

Charter Township of Lyon
Planning Commission
Meeting Minutes
May 23, 2016

Approved: June 27, 2016

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

Roll Call: Patricia Carcone, Board Liaison
Jim Chuck
Michael Conflitti, Chairman
Kris Enlow, Secretary
Stephan Hoffman
Kurt Radke
Carl Towne, Vice-Chairman

Guests: 35+

Also Present: Leann Kimberlin, Township Attorney
Chris Doozan, McKenna Associates
Leslie Zawada, Civil Engineering Solutions
Tina Archer, DDA Administrator/Econ. Dev. Coordinator

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

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

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

MOTION APPROVED

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

A. Approval of the April 25, 2016 Minutes

Mr. Chuck made a correction to the minutes.

**Motion by Towne, second by Carcone
To approve the April 25, 2016 minutes as revised.**

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

MOTION APPROVED

COMMENTS FROM PUBLIC ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Mr. Chuck explained that the weekend after this weekend is the 8th annual Kite Festival, and it is a fun family environment. The hours are Saturday 10 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. and Sunday 10:00 a.m. 3:00 p.m.

DDA REPORT – Ms. Archer brought the Planning Commission up to date regarding activities in the DDA.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- 1. AP-16-16b, Tim Horton's Plaza – Special Land Use. Property located on the west side of Pontiac Trail, north of 8 Mile Road. Public hearing to consider a special land use request to allow two proposed businesses to have drive-thru windows in the B-2 District.**

Mr. Doozan reviewed the McKenna Associates memo dated May 9, 2016 for the site plan. He explained based on their review they recommend approval of the Tim Horton's Plaza site plan subject to the following conditions.

1. Manufacturer's spec sheets for the exterior lighting shall be submitted.
2. The sign for the barrier-free space must be relocated, as noted in item 6.
3. Architectural plans for the Tim Horton's building must be sealed by an architect licensed in Michigan.
4. The plans are subject to review and approval by the Township Engineer and Township Attorney.

Mr. Doozan reviewed the McKenna Associates memo dated May 23, 2016 referring to the special land use. He explained based on the findings presented in the memo, they recommend that the Planning Commission recommend special land use approval for Tim Horton's Plaza to the Township Board, subject to the following conditions:

1. The plans must be revised to address the issues cited in the site plan review letter.
2. The plans are subject to the Township Engineer and Township Attorney approval.

Ms. Zawada reviewed the CES memo dated May 4, 2016. She explained the main concern is the outlet from the detention basin and they would like to review that further during detailed engineering review. More of this outlet may need to be enclosed in a pipe.

Ms. Kimberlin referenced her memo dated May 5, 2016 where it references proof of property ownership and the necessity for a lot split. The applicant explained that the information had been provided as part of the parcel lot application, Mr. Doozan confirmed receipt of that document.

Mr. Patrick Bell provided a PowerPoint presentation. He explained they are getting back to the feel of a coffee shop. There are natural color tones and they are sticking to the branded colors. The southern building is a two tenant building, and they have not determined tenants for that building but are in discussions with national businesses.

The site itself works really well.

Mr. Towne questioned the cut throughs and commented that they don't seem to be lined up. There is a problem with the radius. He would like the engineer to take a look at that. He also felt the drive-thru was too narrow; it needed a softer curb. Mr. Bell stated that they can look at that, but it is constraining. He also had no issue with the engineer checking the radius. Mr. Towne also felt that the façade was not attractive.

Mr. Hoffman stated that they have brand standards and try to make it a unifying look. He appreciated the stone; he was not a fan of the clapboard look. He had more of an issue with the stacking of cars. He did not like the boulevard and felt it was taking up valuable space. Mr. Bell stated it is separation from the drive thru. Mr. Hoffman stated that there needs to be an escape route with soft curbs. Mr. Bell stated they can do a soft curb but felt there needed to be a separation.

