

**FINAL
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF COMMERCE
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

Monday, January 9, 2023
2009 Township Drive
Commerce Township, Michigan 48390

A. CALL TO ORDER: Chairperson Parel called the meeting to order at 5:30pm.

ROLL CALL: Present:

Brian Parel, Chairperson
Brian Winkler, Vice Chairperson
Joe Loskill, Secretary
Bill McKeever
George Weber

Absent: Brady Phillips (excused)
Sam Karim (excused)

Also Present: Dave Campbell, Township Planning Director
Paula Lankford, Planner
Mark Gall, Fire Marshal
Rose Kim, Staff Planner, Giffels Webster
Julia Upfal, Planner, Giffels Webster

B. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION by Loskill, supported by Weber, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Agenda of January 9, 2023, with a change to swap Items I1. and I2., with the Concept Plan Review for The Cove at Benstein Crossing to be heard before the Master Land Use Plan Review.

C. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION by Winkler, supported by Loskill, to approve the Planning Commission Regular Meeting Minutes of December 5, 2022, with the following two corrections:

1. Page 2, 2nd to the last paragraph, "lost" should be "loss"; and,
2. Page 11, 3rd paragraph, "time" should be "align".

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

D. UPDATE OF ACTIVITIES

George Weber – Township Board of Trustees

- The last Township Board meeting was on December 13th. There are a few items of note for this Commission.
- First, the Township approved the 2023 budget, and also approved the wages for the full-time elected officials. I will note that there were no increases in compensation for this Commission or any of the boards.
- The Board reappointed Mr. Winkler to the Downtown Development Authority for another 4-year term, expiring 2027.
- We approved the agreement with Oakland County for Assessing services through December 31st of 2027.
- We introduced two ordinances.
 - One is associated with Long Farm where they are looking to become what's defined as a small wine maker so they can actually sell hard apple cider from the farm. There was an amendment made to our ordinance, 1.061, that would facilitate that in the future.

- The second ordinance that was introduced was for our fees, primarily associated with SAD petitions. The Board was not in favor of increasing fees to residents for the introduction of Special Assessment Districts. The conversation centered upon that is what we should be doing and we should not make it too onerous on the residents.
- We approved all the meeting schedules as submitted for all of the boards, including the Township Board and the DDA.
- We approved Kerr Engineering for ongoing professional services, specifically in the Building Department activity from 2023 through 2026.
- That is the majority of the highlights.

Bill McKeever – Zoning Board of Appeals

- Nothing to report.
- We haven't had a meeting since our last Planning Commission meeting.

Brian Winkler – Downtown Development Authority

- The following is a summary of the December 13th DDA meeting.
- Derek Tuck was introduced as the newest member of the DDA board. He is the owner of an electrical contracting firm in the Township.
- Insite Commercial Report:
 - Parcel B1 – Phase I – Aikens Five and Main: Attorneys are working on the agreement for the gourmet market. Bruce is also working through a purchase contract for the multi-family component.
 - Parcel B1 – Phase II – Aikens Five and Main: The amendment to the purchase agreement will be addressed at the January DDA meeting. Per Attorney Martella, a draft amendment is currently making the rounds.
 - Parcel C – Pontiac Trail and Haggerty – LaFontaine Automotive Group: With the recent change in their development plan, LAG requested a 90-day extension to obtain the approvals for the PUD based on the revised development plans. The DDA approved the extension at the meeting. Director Watson provided additional details on the timeline of this development in her Director's Report.
 - Randy Thomas had nothing new to report on the remaining undeveloped parcels.
- Director's Report: In September, the DDA applied for a FY23 DNR Community Forestry Grant in hopes of supplementing a tree planting project for Martin Parkway. While we did not receive a grant this year, additional grants may be applied in the future, with potential assistance from a grant application specialist that the Parks and Recreation Department has used in the past.
- Director Watson read a resolution for Thomas Rauch, DDA Attorney, thanking him for his many contributions to the DDA and development within the Township in serving as DDA counsel over the past 22 years. They had a really nice luncheon to send him off.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you. I have a question. We talked last time we met regarding the timeline for the gourmet market within the Aikens' development. It sounds like they're negotiating and are working toward signing a lease. Does that trigger the development itself?

Vice Chairperson Winkler – Brian, I'm not sure. David might have some input, and that's also a question for Deb.

Dave Campbell – We are scheduled to be meeting with Mr. Aikens on a monthly basis to get updates on where he is with negotiating with various tenants and so-forth. We had the first of those meetings in November, and now I'm looking to Mr. Weber. We intended to have a meeting in December and it had to be rescheduled due to a conflict Mr. Aikens had.

Paula Lankford – That's tomorrow.

Dave Campbell – We're meeting with him tomorrow and hopefully we will get a better update on where he is, including with the market. Every time we talk to him, he continues to have negotiations with his residential partner. It sounds like he is zeroing in on one particular residential developer, but I don't know that they've signed a deal yet. He is shifting things around the development, and particularly along the Pontiac Trail and Martin Parkway frontage, which includes where he envisions where the gourmet market will go. And then this all goes back to the deal he has with the Township for what we call the Library Parcel, the piece of property that he is under contract with the Township to purchase, and a portion of the gourmet market would land on that Library Parcel, which he has not closed on yet. He's on his fourth or fifth extension with the Township to buy that property.

Chairperson Parel – I'd appreciate an update tomorrow, and I think all of us would. My guess is that, as we talk to people in the community, and they know our roles here, we get a lot of questions about that development.

Dave Campbell – Yes.

Loskill – And Chipotle.

Chairperson Parel – Yes.

Dave Campbell – The Chipotle question has been settled.

Chairperson Parel – We haven't seen their sign up yet.

Dave Campbell – The building is there though.

Chairperson Parel – Typically we go to Jay next for Building updates. Is there anything he passed on?

Dave Campbell – I didn't have much of a chance to talk to Jay. I was out of the office last week.

Paula Lankford – The December Building report for commercial was handed out, and it was just one item.

Dave Campbell – I know that he and Fire Marshal Gall are in the process of doing their annual reviews of all the Class C liquor licenses in the Township. They started that today, so that is where Jay spent the bulk of his time today.

Chairperson Parel – Do we have good progress on the Clark station in the Village?

Paula Lankford – Marathon.

Dave Campbell – It used to be Clark; now it's Marathon and it will remain as such. They are making good progress on construction. We were recently contacted by the sign company for the Marathon operator, confirming what they can and can't do with respect to the ground sign, wall signage and canopy signs. I believe at one point the owners were hoping to have the place back up and running in February. From what I've seen, it's a good-looking building and an improvement to the Village area.

E. PUBLIC DISCUSSION OF MATTERS NOT ON THE AGENDA

Chairperson Parel opened to Public Discussion of Matters Not on the Agenda.

Ray Golota, 1595 Vanstone, Commerce Township, MI – Dave, where is the new Chipotle?

Dave Campbell – At Midtown on Haggerty, at 14 Mile and Haggerty Road, north of Kroger. There are three retail buildings out front and within one of those will be a Chipotle.

Ray Golota – Great, thank you.

Chairperson Parel – Another excited fan of Chipotle.

Dave Campbell – If I had known ... that's all it takes to make my constituents happy is to find a place for a Chipotle.

Chairperson Parel closed Public Discussion of Matters Not on the Agenda.

