

Planning Commission Pre-meeting - 4:00

Agenda Review

Planning Commission Meeting - 4:30

- I. Call the Meeting to Order
Chairperson Werth Called the meeting to order at 4:36 p.m.

- II. Roll Call
Present: Sandra Werth, Chairperson
Colleen Murphy, Commissioner
Matt Ray, Secretary
Tony Bartolotta, Commissioner
Art Frasca, Commissioner
Dave Kramer, Commissioner

Absent: Scott Sintkowski, Commissioner

Also Present: Jeffrey Polkowski, Superintendent/ Planning
Scott Alef, Planner II
Amy Williams, Departmental Aide

Public Present: Approximately 60

- III. Approve the Agenda of the August 24, 2021, regular meeting of the Planning Commission as printed.

MOTION AND VOTE

Moved by Frasca

*Supported by Bartolotta: Resolved to **Approve** the August 24, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Agenda.*

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(6 - 0)

- IV. Approve the Minutes of the July 27, 2021, regular meeting of the Planning Commission as amended.

MOTION AND VOTE

Moved by Frasca

*Supported by Bartolotta: Resolved to **Approve** the July 27, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes as amended.*

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(6 - 0)

V. Consent Agenda

MOTION AND VOTE

Moved by Bartolotta

*Supported by Kramer: Resolved to **Approve** the Planning Commission Meeting Consent Agenda.*

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(6 - 0)

VI. Site Plans and Public Hearings

1. PUBLIC HEARING - Special Approval No. 21-08-01

Requesting: Special Approval for Outdoor Dining Patio
Property Location: 4710 Cooley Lake Rd; Parcel # 13-27-302-015
Property Zoned: C-3, General Business
Applicant: Jerry Sanchez

Applicant or representative present: Jerry Sanchez and his architect, Chester Stempien

Mr Polkowski gave a brief review of this request for an outdoor patio.

Mr. Stempien further described the proposed patio.

Mr. Sanchez provided his background.

Commissioner Ray asked several questions regarding the construction and overall look of the proposed patio and if music would be playing.

Mr. Polkowski read four letters that were submitted to the Township regarding this request.

Letter from William and Melissa Berlin of 4885 Motorway in support of this request.

Letter from James Cioroch of 4713 Crescent Point with concerns for noise, traffic congestion, and decrease in property values.

Letter from Jo Rosol of 15 Crescent voiced concerns regarding the dock, parking, noise and pollution on the lake. They like outdoor dining but feel that 80 people is too many.

Letter from Erica Burris of 5001 Libcrest Dr supports some outdoor dining, but limited. Further concerns with parking, congestion, sound and light.

Commissioner Bartolotta questioned how soon the applicant expected to open. He further added that this is a public lake, with public access and anybody can play music.

There was further comments from commissioners and Staff regarding the Township's noise ordinance and background music on a patio, and on a public lake.

During the public portion of the meeting, the following spoke regarding this request.

Mike Ulmer 4730 Cooley Lake Rd questioned if the previous request for rezoning for the parking lot at this location was a prequel to getting approval for an outside patio. He further voiced concerns about litter, noise and lighting.

Jo Rosol of 15 Crescent has lived here for a very long time and has concerns with a patio, alcohol and boat slips. Fishermen and other patrons leave behind much litter.

Ralph Rehme of 2820 Sunderland is a former law enforcement officer who spoke in favor of this request. He has visited other establishments by this owner and they are very upscale and feels this would be a nice improvement.

Rebecca Simkins of 4709 Crescent Pt voiced concerns with parking, traffic, safety, sound and light. Feels this would not be considerate to residents.

Clem Nowak of 4709 Crescent Pt stated that there are 3 bars in the immediate area and that it is too compressed. Concerns with light and drunk and disorderly patrons. Asking for the Township to put families first.

Jodi Bohn of 4715 Crescent Pt has concerns with noise, traffic and safety. Says that there will be a party on the lake every night.

Gwendolyn Geralds of 4759 Crescent Pt says that she has experienced a lot of change over the years and noise is normal, she is concerned with entertainment. Less is better, she supports outdoor dining but wants to see it limited.

Dave Kaminski of 4797 Fairway Ct agrees with previous comments regarding parking and has concerns with noise and no live music outside.

Commissioner Ray questioned the material to be used for the 6' screen wall.