Mr. Towne asked why they need another coffee shop in that area. Mr. Bell stated it creates another dining opportunity in that area. This is affordable coffee and is a great gathering place for the community. Mr. Towne stated that they want a building that looks attractive. Mr. Bell stated that they can do the building in full brick. As far as changing anything else, it would be very difficult to do.

Mr. Chuck stated that the location is a focal point and has to look good. He questioned why they wouldn't want two ingresses and egresses. Mr. Doozan stated that, in terms of traffic safety, it is the number of curb cuts. The whole purpose is to limit and reduce the number of curb cuts because those are the accident points. Mr. Chuck questioned where the outdoor seating would be located. Mr. Bell stated it would be located on the front of the building. Mr. Chuck asked what kind of screening would be used. Mr. Bell provided an example from an existing Tim Horton's.

Mr. Towne questioned the garbage removal and what kind of tree planting, sound boarding, and hours of operation are planned. He felt something should be done for Quail Run as far as landscaping. Mr. Bell stated as far as north of the drive it is not their property. He agreed they can do evergreens, no problem. There are blackout times for delivery and trash removal, roughly from opening 5:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m. There are no deliveries or trash during that time or 6:00 p.m. to close.

Mr. Conflitti asked for the applicant to address the parking lot further. He questioned deliveries as well. Mr. Bell stated that deliveries should not happen during those time periods. He explained it is a delicate balance.

**Motion by Towne, second by Chuck
To open the public hearing at 7:42 p.m.**

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

MOTION APPROVED

Mary Ann Gingrich, 22215 Quail Run Drive, #5. Ms. Gingrich stated she is representing Quail Run. They are primarily older folks who would be further hassled by the additional traffic and noise around the clock. She explained the semi-trucks think their complex is the access drive for the Dollar Tree complex, and they back up and take out their trees/shrubs. The homeowners are stuck with the bill if the trucks aren't caught. When trying to get out, it can take 10 minutes to get onto Pontiac Trail. They are not anti-Tim Horton's but would like a 3rd lane put in. They would like a barrier wall for noise abatement. The western boundary should also have sound barrier properties, they even get a lot of noise from McDonalds, traffic and radios. Pontiac Trail should be widened. Sidewalks would also be good to enhance pedestrian safety.

Stephen Emsley, 51824 Eight Mile – Mr. Emsley stated he felt it was a good discussion. Although the other building on the site was discussed, it's twice as large. He thought the Tim Horton's was approvable but didn't think building number two had been discussed enough.

**Motion by Chuck, second by Towne
To close the public hearing at 7:48 p.m.**

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

MOTION APPROVED

Treasurer Carcone commented that she is in favor of having the building be all brick. She thought the outside seating was nice. She understood the branding. She is in favor of this and felt the community would enjoy it. She is concerned with Quail Run and felt that anything that can be provided to help them is necessary. She agreed with the drive-thru recommendations.

Mr. Enlow questioned if the outdoor fencing will be added to the landscape plan. Mr. Bell stated yes. Mr. Enlow stated he is in favor of the all brick façade. He also agreed that the radius should be cleaned up, as it would make it easier to navigate the site. The turn lane would get picked up by the Road Commission at their review. As far as sound proofing goes, he agrees with the wall being done on the northern parcel once that comes through, on the west, any type of evergreens would help. He questioned the second building and if they would have to come back based on the tenant. Mr. Doozan stated if it fits into the building then they do not have to come back. If the tenant does not fit, then they would need to come back.

Mr. Chuck agreed about the landscaping and soundproofing; the Township wants the applicant to be a good neighbor to Quail Run. He would like to see a vinyl or composite fence for the dumpster enclosure. Mr. Bell agreed.

Mr. Radke stated he agreed with the full brick, soft curbing, and evergreen trees.

Mr. Towne stated that plans are so deceiving. He wants to make sure that they line up and have an appropriate turning length. Mr. Doozan agreed that the boulevard to the north should be cut and the opening shifted to the west.

