

Charter Township of Lyon
Planning Commission
Regular Meeting Minutes
November 24, 2014

Approved: December 22, 2014

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Conflitti at 7:00 p.m.

Roll Call: Ed Campbell
Jim Chuck
Michael Conflitti, Chairman
Stephan Hoffman
Sean O'Neil, Board Liaison
Carl Towne, Vice-Chairman

Absent: Kris Enlow

Guests: 7

Also Present: Jennifer Elowsky, Township Attorney
Chris Doozan, McKenna Associates
Leslie Zawada, Civil Engineering Solutions

**Motion by Conflitti, second by Chuck
To excuse the absence of Kris Enlow.**

**Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nays: None**

MOTION APPROVED

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

**Motion by Chuck, second by Campbell
To approve the agenda as presented.**

**Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nays: None**

MOTION APPROVED

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of the November 10, 2014 minutes.

Motion by Towne, second by Campbell

To approve the Consent Agenda as presented.

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nays: None

MOTION APPROVED

COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC- None

DDA REPORT - None

Mr. Chuck suggested starting the Planning Commission's meeting 30 minutes earlier in order to hold a type of workshop meeting prior to the regular meeting which starts at 7:00 p.m. The Commission decided against meeting 30 minutes prior.

PUBLIC HEARINGS – None

OLD BUSINESS - None

NEW BUSINESS

1. **AP-14-55, Charlevoix Place PD – Conceptual Review. Property located on the northwest corner of 9 Mile Road and Napier Road. Conceptual review of a proposed single family residential development consisting of 34 homes on 24.4 acres.**

Representing Charlevoix Place – Bruce Michael

Mr. Doozan reviewed the McKenna Associates memo dated 11/7/14. The review letter has identified issues that must be addressed before this proposal can move through the review process. He recommended that the plans be reviewed to address the deficiencies identified in the McKenna mem. No action shall be taken by the Planning Commission at the conceptual review stage. Instead, the Commission shall offer advice to the applicant on the issues presented in the memo.

Ms. Zawada reviewed the CES memo dated November 3, 2014 along with the revised letter dated November 10, 2014. She also explained that the 3 applicants that are before the Planning Commission are working together on a regional water and sewer plan to accommodate all of the developments. That is not final yet and the legal documents are being worked on now. She reviewed the following concerns:

1. CES is in the process of verifying if the existing 15 inch gravity sewer in 9 Mile Road at the Kirkway entrances has capacity and depth available for this development. This existing sewer is approximately 1,700 feet west of the subject property. The Township Master Sewer Plan depicts a portion of this proposed connection as a force main.
2. The sediment forebays will be required for any ponds outletting to a regulated wetland.

3. The storm water calculations must be revised to reflect a discharge of 0.10 cfs/ac.
4. The plans will also need conceptual grading to determine feasibility. Approval from the MDEQ shall be required for this development for work in the wetlands that appear to be regulated.
5. While non-regulated wetlands are allowed on lots, the site has several lots with regulated wetlands extending into them, which will affect the layout. Those should be revised prior to submitting the preliminary PD documents for review.

Mr. Michael, representing the application, explained that two of these projects are located in the Northville school district with the price points in the mid \$500,000 range and with the house sizes approaching 3,000 sq. feet. They have been working together to come up with a solution to the utility situation. There are 5 different property owners that will co-venture together in sharing the cost of extending the water and sewer lines. There are draft agreements right now that should be coming forward shortly.

Mr. Campbell commented that they are looking at incremental density. He liked the consortium idea, but he did not see much usable open space. He would like to see more usable open space such as a tot lot or park type setting. He does like the way it flows and felt that they were on the right track.

Mr. Michael explained that he was trying to understand the comment of “usable open space.” One of the concepts that were discussed was to create a continuous pedestrian walkway that walks around the wetland area. Mr. Campbell stated that unless that area was actually like an asphalt pathway, he has seen that backyards tend to grow into the common area.

Mr. Towne thought the lots should be larger. He asked if this would be a phased development. Mr. Michael stated that this is a smaller project, so it will probably be done all at once. Mr. Towne stated he would like to see some buffering done, have the lots made bigger, and take all of the comments from the Engineer and Planner. It could be a really nice project. He also did not want to have back-to-back side entry garages.

Mr. Chuck stated that he commended the applicant for working through the infrastructure of the water system. It is difficult to give a conceptual review when so many items are missing or need adjusting. He would need to see a lot of things, like lot sizes. He thought it was great extension from Kirkway.

Mr. Hoffman stated he liked the design, but he would like to see greater density. He is concerned about putting kids at a bus stop in the dark morning. He would like to see the pathway along Napier addressed.

Mr. O’Neil stated he would like to know where they are density wise. He agreed with all of the previous comments. He would like to see open space that would be a feature of the development, and the Napier pathway needed to be done as well.

Mr. Michael explained that he knew the path is important but questioned how they would get across all of the wetland areas. Ms. Zawada stated it didn’t make a difference if it went around the wetlands or through them. She would prefer not having a pathway

connect to a sidewalk in the development; it would need to go along the frontage.

Mr. Michael stated that all of the comments were good input, and they would consider all of them. Mr. Doozan explained that streetlights are required in the ordinance at the intersections of subdivisions streets and arterial reflector road.

2. AP-14-56, Devonshire PD – Conceptual Review. Property located on the north side of 8 Mile Road, west of Napier Road. Conceptual review of a proposed single-family residential development consisting of 90 homes on 64.11 acres.

Representing Devonshire PD – Bruce Michael

Mr. Doozan reviewed the McKenna Associates memo dated 11/12/14. Mr. Doozan concluded that the review letter identified numerous issues that must be addressed before this proposal can move through the review process. The recommendation is that the applicant revise the plans to address the deficiencies identified in the McKenna Associates memo.