F. TABLED ITEMS

None.

G. OLD BUSINESS

None.

H. SCHEDULED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

None.

I. NEW BUSINESS (2):

>>Items 11. and 12. were reversed on the agenda under approval of the agenda.

ITEM 12. CONCEPT PLAN REVIEW – The Cove at Benstein Crossing

Dave Campbell – The property that the prospective developer is looking at is on the east side of Benstein Road just north of Loon Lake Road. (Dave presented the aerial on

the overhead.) This site is currently occupied by a farmhouse and an outbuilding, and what most people recognize along this stretch of road which is the silo. The address is 1420 Benstein Road.

The developer is considering a development not unlike those that bookend it both the north and to the south, and to the east as well, which is for-sale attached condominiums or for-sale duplexes. They envision 18 units within 9 duplex buildings, tentatively called The Cove at Benstein Crossing. So, Benstein Crossing is to the south, which was done by the same developer, M. Shapiro Real Estate, back in the mid-2000's, and then a different developer did the Benstein Commons development to the north. Both of those developments and what is being proposed are comparable with respect to being duplex units.

The property is currently zoned R-1B which is a single-family zoning district and any form of attached residential is not a permitted use in the single-family zoning districts. So, what the developer would need to do to bring this project to fruition is to amend the zoning for this property. The property is about 4.25 acres, but as you can see that gross acreage includes the property line going out to the centerline of Benstein Road, so the net acreage is going to be less than that.

The property would have to be rezoned to R-2 attached zoning district, which is the zoning district that specifically envisions duplex units. We've had a couple conversations with the prospective developer about whether they would want to do it as a straight rezoning or as a Conditional Rezoning. They've said that even if they did a straight rezoning, what they're proposing is probably the only realistic and feasible development for that property, so a Conditional Rezoning might be unnecessary. However, the Township might want to consider the conditions that come along with a Conditional Rezoning and those might the developer volunteering to only do the attached units and not some of the other uses that are permitted in the R-2 zoning district. There could be conditions relative to building materials, landscape and so-forth. Those are conversations that could be had as part of this conceptual discussion.

There would be one point of access off Benstein Road. There would be a total of 9 buildings, each with 2 units for a total of 18 units. The cul-de-sac is off Benstein Road with a detention pond toward the southeast corner of the property. The developer also provided conceptual building elevations. As you can see, it looks like a combination of 1.5 and 2-story units, with the front elevations comprised of high-end materials, shake, siding material, brick and stone; aesthetically pleasing architecture and building materials. I think the developer is doing units comparable to these in a project they're doing in Brighton Township at Grand River and Hilton Road. Do you have any of those off the ground?

Mark Kassab – No.

Dave Campbell – The intent of having this conceptual review, as the Planning Commission is well aware, is that it's a non-binding discussion amongst the developer and the Planning Commission, and neither is necessarily committing to anything. It's a good opportunity for the developer to gauge the Planning Commission's interest in the project and their level of acceptance as far as the rezoning aspect. Getting the appropriate zoning would be the first hurdle to clear with a project like this. Since we are going to discuss our Master Plan update a little bit later in this meeting, this property is designated on the Township's current Future Land Use Map as single-family and 3.5 units per acre, which is a land use designation that's consistent with the zoning of R-1B.

That's obviously always a consideration for the Planning Commission and the Township Board anytime someone petitions to rezone property.

Mark Kassab, M. Shapiro Real Estate Group, 31550 Northwestern Hwy, Farmington Hills, MI – A little history on this parcel. When we did Benstein in the early 2000's, we actually tried to acquire this parcel to unify that entire area, with the approximate 136 units to the south and to the east. The owner of that home was the original builder of that home. They are since deceased, Mr. and Mrs. Turner, and we are dealing with his children now with the estate. The home is vacant. They weren't ready to sell. They didn't want to get relocated and we understood that. We were good neighbors with them.

The home has been vacant about a year now. The silo contains asbestos and is not in good condition from the report we received. We took a look at the site and quite frankly, we typically aren't developers for 18 units. We're a little bit larger scale as many of you know, but we are familiar with the area and the market, and we felt that this product is more unified with everything on the east side of Benstein. As it stands alone, an argument could be made that it's almost spot-zoned R-1B, and toward unifying it with an R-2 development, similar to what is to the north, south and east. One of the challenges when you're dealing with duplexes, these are lifestyle-change buyers. It's an all-age community. It would be whoever qualifies for a mortgage or has cash to buy. By design, these are appealing to folks who have sold a home that want to stay in the market and in the community, typically no children, but we do allow children. If this was single-family and you're surrounded by an R-2 type zoning, it's probably not the best use adjacent to you.

As Dave pointed out, we have a similar type of product that's going in in Brighton Township. We estimate these units to be selling for approximately \$400,000 to \$450,000 per unit. A little bit of work has to go into this along Benstein Road. You have the entrance to the north and the entrance to the south, at Benstein Commons and Benstein Crossings. If the board wanted us to change the name to leave Benstein out, I wouldn't be opposed to that because I think you've got too many Benstein names on that road. We could align the acceleration and deceleration lanes to make it more passable.

I'm happy to answer any questions. Again, this is just a concept plan. Density wise, if you look at the density to the north, it's considerably higher than we are. We're more inline to what's at Benstein Crossing to the south and to the east. It's going to need its own storm pond, its own road pattern and its own main entrance off Benstein Road. I think that covers it. You can look at density calculations as Dave pointed out; it's 3.5 as R-1 straight down the Master Plan, and I believe we're at 4.25. It's not considerably more, but nonetheless, there is quite a bit of work that has to go into this parcel as a standalone parcel, versus if it was tied into Benstein Crossing. We'd be able to take advantage of the same storm pond, the same entranceway, one curb cut off of Benstein Road versus adding in all of these features.

Dave Campbell – Mark, can you speak to how this would be managed? If this were to come to fruition, in my experience, you guys aren't just the property developers; you would also be the property managers moving forward.

Mark Kassab – This would not be managed by us, Dave, because it would be a condominium. It's not for-rent. It would be a for-sale product. So typically the way we

handle these is that we start off running the HOA, then we bring in a professional HOA company, similar to those running the properties to the north, south and east. That then gets turned over to the homeowners as far as what they want to do for snow plowing, maintenance and so-forth. We get it set up and funded properly, create the budgets for them, and then it's turned over to the homeowners upon certain occupancy of the units. Depending on the comments today, we're thinking the best way is with a development agreement. I understand the concern is that if this is zoned R-2, then somebody could come in with whatever uses are allowed within R-2. Certainly there are only a certain amount of ways you could develop the site, as we're showing from a duplex standpoint. We could attach a plan to a development agreement and whatever conditions the Planning Commission or the Township Board may have in addition to that would be incorporated within the development agreement.

Commission Comments:

Chairperson Parel – Dave, is it hard to pull up the Master Plan?

Dave Campbell – The Future Land Use Map?

Chairperson Parel – Yes.

Dave Campbell – It will take a moment.

Chairperson Parel – Maybe while you're doing that, we'll see if we have any questions. Bill, anything come to mind?

McKeever – I don't have any questions.

Weber – I'll tell you, when I first went through this, I was very much opposed to it. While Dave is doing that, I was going to ask him to pull up a map as well. I'll bide my time. You made two comments that have moved me a little bit, however, I'm not going to say I'm supporting of it. One is the appearance of almost spot-zoning; that resonates with me. I really like the elevations that you've provided.