Motion by Chuck, second by Enlow

Move to approve AP-16-16a Site Plan based upon McKenna Associates memo dated April 19, 2016 and May 23, 2016. The CES memo dated May 4, 2016 and the Attorney memo dated May 5, 2016. Also, including the all brick façade, the vinyl dumpster enclosure, the soft curbing in the drive thru and anything that can buffer the sound from Quail Run.

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

MOTION APPROVED

Motion by Towne, second by Radke

To recommend approval of the special land use AP-16-16b. The special land use meets all nine criteria for special land use. The Commission has looked at the need base and the outdoor seating.

**Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Unanimous
Nays: None**

MOTION APPROVED

- 2. AP-16-13, The Heights at Elkow Farms – PD Amendment. Property located at the north side of 11 Mile Road, west of Milford Road. Public hearing to consider a proposed amendment to remove the woodchip paths, replace the stub street with a sidewalk, and increase the number of remaining phases.**

Mr. Doozan reviewed the McKenna Associates memo dated May 11, 2016. Following the public hearing, he commended that the Planning Commission recommend approval of this amendment to the Planned Development for the Heights of Elkow Farms to the Township Board, subject to the following conditions:

1. The Planned Development plan must be reviewed to illustrate the stub street.
2. The amendment shall comply with all conditions cited by the township Engineer and Township Attorney.

Ms. Zawada referenced the CES memo dated May 20, 2016. She explained there is a tot lot proposed north of lot 17 on sheet LP-1. Per the proposed phasing plan this would be installed as part of phase 6. The existing residents in the Heights at Elkow Farms have requested this be installed sooner. This should be discussed.

Ms. Kimberlin explained her concerns regarding the Master Deed were resolved.

Mr. Elkow stated he is concerned about the tot lot going in because of the further development and safety issues. Treasurer Carcone stated that the people want it and it should go in. Mr. Elkow stated he has struggled moving forward due to the prepayment of the sewer taps. He did not think they would get in the ground this year for phase 4.

Treasurer Carcone stated she has gotten a lot of emails regarding the state of the existing tot lot. Many of the emails stated there is a lot of grass growing in the tot lot and a lot of rocks. She stated that he has to maintain the development, people live by these open areas. Mr. Elkow stated that he was not allowed to get permits, inspections and he was forced to dig out around the tot lot that was perfectly good and it was brought back into disrepair. Treasurer Carcone disagreed.

**Motion by Enlow, second by Towne
To open the public hearing at 8:20 p.m.**

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

MOTION APPROVED

Stephen Emsley, 51834 Eight Mile. Mr. Emsley is concerned with the timing of the roads being built. Without the loop road being there, it is not safe for anyone to live there. This is getting chopped down into very small sections which would be potential safety issues. It is inappropriate to go 10 phases or the road should be built out.

Mr. Doozan stated in every development there is phasing with portions of the road being developed.

Terry Oplinger, 26249 International Drive - Mr. Oplinger is a member of the Board of Directors for the association. The number of phases is unacceptable. The cost of the taps is a severe detriment to builders in this area. Just down the street there are other builders building spec homes without buyers. When you have a builder that wants to build homes, that hurts the builders and the residents. He is not looking forward to 5 more years of construction. He felt a special assessment district should be created to address this, and it needs to be resolved before spring time. Lack of a construction entrance is a concern, but there are options that should be discussed. As it stands they already get plenty of traffic out of his driveway. Something needs to be decided. The way it's done today is not acceptable. The Planning Commission and Lyon Township need to take responsibility for that. We really have put the homes, children, and families at risk. They cannot have simple services, like trash pickup. If they have the trucks back out of the street or they pull into his driveway and cause damage, that's not going to work. He doesn't have a six inch concrete driveway and he has concern that it won't hold up.