Ms. Zawada referred to the CES memo dated 11/11/14 with the following concerns highlighted:

1. The soils map on sheet 2 is not legible and needs to be clarified.
2. The street names for the proposed onsite public streets will need to be added to the plans for review and approval.
3. The 100-year flood plain appears to exist at the south end of numerous lots and within the proposed roadway. The flood zone is designated by FEMA as flood zone “A”, meaning the area is subject to the 100-year flood, yet the flood elevation has yet to be determined. No compensating cut is proposed on the plans. It is recommended that the site be signed so that 100 year flood plains do not encroach within the boundaries of lots.
4. The Sump Drain may be impacted by the development, and needs to be shown and labelled on the plans.
5. Like the previous development this one will also be participating in the offsite extension of water and sewer and it will need to be shown on the plans or on a separate plan, since they will be required as part of the PD.
6. They are in process of verifying the downstream sewer capacity to the Kirkway development.
7. Sediment forebays will be required for any ponds outletting to a regulated wetland.
8. Not enough information is provided to review the feasibility of the storm water management systems. Preliminary storm water calculations pond elevations and other pertinent information should be provided.
9. The plans will need conceptual grading to determine feasibility. The addition of high and low points in the roads should be sufficient along with top of storage/bottom of storage invert elevations for the pond/inlets/outlets and culverts. The wetland line as well as the 25 foot wetland setback line needs to be shown and labelled on all plans. For several lots on sheet 7, a 15 foot setback appears to be provided rather than the typical 25 foot.

10. Approval from the MDEQ shall be required for this development for work in wetlands that appear to be regulated. The plans also need to indicate which wetlands are regulated and which are non-regulated.

Mr. Michael explained that the property to the north of them is being re-submitted again. Their intention is to provide a stub to them, and they will provide a stub to this property. That would provide a contiguous road system that goes out to Napier. Beyond that, they expect to comply with all of the other comments.

Mr. Chuck stated he felt it was a great project, but it was tough to get a handle on it without all of the information.

Mr. O'Neil questioned the road to the north. He didn't see how it would line up to the other parcel. He understood this is the first step in the process and felt that as time went on they would be able to get more specific in his comments.

Mr. Towne stated that there are some lots and felt that those needed to be bigger. Mr. Michael explained that the road to the north would be regular public street. He felt that the landscaping should be considered along the frontage in that area and to do something unique.

Mr. Hoffman questioned the street light on 8 Mile and Napier and questioned who is responsible. Mr. Doozan explained that ultimately it is the Road Commission for Oakland County. Mr. Michael stated that they did the traffic study but they haven't even thought about it yet.

Mr. Hoffman stated that the density really has no impact on that street light. Mr. Doozan stated it could have an impact. Contributions for a street light could be looked at from the developer, but they could look at that later.

Mr. Campbell stated it would have been great to have an overlay. It is a rough conceptual plan; it is hard to make comment. He had every confidence that the applicant would come back with the concerns addressed.

Steve Emsley, 51824 8 Mile Road – Mr. Emsley commented on the water and sewer lines. He explained that the Consumer Energy gas main is under the proposed road or a line of homes on the gas main. The biggest problem he has with the plan is that Consumers won't let them do that. He also commented that the land does not perk. Ms. Zawada asked if Mr. Emsley would want the water and sewer across his frontage. Mr. Emsley stated that for the future potential owners of the property, he would like to see water and sewer able to be tapped.

3. AP-14-57 Shadow Wood PD – Conceptual Review. Property located on the northwest corner of 8 Mile Road and Chubb Road. Conceptual review of a proposed single-family residential development consisting of 140 homes on 95.59 acres.

Mr. Doozan reviewed the McKenna Associates memo dated 11/12/14. The review letter identified numerous issues that must be addressed before this proposal can move

through the review process. It is recommended that the plans be revised to address the deficiencies identified in the memo.

Ms. Zawada referred to the CES memo dated November 18, 2014. She referenced the following comments:

1. Chubb Road along the frontage of the proposed development shall be paved as part of this project.
2. Street names for the onsite public streets will need to be added to the plans for review and approval.
3. CES is in the process of verifying the downstream capacity.
4. The forebay and detention basin volume calculations and sizing will be reviewed in detail during the preliminary PD review. Sediment forebays will be required for any ponds outletting to a regulated wetland.
5. The storm water calculations must be revised to reflect a discharge of 0.10cfs/ac. This will result in a greater detention volume being required. The northern 20 acres is located within the Blackwood drainage district. This district's discharge is limited to.03 cfs/acre. Both ponds currently appear to be undersized. Pond volume calculations and layout shall be required with the Preliminary PD Submittal.
6. The plans will need conceptual grading to determine feasibility. The addition of high and low points in the roads should be sufficient along with top of storage/bottom of storage invert elevations for the pond inlets/outlets and culverts.
7. Approval from the MDEQ shall be required for this development for work in wetlands that appear to be regulated. Several fills, discharges, crossings, and culverts are proposed.
8. Wetlands do not appear to be delineated on this plan. Please provide us with a wetland consultant report.

The Commissioners commented that there is a lot of work to be done on this site, and it is more challenging than the other projects. There was concern that some of the lots were too small.

Mr. Michael thanked the Commission for their comments. Mr. Healy commented on the setbacks and the usable open space.

COMMUNITY REPORTS

Mr. O'Neil brought the Commission up to date regarding the last Board meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

**Motion by Chuck, second by Campbell
To adjourn the meeting at 9:08 p.m.**

**Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nays: None**

MOTION APPROVED

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 9:08 p.m. due to no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kellie Angelosanto

Kellie Angelosanto
Recording Secretary