When I was in Dave's office earlier and I had him pull up an aerial of this portion of the Township, showing what it looked like in 1990, and what it looks like today. The density has just gone through the roof in this part, all the way from Shearwater to Benstein Road, to Maple Road and up to McCoy, we have really jammed in a lot of homes in a relatively small geographic area.

Maybe I'll let Brian comment, and then after we look at the Future Land Use Map, Dave can pull up Property Gateway.

Dave Campbell – Yes, so I can do either one. What you're looking at here is the overall Future Land Use Map, and the distinction here is that on this version of the map, everything that is single-family is this shade of yellow. But then there's a companion map that goes with that where all of that yellow, all of which indicates single-family, is then broken into subcategories. I'll show you what those subcategories are, which have different densities envisioned. When we get back to that property, it's called the yellow subcategory which we just call single-family residential, and that's where I get the 3.5 dwelling units per acre. That is what's called for in the Future Land Use Map.

I think what Mr. Weber is asking for ...

Weber – Can you zoom out a little bit?

Dave Campbell – Here's 2020 for that property. Did you have a year in mind, Mr. Weber?

Weber – 1990, anywhere in that time frame. It's something I am cognizant of; at what point in time do we slow down, particularly in this area? I don't know the right and wrong answers, but that's my concern on rezoning. When you look at what we've done in a short 30 years, it's pretty dramatic.

Mark Kassab – That's a fair comment, Mr. Weber. I certainly am sensitive to the Township's take on density. I just want to point out, I know density is always a concern with any Commission. To Dave's comment, if you took the residential density of the Master Plan of roughly 3.5 units per acre, it's roughly .7 difference from where we are on 4 acres, so that's roughly 2 units. Again, if somebody came in on a single-family site with smaller lots to bring in a different type of product ... If I lived there next to this in that market, what would I want to see? I think the harmony of keeping duplexes on the east side of the road should be important to the Township. If this were 50 acres, or 80 acres, where a unit or two per acre would be significant, I think then I would be looking more or less at the quality of the development and what the Township can achieve with what's being proposed. As we all know, the cost of everything today is not cheap. We have a cost take-off on these units, which will be in the low to mid \$300's, so it's not like we can pop in \$199,000 units here.

Dave Campbell – Mark, you mentioned price points. Was that for the Brighton development, or for what you envision here?

Mark Kassab – It's one in the same product as you pointed out. It's going to be the same. I think Commerce is more appealing than Brighton.

Chairperson Parel – I agree.

Loskill – I think it's a good use of the area. I'm not in favor of development generally, but with everything going on to the north, south and east, it completes the picture because nothing else is going to go there. It's not something I normally would approve, but I think I would be in favor of this as long as it met all the requirements of the Township, for turning radius for the fire trucks at the end of the road and all that, so that we can make sure it's a safe subdivision for emergency vehicles to get in and out of, and as well as any other standards that we normally apply to similar style homes in the same development. If all those were followed, I'd have no problem with it.

Winkler – I think the project is a good fit for the site. It would be very hard to develop under the current zoning. The density is fine. The fact that they're all owner-occupied is fine, and the fact that it fits with the surrounding sites to the north, south and east. I don't have any objections.

Chairperson Parel – I think it's a really good-looking product. If it looks anything like your rendering when it's completed, it's beautiful. As it currently sits, and I think George used the phrase spot-zoned, it does appear that way to me. I do agree with George,

and we're learning this in our Master Plan, we do have to be considerate on the amount of development and really focus on certain areas to ensure we aren't over-developing. At the same time, I do recognize that I think this will clean up that road. I think it's a good product that fits, and we're talking about 18 units. I think I feel comfortable supporting that.

As far as the building materials, I heard you, Dave, mention Hardiboard and some other products that we like. There's no vinyl on these, right?

Mark Kassab – No vinyl. Stone, brick, Hardiplank siding. It's not a vinyl and we'll certainly work with the ordinance which was amended by the Township about a year ago. There is a product out there that's being used in a lot of nice, high-end lake homes. The concern with Hardiplank siding is the ongoing maintenance of it from an association standpoint; the freezing, thawing, shrinking, caulking and painting. So, there's a product out there which we'll share with Dave that is significantly more expensive than Hardiplank that looks like Hardiplank, but it's not. It can be painted, but painted once, or you can buy the material as the color you want. The ongoing maintenance is always a concern of the associations.

Chairperson Parel – Interesting, I appreciate that. Other than that, it sounds like we're leaning toward a Conditional Rezoning. Is that what is preferred?

Dave Campbell – That was one of my questions for Mark. I heard you reference a development agreement. Do you see that being something different than what we understand to be a Conditional Rezoning?

Mark Kassab – We would propose a development agreement to the Township which would have certain conditions. We'd attach a plan to it. If the Board elected a certain product they wanted us to utilize, we'd incorporate that. We would give the Board the surety that the site is going to be developed as proposed, with the product and density as proposed.

Dave Campbell – With the two elevations we see there, what are we looking at as far as floor plans and the number of bedrooms?

Mark Kassab – Typically when we develop these, the one on the bottom is more of a single story with a loft option. On the interior of those units, that's a loft, whereas the photo on the top is a true second story with bedrooms. Typically, if this was a different market, we would spec these and put up all 18 units, and probably be in and out of there in a year. With where the market sits today, if it continues as it is, we'll probably have a model with the loft and have a building with the second story as shown on top, and allow a user to pick. If we're going to develop a building, you've either got to do the bottom building or the top, and you can't mix the two because of the roofline elevations on them.

Dave Campbell – Any way to predict which one would be more popular?

Mark Kassab – In my opinion, the bottom one.

Weber – No stairs.

Chairperson Parel – Hopefully we gave you some good information.

Mark Kassab – You did. I appreciate your time. I know you've got another agenda item.

Dave Campbell – Is there a report about the condition of the silo?

Mark Kassab – I would caution anybody walking in there. It does contain asbestos. We're going to have to abate it and remove it properly. I have not gone in there to be very candid with you, but I even think in your aerial that a portion of that silo is missing. Paula probably knows better than anybody because she's been around a long time in this Township.

Dave Campbell – Nice.

Mark Kassab – But I don't believe it's structurally sound to continue.

Weber – It's a landmark.

Dave Campbell – Supervisor Gray has said that if the project were to move forward, he really wants that silo to be preserved.

Mark Kassab – We could donate it to the Township.

Dave Campbell – So if this is to be rezoned, which it would have to be, it would have to get approved by the Township Board as well. He will need to be convinced that there's no way to salvage that silo.

Mark Kassab – I'm sure I can get a structural engineer to give us a report and some photos that would speak to it better.

Weber – It would probably be less expensive to just have Jay go out there.

Mark Kassab – With a mask on.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you for your time.

ITEM 11. MASTER LAND USE PLAN REVIEW

Work session of the 2015 Master Land Use Plan update.

Chairperson Parel – Ladies, thank you for being patient. I appreciate it.

Dave Campbell – A package of materials were included in your agenda packet, summarizing all of the public input efforts that have been completed thus far, which was quite a coordination effort on the part of a lot of different people. I think Rose and Julia are here to summarize what we heard from our public.