Brad Ward, 58285 McCormick Court – Mr. Ward has been a resident since 2007. Since that time, they have been plagued with issues from the developer. To allow this request would only reward this bad behavior. This road needs to be completed and turned over to the residents. International Drive boundaries two ends of the subdivision. Emergency vehicles go to one side and have to turn around to get to the other side; something needs to be done to connect those two ends of the road. It is a safety issue. The road integrity becomes an issue as well. The road condition is already starting to deteriorate. To extend the building out 5-10 years only extends the frustration of the homeowners that are already there along with the noise, traffic, and debris. The

Planning Commission should deny the amendment to the plan.

John Scheel, 26234 Great Plains Drive – Mr. Scheel is on Mr. Elkow's side. He was there when the Township told him to put in the sidewalk. The common area is a constant battle, there are plenty of other common areas that are still unacceptable to the homeowners. There are rocks, mounds of dirt that were grassed over, and top soil was not put down before grass was planted. When the farming does stop, what will be the barrier between the farming and the homeowners? How does the farming equipment get back there and farm? International Drive won't be connected until phase 8 so if the road is not being connected, when does the road go in for phase 10? He would like to hear from the Fire Chief the amount of feet needed in order to back up. When do common areas need to be finished and what kind of condition should they be in? He encouraged everyone to come out and look at the common areas.

Jayne Moerdyke, 58183 International Drive – Ms. Moerdyke stated that the biggest thing is the grass common area. Her lot ends 10 feet after her patio ends. There is just dirt. She paid a lot of money for landscaping, but her property backs up to weeds. Her son also has asthma, so she is concerned with the pesticides. She felt at the bare minimum the grass should be completed. All the neighborhood kids are the right age for the tot lot. If the tot lot is not built now and instead 6-8 years down the road, the majority of the kids in the neighborhood would be too old to use it.

**Motion by Towne, second by Hoffman
To close the public hearing at 8:38 p.m.**

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

MOTION APPROVED

Mr. Enlow stated there looks to be 11 new phases. It sounds like the sewer taps are driving this, since those have to be paid up front. He wondered if this is something that could be amended in the sewer ordinance. Ms. Zawada explained It's not as simple as modifying the ordinance, due to the agreement with Lyon Wastewater.

Mr. Enlow felt the tot lot going in now is reasonable. He stated they should keep the stub street for the school and have the wood chip path become a sidewalk. He asked if there are temporary turnarounds at the end of each phase, Mr. Doozan stated yes.

Mr. Enlow stated they used to have the farmers come in and give them a plan, and it was pushed to administration committee. He questioned when does it end and what is sprayed. Ms. Zawada stated the farming is allowed by right in this PD agreement. There is not a limit or a distance from the phase lines; it's just allowed. Mr. Enlow stated he is mainly concerned with the number of phases.

Mr. Towne explained that they work through the process to make sure everyone gets a fair shake. He can't approve the extra phases without the road work being done. Some phasing has to take place where the road work is done. They have to be practical, do they need a tot lot or to have the road done? There is no excuse for the common areas.

There are too many odd items that need to be taken care of before adding extra phases. He is not ready to vote on this.

Mr. Chuck stated he has heard about the rocks, and the common areas are atrocious. He has never heard of 10 phases. He will not be supporting this. He likes the stub road and supports the tot lot but not ten phases.

Mr. Hoffman questioned the original number of phases. To listen to the trucks for years on end would make him angry. Maybe there are solutions for construction access to ease some of the problems. He can't let financial issues decide this way of life.

There was brief discussion regarding the original number of phases that were approved.

Mr. Doozan explained he did get one of the emails and is aware of the maintenance issues, since they have been ongoing. The roads are a serious issue. Mr. Radke stated he didn't see how they can move forward without knowing what is critical. Mr. Doozan stated that they can deal with what happens at the end of the road with a cul-de-sac, or a "T" turn around so the trucks aren't using someone's driveway and they maintain the continuity of the street. The maintenance issue is a separate issue from what is on the table tonight.

