options for notifying the public. Due to the limited amount of change in the Future Land Use Map, the Planning Commission decided to notify the public as the Township was originally planning to do.

3. Elections

Mr. Soper made the motion "That we elect Mike Barber as Chairman." Mr. Hamilton supported the motion.

Voice vote:
Ayes: all
Nays: none
Motion approved unanimously.

Mr. Hamilton made the motion "That we nominate Ted Soper as Vice Chairman." Ms. Williams supported the motion.

Voice Vote:
Ayes: all
Nays: none
Motion approved unanimously.

Mr. Barber made the motion "To nominate Laura James to Secretary." Mr. Soper supported the motion.

Voice Vote:
Ayes: all
Nays: none
Motion approved unanimously.

4. Date for Master Plan Public Hearing

The Planning Commission discussed and changed the date of the Master Plan Public Hearing to March 27th, 2006.

Mr. Barber adjourned the meeting at 7:40 P.M.

Respectfully Submitted,

Catherine Culver

Catherine Culver
Recording Secretary