Julia Upfal – Thank you so much. I really want to hand it to the Township administration for all of their efforts to get the word out and really make sure that we had ample

participation in those different community engagements. We certainly couldn't do it without you.

Rose Kim – You guys killed it.

Julia Upfal – Yes, you did a great job, and especially with the meeting toolkits. We were really happy with all the different responses we had there and how many different community organizations took the time to meet to go over that information. I'll go through some of the key points from the Open House. As I do, I think some of the key themes to really latch onto were nonmotorized transportation, open space preservation, traffic mitigation, recreation and parks, and food and entertainment options.

To begin with, all of the charts are broken down to see if the respondent was from online at the Open House, online after the Open House, and during the Open House. The main reason why this is interesting is because there were some demographic differences between the people who responded after the Open House and people who responded at the Open House. We found that those who were at the Open House were generally on the older end, and the ones who responded later were a bit younger. Also, we found that those who responded later were more likely to have kids at home. It tracks with people who might be a little bit busier and weren't available to attend in person. Those are helpful considerations when looking through the data, as far as who is responding to the questions.

After demographics, we ask people what their ideal place to live is. We did the word cloud and everybody had the opportunity to put 3-5 words into the computer which was projected onto the screen. A graphic came out that showed all of the words, graduated in size by the frequency of responses. We did gather some responses afterwards, but not very many. I think there were only three added, so it's mostly a blue chart denoting that most responses were in person. The number one characteristic was along the lines of green, natural, access to greenspace, and the second most common response was safe. I thought friendly was an interesting one to come up so many times. The question is, *What are 3-5 characteristics that describe your ideal place to live?* I do think a lot of the words that came up really resonate with Commerce Township. I found that interesting. People are living where they want to be.

At the next station, we went through the guiding themes, and we asked for the community's feedback. The theme that resonated most with the community was traffic mitigation. When asked if anything was missing, we heard a lot about preservation, preserving water quality and that it's a rural community.

At the next station, we asked the participants to respond to different housing types to fill the missing middle. We found the most popular housing type during this activity was a duplex, side-by-side, which was followed by the Cottage Court house. That was for those later in life. For new families, it was Cottage Court followed by duplex. So similar answers for both. We also had a map below showing where people felt the missing middle was missing the most in the Township. As you can see, it was really along the key corridors, which were identified as opportunities for more missing middle housing.

Weber – Do you have the housing broken down by age of response?

Julia Upfal – These were at the Open House so these were people putting stickers on the boards. We really don't know who responded specifically to each of these.

Weber – But you had at the Open House that we had an enhanced demographic of people, so even if we just split what was the Open House respondents versus what was the online respondents ...

Julia Upfal – Yes, then you can kind of see what the older demographic generally felt toward things if you look at those separately, which is why we provided the charts together.

The next two activities focused on the commercial center and the north end. I wouldn't say there was a lot of consensus in any of these questions. We got a few interesting comments in both. Some people are really interested in seeing more development and some are not. I would say that there was a clear tension in the answers. Some people were asking, *Why are we starting this now?*, while others were really interested in seeing something more urban in their community.

Chairperson Parel – I noticed on Page 7, with Station #4-Housing, under key findings it says, *The most attractive type of missing middle for later in life was “duplex, side-by-side”*, which is the housing we just looked at a few minutes ago.

Julia Upfal – Yes.

Loskill – Right.

Chairperson Parel – We gave our support for that project, and that type of product is what came up in your key findings.

Julia Upfal – Yes, and I would say that was even further demonstrated on the map. One of the comments from after the Open House is that there should be more missing middle housing at Benstein and Sleeth. The green labels, those answers weren't dots – they were written in because they were answering online after the event in a survey format. The orange ones represent dots that people actually placed on the map at the meeting.

I think both the commercial corridor and the north end had strong support for more trails, and that came out quite a bit; sidewalks, trails, bike trails. There were some comments that there's a need for bike trails and not walking trails, and some comments that there's a need for both. A strong consensus that there's an appreciation for the existing nonmotorized connections and a desire to see more.

Moving into the segment on downtown, we asked people about the different urban amenities that they would like to see and had them vote on those. We found that parking in the back was the most attractive option for a site layout, which is really consistent with a recommended best path for a more urban landscape. It's nice to see that the community is supportive of that site layout when considering a more urban commercial corridor or development.

As far as building height goes, between 2-3 stories, there wasn't really a consensus. They both received an equal number of votes. And with respect to site amenities, the most popular site amenity was trailheads, which was followed by outdoor dining and sitting and gathering areas, and some additional comments for public gathering spaces along trails.

Going down to key findings for the nonmotorized transportation on Page 18, we asked respondents what would allow them to curb the amount of driving that they're doing. More respondents answered that trails would allow them to drive less, rather than e-bikes, scooters, bike shares or the safe routes to use them. Many respondents noted that bike lanes are desirable, or even expressed that they are more desirable than sidewalks, and suggestions for new, nonmotorized facilities were Township-wide, including connections between residential areas and schools, trails and parks, or shopping areas.

Finally, I'll go through the Picture This activity. That was the activity where we asked the community to submit images of things that they love about the Township, that they want to see more of in the Township, or things they feel are missing from the Township, and they were able to location tag those images. We can scroll through the images that were submitted, but what's really notable here is that the majority of the responses did have to do with trails, nonmotorized transportation, sidewalks, pathways. There were a lot of answers about recreation in general, a recommendation for a skate park, discussion of an equestrian facility, discussion of disc golf in the Wise Road open area. Then outside of the more recreational responses, there were a couple just general development answers, Trader Joe's or other upscale grocery store, safe crossings from the Library, so I suppose that's another nonmotorized connection, and then a roundabout at Wixom, Duck Lake and Sleeth, and recommendations for more native plantings throughout the Township.

With that, I will hand it to Rose to go through the meeting toolkits, unless anybody has any questions on the first two sections of the community engagement.

Weber – On Page 19, with the map, with the key, for example, *What is missing?* Where can I see what they refer to?

Julia Upfal – The corresponding answers, when you scroll below, all of the pictures are numbered. I suppose it would have been helpful if I had put the colored dot next to each of those numbers. It was hard to put the legend on the map because of the pictures being so big.

Weber – That's fine, I get it.

Rose Kim – I'll just do a quick summary of the meeting toolkits that we did. Good job getting seven meeting toolkits back. There were sessions held at the Library, the Richardson Center, Fire Station #3, and a couple of HOA's in the community including one in Lake Sherwood. We did go through the toolkits with you a couple months ago. As a refresher, the first exercise was the strengths and weaknesses assessment. If the groups were large enough, the small groups would come back and reconvene as a large group and report out on strengths and weaknesses that they found. Similarly, a second exercise was focused on strategies for the future.

In terms of the results that we got back, we got them back in different forms. Some toolkits had more of the complete set, and others returned only some portions. It was a little bit of work piecing it together, but across the board, I think we really did find that a lot of residents seem to value the same things; parks and recreation, open space, lakes, community programming and services, and nonmotorized pathways and trails. It was fairly consistent in each stage of public engagement that we've done.