Mr. Elkow stated the roads are eleven years old and look better than most of the roads out there. If they are looking at sales, he is on top of Rodeo Drive, so he knows he is doing something right. He never led anyone astray. He thinks they are wrong about this SAD, the risk is not bad. If the association will agree to maintain them, he will widen them. They need to have standards. The soil is a gravel pit. They have hired people to come in and spruce up the common areas, so he doesn't understand why they are not acceptable. They do not use pesticides other than Round Up. They are farmers and grow soy beans only. He can do the tot lot. The phasing plan calls for cul-de-sacs in the next 3 phases. He put in stone to make an area for the trucks to turn around.

Mr. Towne stated he sees no commitment; we need a stronger plan. He is not going to approve this. If the common areas need 4 inches of top soil then that's what you have to do.

Ms. Kimberlin suggested tabling it to come back with a more definite plan.

Treasurer Carcone stated she didn't like that Mr. Elkow was putting the SADs on the Township's back; it's not fair.

Motion by Towne, second by Chuck

To deny the request of AP-16-13 The Heights of Elkow Farms PD amendment for the following reasons: there is no fluidity in the road system and it's causing danger for the residents with garbage trucks having to back up; International Drive has to be finished or turnarounds installed in order to phase in extra phases; common areas must be completed to the liking of the HOA; tot lot must be installed.

Roll Call Vote: Ayes: Unanimous

Nays: None

MOTION APPROVED

OLD BUSINESS

3. **AP-15-33, Look Self Storage – Site Plan. Property located on the northwest corner of Griswold Road and Oasis Center Drive. Site plan review of a proposed 38,550 square foot self-storage facility.**

Mr. Doozan reviewed the McKenna Associates memo dated May 2, 2016. He explained the following issues remain to be resolved on the Look Self Storage site plan:

1. The fence in front of the building must be relocated.
2. Wall details are required.
3. The trash dumpster must comply with required setbacks.
4. The freestanding sign must be relocated to comply with the 15-foot front yard setback.
5. The maneuvering lane at the front of the facility must be increased to 24 feet in width.
6. An additional 260 sw. ft. of interior parking lot landscaping must be provided.
7. The location and screening of HVAC equipment must be specified.

Mr. Doozan also reviewed the McKenna Associates memo dated April 6, 2016 referring to the special land use.

Mr. Doozan explained the findings presented above indicated that, in its present form, the proposed Look Self Storage facility does not satisfy the special land use requirements set forth in the Zoning Ordinance. Our principal concerns are non-compliance with site plan review requirements and the level of need for such a facility.

It is recommended that the applicant work toward addressing the site plan review concerns and provide documentation regarding the need for a facility of this size. In the meantime, it is recommended that the Planning Commission table this case.

Ms. Zawada referenced the CES memo dated May 5, 2016.

She reviewed the following concerns:

1. There is a significant retaining wall along the Yerkes drain from 2.0 feet to 6.5 feet in height. . Some additional detail top and bottom of proposed wall grades for each side will be required for detail engineering plan review. Along with structural calculations for all walls over 2.5 feet in height. A railing or guard rail may also be required.
2. The spillway must be relocated it cannot flow over the retaining wall.
3. Parking along the top of retaining wall will not be allowed unless there is a barrier or guard rail.
4. All detention sizing and restricted outlet calculations must be revised based upon the total area contributing.

Francesca Aragona with Designhaus Architecture explained it is a decorative metal fence. The dumpster location is within the building setbacks and is within 28 feet of the nearest building. The photometric plan was fixed. The freestanding signs were removed, now there are two signs on the frontage and both signs are in compliance. The parking lot landscaping was revised so they are now in compliance. Made the trees more uniform along the frontage. The parking and circulation are compliant now as well. The HVAC will be screened by a 48" white parapet wall and will not be seen.

Mr. Doozan stated it looked like the concerns were on point.

Motion by Towne, second by Chuck

To approve the site plan AP-15-33, referencing CES memo dated 5/5/16.