MOTION AND VOTE

Moved by Bartolotta

*Supported by Frasca: Resolved to **approve with conditions** the request for special approval in Case No. 21-08-01, Special Approval for Outdoor Patio based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance review criteria and considerations, which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.*

Findings:

- A. *The proposed use is in accordance with the objectives of the Master Plan and with future land use plans for the area as adopted or maintained by the Planning Commission.*

- B.1 *The proposed use will be compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of building and activity location, scope of activity, character, hours of operation, and compliance with the performance standards required under ARTICLE II, Division 2-2.*
- B.2 *The proposed use will not have an adverse effect on the environment or adjacent properties beyond the normal effects of permitted principal uses in the same zoning district.*
- B.3 *The proposed use will not result in an impairment, pollution, and/or destruction of air, water, natural resources and/or the public trust therein.*
- C. *The proposed use is not located in any Special Approval use service areas identified and adopted by the Planning Commission.*
- D. *The proposed use will not impose an unreasonable burden upon public services and utilities.*
- E. *The proposed use will be in compliance with the regulations of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be located.*

Conclusions:

- A.1 *The proposed use is of such location, size and character as to be compatible with the orderly development of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be situated.*
- A.2 *The proposed use will be compatible with the orderly development or use of adjacent zoning lots.*
- A.3 *Pedestrian circulation will not be hindered by the proposed use.*
- A.4 *Outdoor operations and display in connection with the proposed use will not burden and/or disrupt uses on adjacent properties.*
- A.5 *The natural and surrounding environment will not be negatively impacted by the proposed use.*
- B. *The proposed use will be within the capacity limitations of the existing or proposed public services and facilities which serve its proposed location.*
- C. *The proposed use will be conducive to fulfilling a gap in the geographic coverage of such services to Township residents.*

Conditions:

The conditions of this approval, which have considered the Planning Commission's ability to impose reasonable restrictions to ensure compliance with the performance standards established in the Zoning Ordinance, are as follows:

- 1. All comments will be addressed to the satisfaction of staff prior to final approval.*
- 2. Landscape requirements for the site are waived except for the screen wall along the northern property line.*
- 3. Staff may coordinate and finalize site plan details.*

4. *The Planning Commission reserves the right to modify or revoke this special approval following complaints, safety concerns, or site plan violations.*
5. *Sound is off at a reasonable hour – 10:00p.m.*

MOTION CARRIED

(4 - 2) with commissioners Kramer and Ray opposed.

2. PUBLIC HEARING - Special Approval No. 21-08-02

Requesting: Special Approval for Commercial Storage Establishment with Outdoor Storage
Property Location: 5233 Dixie Hwy, Parcel # 13-04-402-009
Property Zoned: M-1, Light Industrial
Applicant: Skipper Properties, LLC

Mr. Polkowski gave a brief history and voiced concerns with this application.

Commissioner Kramer questioned applicant if they had a principle use in the building, and applicant responded that they did not, but possibly retail in the future.

During the public portion of the meeting, the following spoke against this request.

Bill Smith, 5277 Dixie Hwy voiced concerns with the chain link fence in poor condition, and the weeds are an eyesore. To use this site for storage will be a greater eyesore. While he is not opposed to this use, he would like to see stipulations set forth to remove the fence and tree stumps, provide a survey and re grade the property to re-level and install a new 6' privacy fence to be maintained and fix small sinkholes.

Another owner at this location spoke up and did not identify themselves, but concurred with the previous statement of concerns.

Dale Campbell of 5275 Dixie C-1, another owner, agrees with previous concerns that he said were brought up to the applicant over a year ago and nothing has been addressed.

Another owner at this location spoke up to say that these concerns were the request of all of the owners.

Commissioner Ray questioned the applicant if the conditions stated were acceptable to him.

The Applicant replied that they did not wish to install a privacy fence; they did their best to repair the existing one.

Staff spoke up to remind the board that there is an abundance of boat storage in Waterford now, and without a principle use, they would not recommend approval.

MOTION AND VOTE

Moved by Frasca

Supported by Bartolotta: Resolved to **deny** the request for special approval in Case No. 21-08-02, Special Approval for Commercial storage Establishment with Outdoor Storage based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance review criteria and considerations, which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.

Findings:

- A. The proposed use is not in accordance with the objectives of the Master Plan and with future land use plans for the area as adopted or maintained by the Planning Commission.
- B.1 The proposed use will not be compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of building and activity location, scope of activity, character, hours of operation, and compliance with the performance standards required under ARTICLE II, Division 2-2.
- B.2 The proposed use will have an adverse effect on the environment or adjacent properties beyond the normal effects of permitted principal uses in the same zoning district.
- B.3 The proposed use will result in an impairment, pollution, and/or destruction of air, water, natural resources and/or the public trust therein.
- C. The proposed use is located in any Special Approval use service areas identified and adopted by the Planning Commission.
- D. The proposed use will impose an unreasonable burden upon public services and utilities.
- E. The proposed use will not be in compliance with the regulations of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be located.

Conclusions:

- A.1 The proposed use is not of such location, size and character as to be compatible with the orderly development of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be situated.
- A.2 The proposed use will not be compatible with the orderly development or use of adjacent zoning lots.
- A.3 Pedestrian circulation will be hindered by the proposed use.
- A.4 Outdoor operations and display in connection with the proposed use will burden and/or disrupt uses on adjacent properties.
- A.5 The natural and surrounding environment will be negatively impacted by the proposed use.
- B. The proposed use will not be within the capacity limitations of the existing or proposed public services and facilities which serve its proposed location.