There was a little bit less of a consensus with weaknesses, but you see similar trends and see that people are still having trouble with traffic, but want more nonmotorized pathways and trails. They have concerns about over-development, but still want access to food, retail and entertainment options, so just trying to manage those expectations. As to strategies for the future, again we had hoped that as small groups, they would do a little bit of ranking, but we didn't necessarily get those results. We just had a large list that you'll be able to look at which is at the end of the packet to get some ideas. Generally speaking, I think people wanted to limit development and had some ideas that might be relevant, as well as updating Township services and facilities, maybe updating the zoning ordinance, and having better processes for getting public engagement with things like rezoning or improvements to the development review process. Any questions about the meeting toolkits?

Weber – I think I'm going to blame Mr. Gall in the back of the room. I noticed that some of the comments from the session held at the Fire Department were we needed a fire training tower, more hydrants and more fire service.

Dave Campbell – We figure the Fire Department spends as much time driving around and looking at Commerce Township as anyone. They know the community as well as they should. Paula and I were just chuckling because what I don't see on here as far as weaknesses is not enough gas stations, not enough liquor stores, not enough car washes, not enough self-storage places, which are the types of places that we get a lot of developers wanting to build.

Weber – Anything with a drive-through, right. I mean specifically sit-down restaurants were noted as a high priority, but no mention of drive-throughs.

Chairperson Parel – A couple things that I noticed; I don't know why it stuck out to me. In the pages with the meeting toolkits, someone made a comment in regard to the Library. I was happy to see that there were a lot of residents who participated in this that agree that we need more nonmotorized pathways throughout the community. For me, I think that should be a priority. In this comment, they were speaking on the Library, and they said, *I would like safe crossing so that residents can walk to the Library from their homes and Clifford Smart Middle School.* To me, that makes sense. Kids at the middle school, at an age where parents feel comfortable with kids walking to the Library.

McKeever – From the school to the Library, but the school has a library.

Chairperson Parel – Yes, but I can tell you, my kids don't want to spend any more time in the school than they need to. Yesterday, for the first time my daughter asked if she could go with a friend to our Library and study there with her friends. That's social too.

Dave Campbell – They have the private study rooms in there that I know get used. I think I've heard the librarian say if they could build that Library over again, they would build more study rooms because of how popular they are.

Chairperson Parel – To me, I think that's something that really stuck out.

Rose Kim – Can your daughter walk to the Library from your home?

Chairperson Parel – No, she can't from my home. It's dangerous. Dave, I'll put it to you. Are we sharing this? Are we at that point? There's some really good stuff in here. We're sharing it with the Board of Trustees and our Supervisor?

Dave Campbell – I guess I have not discussed that yet. I have no reason to say no. It's very much public information.

Chairperson Parel – I don't know if it's a summary, but I think there's some really good stuff in here.

Dave Campbell – I think it's too late to get it to the Board for their meeting tomorrow night. They already have their agenda packets, but I think we absolutely should include this in the next Board agenda packet, or get it to them individually. This is very good information for them to be familiar with.

Weber – One thing I couldn't determine was how many individuals participated, a total number, including high school kids, at the HOAs and everything combined.

Rose Kim – We will get back to you on that.

Julia Upfal – During the Open House, I think some people responded to some activities and some to other activities. So, while we have a total number of stickers for each poster for example, we don't know exactly how many respondents.

Rose Kim – And some people signed in, but some people didn't.

Weber – Did we get a count at the HOA meetings, at the Library and the Senior Center?

Rose Kim – For most of them. Again, some people decided not to return their sign-in sheet, but generally between 6-12 people.

Dave Campbell – You guys can speak to this better than I can, but it was purposeful that Township staff and consultants weren't at the neighborhood HOA meetings. We thought they would be more comfortable discussing amongst themselves than having us looming over them. In that sense, we got back from them the best that they could provide. It wasn't necessarily consistent across the board from one neighborhood to the next what came back in those toolkits.

Chairperson Parel – Have we shut down the service, like the Picture This? Are we done getting results in?

Rose Kim – It is still up, but we didn't quite get the amount of engagement we had hoped for.

Chairperson Parel – How did we roll that out?

Dave Campbell – We blasted it on Facebook a few different times and on our website.

Rose Kim – I think there was a little bit of confusion. Some people just left comments on the Facebook page instead of going to the link.

Chairperson Parel – Were there a lot of comments? I didn't see it. I try to stay away from social media. Can we somehow grab those comments?

Rose Kim – I think there were about 30 comments for one post, and over a hundred for another.

Dave Campbell – For Picture This specifically?

Rose Kim – Yes, the Facebook posts, but some of them would be private comments. Ben might be able get those.

Chairperson Parel – It would be interesting to see if we could capture those.

Dave Campbell – I don't do social media either. We would put a post on the Township's Facebook page saying, "Go to Picture This", and then people would comment on Facebook?

Rose Kim – Yes, instead of going to the link.

Dave Campbell – We purposefully don't make those comments public because people don't always say the nicest things when they reply to posts from their government office. Ben should be able to retrieve those comments.

Julia Upfal – I think that brings up a really good point. One thing we're interested in collecting in addition to our more formatted methodologies is just the anecdotal information. We know that during the Open House, there were a lot of great conversations taking place, especially during the developer preview at the beginning. We were hoping that we could use some time this evening to talk to the Commissioner's about feedback that they heard at the Open House that may not have been captured, or any information, ideas, discussions that came up that we really should hear about, but that we didn't get from our methods at the Open House event.

Chairperson Parel – Did anybody have any comments on that?

Weber – I was being sold as different developers were pitching ideas. I did have a long conversation with Rob Long. He was concerned that his property was identified as an area of study, but most of the developers were selling.

Chairperson Parel – Anything from the second event that we had with the public that night?

Weber – There was discussion on paths and trails, and general comments on over-development. We moved to Commerce to get away from traffic and high-density, and now Commerce is turning into traffic and high-density.

McKeever – [Inaudible] Everybody keeps moving here to get away from those things.

Chairperson Parel – I had a few conversations with some folks in regard to the Village and the development there, the Marathon station is coming along and how those developers feel about the Village itself, and the folks that own Annie's and they own a few parcels, and what their thoughts and plans are.

Dave Campbell – With them specifically, the owners of Annie's, the Rabban family, you mentioned they own the party store on the north side of Commerce, and they also own the northeast corner of Commerce and Carroll Lake Road, which is adjacent to the Library, which is relevant to the whole Library walkability discussion. We had one meeting so far, and we've got another coming up that had to be rescheduled. We have a meeting coming up this week with the Rabban's because with their various properties in the Village area, they've got some big ideas of their own. I think a lot of their big ideas mesh pretty well with what I think this Planning Commission is wanting to see in the Village area. Hopefully they will be partners.

Chairperson Parel – I think that extends to the Board too. We heard that comment at our meeting with the Board last year. I heard a lot about walkability and pathways in that conversation with folks, some of the owners of parcels in the Village, speaking on how residents could get to their businesses.

Dave Campbell – I'll mention too, I don't know if it's a coincidence, as we've started this process and we've identified particular areas of interest, some of those properties that have been identified have since gathered momentum as far as developers who are looking at them. Three come to mind, and one we saw at our last meeting was the Beaumont property at Maple and M-5. We know the developer and as Mr. Weber mentioned, being sold by developers, this might be one of them. There's a developer who is looking at part of that one and he has foot on the accelerator because he wants to close on the property and develop it, and cash out as quickly as possible because that's how that game works.