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous

Nays: None

MOTION APPROVED

Motion by Towne, second by Radke

To approve special land use AP-15-53 contingent of meeting all engineering standards and producing documentation of the site plan.

Voice Vote: Ayes: Unanimous

Nays: None

MOTION APPROVED

Mr. Conflitti called for a short recess at 9:39 p.m. and called the meeting back to order at 9:47 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS

- 4. AP-12-16, The Woodlands of Lyon PD – Final Review. Property locate on the north side of 9 Mile Road, east of Griswold Road. Final review of a proposed planned development consisting of 103 single-family homes on 120 acres.**

Mr. Doozan reviewed the McKenna Associates memo dated May 6, 2015. He recommended that the plans be revised to address the concerns identified above in our Final Plan Review. Because the plans are intended to be in their final, completed form at the final planned development stage, he recommended that the table this case until the revisions have been made.

Ms. Zawada referenced the CES memo dated May 19, 2016. She explained the language will need to be inserted pertaining to the time table for construction of a water main loop into Stoneleigh West. The applicant has agreed to construction within two years of the phase 1 pre-con meeting, and we find this acceptable. The remaining items were minor. She explained that Mr. Arkin agreed to extend the boulevard into

Rachel Drive at incredible expense.

Ms. Kimberlin explained that the signage and the lighting need to be addressed at this stage.

Mr. Bennett gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the plan. He explained that this project began in 2012. He explained they do not have a development partner right now, so they do not have a minimum or maximum house size. It was suggested to him by their potential developer to not put in a sign because whoever develops it will change it anyway. The lighting portion is his fault; he didn't know it was required. Mr. Doozan suggested a decorative light pole at the entrance. Mr. Bennett stated that the landscape plan will be fixed except that they had an issue with the front plantings due to the gas main.

Mr. Bennet asked that the Planning Commission move this forward to the Township Board subject to them addressing the issues with the landscaping plan and will provide a minimum and maximum house size on the PD Agreement. They have no problem putting in language in the PD Agreement so the future developer is aware of that. He stated that the access roads will be referenced on the plans, and he will add a note on the layout plan referencing the engineering plan.

Mr. Enlow stated that they are asking them to approve a subdivision without seeing the homes and he didn't know if he could do that. Mr. Bennett stated that could be placed in the PD Agreement that those have to be shown before they can move forward, he thought that was a fair request. Mr. Enlow stated the final should be a final plan and it's not.

Treasurer Carcone gave high regards to Mr. Arkin and questioned how they can help move it forward since every single thing has been taken care of. Mr. Doozan stated if they are comfortable they can make a recommendation contingent on submitting revised plans prior to it going to the Board.

Motion by Chuck, second by Hoffman

To recommend approval to the Board of AP-12-16, The Woodlands of Lyon contingent upon having the revised plans submitted prior to going to the Board showing the minimum size of homes, based on all discussion and the CES memo dated May 19, 2016 and the McKenna Associates memo dated May 6, 2016.

Voice Vote: Ayes: 6

Nays: Towne

MOTION APPROVED

- 5. AP-16-18, PC Server and Parts Company – Warehouse Expansion, Property located on the north side of Grand River Avenue, east of Lyon Center Drive East. Site plan review of a proposed 7,500 square foot warehouse expansion.**

Mr. Doozan reviewed the McKenna Associates memo dated May 10, 2016 with the following recommendation that the Planning Commission approve the site plan for PC Server and Parts subject to the following conditions:

1. The trash enclosure must be relocated a minimum of ten feet from the building.
2. The landscape plan must indicate the type of groundcover to be used in the parking lot landscaped area.
3. The plans must comply with the Township Engineer's recommendations, including those related to storm water management.
4. The plans are subject to Township Attorney review.

Ms. Zawada referenced the CES memo dated May 18, 2016. She agreed that a waiver from the storm water retention volume requirements is needed as well as other requirements. In the Engineering Standard 15-27 that waiver of the requirements may be considered by the Planning Commission. They have never waived anything except at the Township Board level, but it is in the Engineering Standards and is very odd. She thinks it's unusual. Since the storm water is not increasing, she didn't know if a variance was needed except for the requirement. She also noted that there is sanitary sewer available to this property, and they may be required to connect to it.

Ms. Kimberlin referenced the memo dated May 13, 2016, the parking issue requiring a variance from the ZBA due to the expansion of the use.

Mr. Diffin gave a brief PowerPoint presentation regarding the project. This is an irregularly shaped lot. They are proposing landscaping in the areas that are reasonable. There is an existing retention area, and they have tried to size it as large as possible since there is no storm water outlet. He explained that the owner will have to go elsewhere since his business is growing.

Mr. Diffin confirmed all of the outside storage will be stored inside.

Mr. Zygnier explained they do have a normal dumpster inside a wooden fence. He explained their water is dissipating, they mow the pond, they are doing the large pond for no reason, he doesn't even think they need it. He has looked into buying the property to the west, but the property was leeching so it will have to be a brown zone.

Mr. Enlow stated they are making things better by expanding the pond; he is comfortable with it.

Motion by Radke, second by Carcone

To recommend approval of AP-16-18, PC Server and Parts Company – Warehouse Expansion to accept the plans based on McKenna Associates memo dated May 10, 2016, CES memo dated May 18, 2016 and Attorney memo dated May 13, 2016 and including waiving the engineering design standards regarding the retention basin.

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

MOTION APPROVED

6. **AP-16-19, Silver Lake Meadows PD – Conceptual Review. Property located at the southeast center of Silver Lake Road and Pontiac Trail. Conceptual review of a proposed planned development consisting of 75 single family homes on 62 acres.**

Mr. Doozan reviewed the May 3, 2016 McKenna Associates memo and concluded that they are pleased with the layout and design of Silver Lake Meadows. Several amenities are proposed that they have not seen in other Planned Developments. The street pattern is easy to comprehend, but at the same time, it achieves the curvilinear aspect that is desired by many. The plan respects the concerns of neighbors by providing a 50 ft. buffer from Deer Creek Subdivision and by preserving the tree line adjacent to Martindale Meadows.

This review has revealed two principle concerns; relationship to the Master Plan and density of development. He recommended that the Planning Commission focus attention on these issues during its review. Meanwhile, they recommend that the applicant address the revisions and provide additional information as called for in the review letter.

Steve Deak provided a PowerPoint presentation highlighting the proposed project consisting of 75 single family homes.

Mr. Enlow commented that the PC has held firm on the density with the other two plans that were before them on this parcel. The main focus is the density, 42% is the most we've seen in a while, especially when the PD only allows for 5% with substantial benefit. There are 53 homes in the parallel plan; 56 homes is the most he would be willing to give, along with receiving good benefits like traffic improvements.

Mr. Towne stated he agreed but he liked the plan. Density is an issue, and he felt 56 homes is a good starting point regarding density.

Mr. Hoffman stated the benefits presented were self-serving, but he liked the plan but with less density.

Mr. Chuck agreed with the density, he felt it was too much. Mr. Radke agreed.

Lise Blades, 29885 Glynn Lee Court – Ms. Blades is concerned with the basin near her road. In the spring sometimes the front of her road is very soft and can become impassable. She asked if that huge basin would change the drainage near her road. She commented that the sidewalk on the plan is a sidewalk to nowhere.

NEW BUSINESS - None

COMMUNITY REPORTS - Treasurer Carcone reported that the Legacy of Lyon received preliminary PD approval by the Board of Trustees. The project went from 48 to 44 units and will require age deed restrictions.

ADJOURNMENT

**Motion by Enlow, second by Chuck
To adjourn the meeting at 12:02 a.m.**

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

MOTION APPROVED

The Planning Commission meeting was adjourned at 12:02 a.m. due to no further business.

Respectfully Submitted,

Kellie Angelosanto

Kellie Angelosanto
Recording Secretary