The Bay Pointe property is one that has been looked at for decades now, but I know there to be a prospective sale on that one that could happen very soon. The Commerce Drive-in property is the last one I'll mention. The Thomas family, and Randy Thomas in particular, have been coming to me more often with different concepts and different ideas of what can be done on that property. Beyond the conversations we had at the Open House and during the public input sessions, here at the Planning Department we have a lot of conversations about prospective developments on those properties as well.

Chairperson Parel – It's a good transition and topic.

Weber – What is the next step?

Julia Upfal – The next thing we wanted to go over with all of you were some of the goals and objectives that we talked about in September and October.

Chairperson Parel – And maybe you're getting at it, but my question would be, how do we roll this out to the community, other than just posting a link on our website with the updated Master Plan?

Julia Upfal – Yes, okay. I think that is going to be a coordinated effort. Part of the Master Plan is also the Future Land Use Map, and part of it is the implementation plan and making sure that you're moving toward the progress that you want to be achieving. During that, you're going to be making zoning changes as part of implementing the Master Plan. I think that it's a living document.

Rose Kim – We also have submissions from the student art contest.

Weber – I did show incredible restraint on not commenting when Dave sent that out.

Dave Campbell – That's my favorite one, that's the winner.

Weber – Yes, but he also recognized there's no lights on the bridge.

Chairperson Parel – Who voted on this?

Dave Campbell – We haven't decided who the winners are yet. I'm just telling you now, that's the winner.

Rose Kim presented the submissions on the overhead. Discussion took place regarding where the artwork would be displayed, including on the website, and featuring them in the Master Plan document. Dave Campbell and Chairperson Parel discussed the art contest announcements sent out to the Walled Lake School District.

Rose Kim – We can switch gears and discuss goals. We began our discussion in September last year. One of the things that Jill, Julia and I started to discuss was how we might update the goals from the 2015 Master Plan update to fit what we're doing in this planning process. At the top is the original goal from 2015, and then we made suggestions that we have redlined, and the bottom is the new proposed goal. We'd love to have your feedback and thoughts. And in general too, whether we need all of the goals, or whether we might pare some down or combine them. That's the kind of discussion that we might want to have today. The first goal is for residential housing. We thought it's important to have something that would cover meeting the needs of all residents, whether that's income levels, ages, abilities, that sort of thing. Any thoughts?

Chairperson Parel – What's the difference between the top and bottom paragraphs?

Rose Kim – The top is the original from 2015.

Weber – *Balanced and pleasant high-quality.*

Dave Campbell – I guess in my opinion; it makes sense that we're talking about residential needs. I think those are based on more than just income. It's based on age and where you are in your life and so-forth, so to me, the change makes sense.

Julia Upfal – That was our internal discussion exactly.

Rose Kim – Is there anything else that you would add, or do you think *balanced and pleasant* needs a little bit more clarity?

Weber – I don't know what *balanced* means. I don't know what the definition of *balanced* is ...

Rose Kim – We also had that thought. It was in there. Do we want to carry that over? Is there other language that you feel fits Commerce Township?

McKeever – *Balanced uses*, that's my take.

Chairperson Parel – I could see that.

Weber – *Balanced housing types*.

Chairperson Parel – Like we just looked at with that developer. *Balanced* as in conjunction with locations of other types of products, like other zonings, industrial ...

Weber – So keep it purposefully vague. We don't want it *balanced* on anything you can think of. We don't want polar extremes. Include something that's more *balanced*.

Chairperson Parel – I think I see it like Bill sees it.

Rose Kim – The next one is economic development, which is a new category we created because we thought there might not necessarily be a need to separate commercial and office versus industrial, and rather to think of it in a more holistic way.

Chairperson Parel – I was going to mention traffic, but I believe you covered that in mitigating impacts of development on neighboring residential uses. Anybody have any comments?

Rose Kim – Next is transportation. Traffic is mentioned in this one.

Loskill – I think permitted uses is kind of weird in that sentence. *Provide motorized and nonmotorized access connections to ...* where? Permitted uses is nothing. *Parks, recreation*, it should be expounded upon to ...

Chairperson Parel – What are we trying to connect to?

Julia Upfal – The term that was previously there was *land development*, and we also weren't sure if that was quite the right fit, but I feel like we weren't set on *permitted uses* either.

Chairperson Parel – Do we need anything? Can we just say *provide motorized and nonmotorized access and connection ...*

Loskill – ... *throughout the Township*.

Weber – Should we have something in here as it relates to the new Oakland County Transportation, meaning should we recognize that, whether we like it or not, it's here?

McKeever – Do you expect it to service our area?

Weber – That's the point. Should we?

McKeever – Unless we actually see benefit from it ...

Weber – But are we ...

McKeever – It's false promises.

Weber – Is there an opportunity to include this to help us in our endeavors to get more for the tax dollars that we're spending, if that makes sense.

Chairperson Parel – How long does that millage go for?

Weber – It's 10 years.

Chairperson Parel – So before we update this again ... we will update this again prior to the end of it.

Dave Campbell – Obviously it's a delicate topic. I think when you're seeking funding or grants, whatever it might be, anytime you can point to your community's Master Plan and say, this is what we envisioned, it helps your score when you're competing for funds.

Weber – That's kind of my point. Is this an opportunity to have something in there that we could point to?

Dave Campbell – I think so, but we want to be smart with how we word it.

Rose Kim – There are certainly opportunities in the implementation plan to have action items focused on exploring ...

Weber – So what if we remove the ... we have *community and regional partners*. I don't know what a regional partner is, but do we put the word *County* in there? *Community, County and Regional partners* ... A regional partner could be People's Express, it could be WOTA, it could be SMART buses.

Chairperson Parel – I mean the purpose of the millage, like it or not, is to get people where they need to go. Specifying that, it's pointing out that we're going to lean on the County, in some form or fashion, to assist.

Weber – My whole point was Dave's comment. By having it in here, it's something we could point to that says, yes, we contemplated it and we're not just coming in on the fly. It's part of our Master Plan.

Chairperson Parel – I definitely support putting it in here, but I wonder if it should also be mentioned in other places where we could maybe be more specific too.

Winkler – I wonder if substituting *appropriate* in place of *permitted*. I'm not sure what is *permitted*.

Chairperson Parel – I think that part of it is a little confusing to all of us too.

Julia Upfal – *Permitted uses* is more of a zoning term. The ordinance has a list of permitted uses, and any use in the Township should conceivably be permitted.

Dave Campbell – *Destinations*.

Julia Upfal – I like the suggestion to drop *permitted uses* all together.

Loskill – Or you could change it to *throughout the Township*.

Rose Kim – *Destinations?*

Chairperson Parel – It really could be to places that are outside of the Township.

Loskill – It needs work.

Weber – You could almost say with *community and regional partners*, because regional partners could be Milford, South Lyon, Wixom, whoever.

Dave Campbell – The County, the State.

Weber – Sure. *Regional partners ... provide motorized and nonmotorized access and connections to countywide transportation ... or to countywide access*. Somehow building upon this network can expand beyond our Township borders, so something that allows residents to get to Commerce, or from Commerce, to eastern Oakland County, or wherever it might be.

Rose Kim – Any other comments?

Chairperson Parel – Maybe we don't tackle it now, but I definitely think that's something we've got to think about. Dave, I don't know if that's something you want to take back.

Dave Campbell – I think there is a way to say, *pursuing opportunities made available by regional transportation funding*. I think I get Mr. Weber's question.

Chairperson Parel – I think it makes sense to include something here, and then more specifically somewhere else. I like the idea.

Rose Kim – We'll certainly look into it. Then, a new goal; we renamed it to *stewardship* to be more thoughtful about sustainability and what Commerce will look like in the future.

Chairperson Parel – I'm good with it. I was just trying to sort out how, what we try to do as a Commission, one of our goals in looking at a new development and considering what environmental or sustainability features we should be pushing, how does that fit into this? But, I think it fits in by saying *identifying*. I mean we're the ones identifying. We're the ones trying to protect and preserve the environment, so I think it fits.

Rose Kim – Public facilities; we thought a separate goal for recreation might be a little superfluous and we could incorporate that a little bit more, all encompassing, into community and public facilities.

Dave Campbell – So you're saying that the existing Master Plan speaks to recreation, and you're broadening that into community and public facilities.

Rose Kim – There was community and public facilities as well, so we're combining them together.

Dave Campbell – You're merging.

Chairperson Parel – Does this address access to those services?

Rose Kim – Not exactly. We could. It would be a good place to reinforce it.

Chairperson Parel – We could create plenty of recreational buildings areas, civic building areas, services to residents, but if they can't get there ... Maybe that's already handled under transportation.

Dave Campbell – It might not just be access as far as getting a ride there. It might be access as far as knowing what's available and being aware of what the programming is. Awareness might be part of that.

Chairperson Parel – I think awareness is a piece of that too.

Rose Kim – This is the last one.

Chairperson Parel – Are there any other items that we should be mentioning?

Loskill – Roads.

Chairperson Parel – Yes, they're not necessarily our roads, but if the roads are shot ...

Loskill – It's part of infrastructure.

Chairperson Parel – It's part of our challenge and it's going to inconvenience our people.

Weber – We do have some monies, we have tri-party funds that we use generally to make improvements.

Dave Campbell – If we're speaking to private franchise utilities, communications. Obviously in this day and age, high-speed internet and things like that are pretty essential, and there are still areas of the Township that aren't well-served by the cable companies.

Chairperson Parel – There were some comments about that.

Dave Campbell – Yes, I saw those.

Chairperson Parel – But it does say other utilities.

Weber – Yes, but that's almost one that we should call out.

Loskill – It's becoming bigger and bigger every year.

Weber – It's so germane and so critical to everything.

Chairperson Parel – Especially for businesses.

Loskill – And with people who are still working from home.

Weber – I would call it out at some level. I don't know if it's connectivity.

Loskill – High-speed internet.

Weber – Technology connectivity, I don't know if that's the appropriate term to keep it as few words as possible.

Loskill – Advanced technology.

Rose Kim – Okay. We will workshop those and get back to you.

Chairperson Parel – Can you go back to the first one? Residential, thank you.

Rose Kim – In terms of next steps, we're going to be diving into Phase III of our initial scope of work. That's going to consist of looking at the focus areas more in-depth. What we'll probably do is come up with some descriptions, and some precedent images, and start going over a couple of the properties that we've identified, going through that process over the next couple months.

Weber – How do we communicate to the Board? I don't know that we would be communicating anything significantly different that what we've talked about right now, but do we plan for ... Is it the end of March is the next quarterly discussion?

Dave Campbell – That sounds right.

Weber – Maybe we carve out time for that specifically to go through this, because by then we'll have more meat on the bones, particularly on the areas of special interest.

Dave Campbell – When you say we, do you envision a joint meeting with the Planning Commission, or is it staff?

Weber – I don't have a view on that.

Dave Campbell – Is that the last Tuesday of the month?

Weber – Yes. I'll look it up.

Chairperson Parel – While he's pulling that up, any other questions or comments? I think this was great. I really appreciate it.

Rose Kim – Thank you.

Julia Upfal – If you think of any more of those discussions you might have had, or if you have any interesting discussions, feel free to share them with us.

Chairperson Parel – It would be nice to see what those Facebook comments were too.

Paula Lankford – I have a note to work with Ben on that.

Dave Campbell – I think maybe a timeline. At our December meeting, the prospective developer of the Beaumont property, the most prominent of the areas we want to look at specifically, as I mentioned, he is ready to close on the property, get his plans submitted and get turning dirt as soon as he can.

McKeever – Is he building a hospital?

Dave Campbell – Not, he's not building a hospital.

McKeever – Then he's got an issue.

Dave Campbell – Yes. So, in our discussions with him last month, when he had a concept plan and we talked about, well, this is a property that is one that we're looking at in our Master Plan, his question was, *How long does it take you to do a Master Plan? How long before you will be done with your Master Plan? How long before you have a vision that would apply to this property?* That might be a question that that developer and maybe some others want answered, what is the timeline with this? I'm not trying to put you on the spot at this moment, but I'd love to be able to have an answer to that question.

Julia Upfal – We do have a timeline along with the scope. I'd have to pull that out.

Dave Campbell – Do you think we're still on that schedule?

Rose Kim – I think we're about a month or two off. Our initial hope was summer.

Dave Campbell – I think that's what we said to them last month, but their position is that they've got money on the line, and we can't expect them to sit on their hands while we go through the Master Plan process.

McKeever – But it's not zoned to their use. I don't recall anything coming out of that meeting that would lead them to believe that we were the least bit in favor of rezoning it.

Weber – It's a high risk on their part I think. I don't think we gave them any ... There were certain specific elements of their proposal that I think we wrapped our heads around, but the majority of the development we did not.

Discussion continued regarding the Beaumont proposal, the residential rental component, traffic issues and circulation in the area of Maple Road.

Dave Campbell – I'd like to give the developer some sense of where we are schedule wise with the Master Plan.

Julia Upfal – We can definitely follow-up with where we're at along the scope.

Weber – The quarterly discussion meetings are at the end of this month, January 24th, and then the next one is April 25th. That's the schedule.

Chairperson Parel – What is a quarterly discussion meeting?

Weber – It's a time for the Board to get together to supposedly not have a full agenda of things that need to be decided upon. Now, that always changes because it's the one time to be able to get stuff done where the agenda is usually not packed. It's supposed to be a time where you can have some strategic thought and we do use them for meeting with the Parks Committee or the Planning Commission, as an opportunity to have discussions without having to make decisions at that time.

Dave Campbell – So if we are to have a joint meeting with the Township Board and the Planning Commission, you're thinking the April 25th date would be the best date to do so.

Weber – I would think that by the end of April, we're in the home stretch.

Rose Kim – I think at that point, we'd be really starting to look at implementation and action items.

Julia Upfal – There's like 5-6 months for the focus areas, and it's January now. I think April is still focus areas.

Weber – I would think by the end of April, we will have some meat on the bones in all of the focus areas. We might not have conclusions and a finished product, but we'll have some good ideas on some of these focus areas.

Julia Upfal – The plan is to do each meeting on a different focus area. We might not have hit on all of them by that time.

Weber – So, by then we would have ...

Loskill – We should prioritize those.

Weber – Well, I think we did.

Dave Campbell – We did.

Weber – Therefore, we can use that April time to say, these are the focus areas we've looked at. Here's how we're looking at them and here is where we are in this process that's now going to continue for another 8 focus areas or whatever it might be. They can see what the process is, they can see some of the conclusions we're drawing from this process, and that will extrapolate down through the rest of the focus areas that we still have to study.

Julia Upfal – Yes, just a general check-in is what it sounds like. We'll let them know what content has been created so far, about the results of the community engagement that we shared with you today, and what efforts have taken place thus far and give them an update.

Weber – Yes, so an update on that, but I think we should be able to dive into some of these focus areas that we will have begun studying. That's where I think we're going to want input from the Board, as we explain the process and how it is forming the decisions for changes we may want to make.

Julia Upfal – Okay.

Dave Campbell – So if nothing else, are we asking this body to stick a pin in that April 25th date on everybody's calendars?

Weber – I think it is an appropriate check-in point.

Dave Campbell – And when we do meet with the Township Board, don't let yourself get bullied by the Township Board. This is the Master Plan and it's the Planning Commission's baby.

Chairperson Parel – Why are you looking at me, Dave?

Dave Campbell – Because you're the Chair.

Chairperson Parel – Understood.

Rose Kim – All right. Thank you so much.

Chairperson Parel – Well thank you, that was great. Thanks for being patient and moving to second on the agenda. We actually did it on purpose so we would have more time to talk with you.

Loskill – We didn't want to have to rush through.

J: OTHER MATTERS TO COME BEFORE THE COMMISSION:

Dave Campbell – Ma'am, I hate to put you on the spot. Our meetings normally start at 7:00pm, but this evening we started at 5:30pm. Was there anything in particular that you were looking to hear about or speak to?

Ms. (Turner) – My dad's property is on Benstein Road, near Benstein Crossing.

Dave Campbell – As I mentioned, we started at 5:30pm so the developer has come and gone. They did have a discussion with the Planning Commission. Was there anything in particular you wanted to hear?

Ms. (Turner) – No, I was just coming in to listen.

Dave Campbell – For her sake, Mr. Parel, do you want to summarize, or do you want me to summarize the discussion?

Chairperson Parel – I'm good with you summarizing. Also, there will be notes as well.

Dave Campbell – There will be minutes of this meeting. You may know a lot of this, but the property is zoned single-family. For them to do the attached duplexes that they want to do, they would have to get the property rezoned to what we call R-2, which is our attached housing zoning district. There are two ways to do that; there's a Conditional Rezoning, or a straight rezoning. The Conditional Rezoning is essentially, give us the zoning we need and we promise to build this and only this. It sounds like that is the route they're going to go so that everybody knows going in exactly what they're going to build. It's a multi-step process because it has to get a formal recommendation from the Planning Commission, and then formal action by the Township Board. It takes a few months if they decide to move ahead with it. It's also up to them as to how quickly they want to move with that process.

Ms. (Turner) – Great, thank you.

Dave Campbell – I think the Planning Commission heard some good rationale from the developer of why a rezoning makes sense, but the developer also heard concerns that anytime you're looking to up-zone a property and do a project that has more density than the current zoning allows, especially along that stretch of Benstein Road which has seen a lot of development over the last 20-30 years. Those are the concerns we would have with their proposal.

Ms. (Turner) – Thank you.

Chairperson Parel – Thank you, Dave. You did a much better job that I could have. The meeting notes will be available on the Township's website.

K: PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT

- **NEXT REGULAR MEETING DATE: MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2023**
- We are looking to have the PUD for the Lafontaine Genesis development. We thought it might be at this meeting, but for a lot of reasons, it got pushed to

February. Mr. Winkler mentioned that they got an extension from the DDA, who they are buying the property from, in order to give themselves more time to get through this process.

- Another project that I have mentioned here before is Sure Conveyors. They want to build at the corner of Metro and Clarenton, in the Harrison Industrial Acres. They submitted their plans today, along with their application and fees. We distributed those plans to Fire Marshal Gall, the Township Engineer and the Landscape Architecture. They would like to be on the February agenda.
- Another you've heard before, although it has been a little while, is at Union Lake Road and Farrant. You saw a concept plan a year ago now. Robert Cobb wanted to put a lakefront bar and restaurant at the corner, but to do that he would need wetlands permits from the State of Michigan, the department known as EGLE. He has had many meetings with them. Long story short, I think he has recognized the challenges in doing any sort of a commercial development there, whether it be a bar or restaurant, or anything else. Now he has resigned himself to building a few houses. He wants to just build single-family homes and be done with the property, but the properties are zoned B-1, Neighborhood Business, so he would have to down-zone them to R-1D which is the adjacent single-family zoning. He is hoping to have a public hearing for that rezoning at the February meeting.

Weber – So he wants to build homes fronting Union Lake Road?

Dave Campbell – No, the way he wants to orient them, they would front Farrant.

Weber – Okay.

Dave Campbell – I thought it was four houses, two on the north and two on the south.

Paula Lankford – I thought the south side was only big enough to get one with the setback from Union Lake Road. There may be two, or a maximum of four.

Weber – Maybe it's two lots, but he can only build one home because one lot wasn't buildable.

Dave Campbell – I'd say it's either three or four houses. But, what he is not proposing to do is to put a restaurant on the south side of Farrant, with parking on the north side. He has recognized that would be very challenging, not just with the State, but with the Township as well.

Weber – So he doesn't want to build on Sally's?

Loskill – That would be my suggestion. Just have him move across the street.

Dave Campbell – As he mentioned when he presented to the Planning Commission, he owns a place in Key West Florida which is right on the water. I think he wanted this to be his northerly waterfront place. He wants to be waterfront.

Weber – So he bought the land?

Dave Campbell – It's my understanding it was a 1031 swap, a capital gains thing. So, he had to buy land within so many days or pay capital gains. He bought with a certain degree of urgency and found out after the fact that it was going to be a challenge to do what he originally dreamed of. They just submitted to rezone the property to R-1D with the intent of having a public hearing at the February 6th meeting.

As I mentioned, we've continued to talk to the developer about the Beaumont property. I also mentioned Mr. Thomas has a number of ideas for the Commerce Drive-in property, in fact I'm supposed to call him back tomorrow about one of them. And, by the end of this week the Bay Pointe property might sell. If that happens, then I'll be able to say who the buyer is.

Weber – Selling without a site plan?

Dave Campbell – Yes.

Weber – That's bold.

McKeever – What are your thoughts on flooding in that area?

Dave Campbell – What the prospective buyer wants to do in the near term would not be impacted by the flooding. Their idea is different than all previous ideas that have come before them.

Weber – You talked about Lafontaine. Have they provided glimpses of a site plan?

Dave Campbell – I think it came in last week, but I just got in today. I read through the PUD agreement today briefly, and I flipped through the plan. I'll spend more time on that tomorrow. So yes, but I don't have strong opinions on it yet. I don't think it's a huge deviation from their original proposal. What I've seen is consistent with what they presented a couple meetings ago. The one answer we're struggling to get is from the Road Commission. They're showing a right-in, right-out driveway on Haggerty Road, but it's the southerly of their two Haggerty driveways. We're trying to get an answer from the RCOC of would they even allow that. It's fairly close to what is obviously a very busy intersection of Pontiac Trail and Haggerty. We're not sure that the RCOC would allow any driveway in that location. Our traffic consultant is trying to get a firm answer too, because they don't want to base their traffic model on a driveway that the RCOC is never going to allow.

L: ADJOURNMENT

MOTION by Weber, supported by Loskill, to adjourn the meeting at 7:24pm.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Joe Loskill, Secretary