- C. *The proposed use will not be conducive to fulfilling a gap in the geographic coverage of such services to Township residents.*

Conditions:

The conditions of this approval, which have considered the Planning Commission's ability to impose reasonable restrictions to ensure compliance with the performance standards established in the Zoning Ordinance, are as follows:

1. *All comments will be addressed to the satisfaction of staff prior to final approval.*
2. *Parking deficiency must receive a variance or site amendment*
3. *Staff may coordinate and finalize site plan details.*
4. *The Planning Commission reserves the right to modify or revoke this special approval following complaints, safety concerns, or site plan violations.*

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(6 - 0)

3. PUBLIC HEARING - Rezoning No. 21-08-03

Requesting: Rezone from PL, Public Lands to R-1C, Single-Family Residential

Property Location: 2455 Richardson Ct. Parcel #13-18-100-008

Property Zoned: PL, Public Lands

Applicant: JLG Properties

Applicant or representative present: Joe Locricchio

Mr. Polkowski gave a history of this property and previous requests brought forward from this applicant. He further described the changes that the applicant has made to consider items of concern that were brought up previously.

Commissioner Kramer said that this new application does address his concerns and noted that it is inevitable that this property will be developed.

Mr. Loccrichio provided a presentation of how he modified plans to acknowledge concerns from the public and has provided a natural feature setback and sidewalks. He also limited the access to Richardson Ct and Williams Lake only. He said that the Road Commission has reviewed this plan and is satisfied with the changes.

Commissioners Ray and Kramer questioned the look of these homes and if there were different elevations and if they all had two-car garages.

During the public portion of the meeting, the following spoke up regarding this request.

Steve Ratz of 2290 Marston, voiced concerns with the traffic on Hatchery Rd.

Laura Raupp of 2573 Campbellgate Dr. voiced concerns with traffic and safety.

Paula Milgrom of 7126 Hatchery voiced concerns with traffic and questioned if there was a traffic study.

Staff commented that there has been no traffic study.

Jim Kohler of 2709 Lansdowne said that just looking at this small section of mapping doesn't really show the whole picture. It is deceiving of how many people actually use Hatchery and Lansdowne.

Ralph Rehme of 2820 Sunderland also had concerns with traffic; it is very dangerous and seems to be getting worse.

Sandra McCarrick of 7426 N Shaker voiced concerns with traffic, air and noise. She would like to keep the greenspace and wildlife.

Randall Smith of 2356 Richardson Ct stated that the people don't want this. Although they appreciate efforts to make revisions, they are still not in favor. Buffer is not enough.

Jacquelynn Brown of 945 Oregon said that the plans are nice but there is not a surplus demand for these homes. They need to keep more greenspace/wildlife. She would rather see other abandoned properties re-developed

Staff spoke up to remind the attendees that the Planning Commission does not decide this today; this will be brought before the Township Board to make the final decision.

Maureen Bates of 2685 Lansdowne brought up that this land was donated to the Airport for the new road expansion and was to be greenspace or park area.

Staff spoke up to clarify that the Road Commission purchased the land from the DNR who now wishes to sell it, and that this will be developed. Whenever a government owned public land zoned property is sold, it must be re-zoned, as it is no longer public land.

Kathy Dutton of 3325 Whitfield Dr. would like to see this stay greenspace. Parks/trees need to be saved – there is other property that can be re-developed.

Greg Bauer of 6950 Hatchery said that the plans looked like a trailer park with trees. He believes this will decrease the property values. He wants the board members to represent them (the public).

Mark Beeman of 7262 Hatchery agrees with comments regarding the site, there are no sidewalks on hatchery and they have no alternative than to use the street and it is very unsafe with all the traffic. In addition, the access on Williams Lake Road is not in a good location; that is where the two lanes condense into one.

Lisa Smith of 6347 Harriet has concerns with traffic, she wants to keep greenspace. Why can't they repurpose a space like the Mall? She also agrees with all other prior comments.

Kathleen Gifford of 6044 Grace K said that we are not even considering the traffic coming from Maceday Lake – Clarkston, onto Williams Lake Road.

Carol Daugherty of 2294 Richardson said that there is no barrier – this is not self-contained, instead of greenspace they will be looking at a wall of cement.

Unidentified person questioned reinforced windows from the Airport proximity.

Mr. Loccrichio read a portion of a letter he received from the airport regarding this. **Glenn Wright** of 6368 Fortune had the same concerns with proximity to the airport.

Maureen Edson of 7084 Hatchery would echo all comments made previously and wanted to add how dangerous it is for her and the other residents that currently have to back out onto Hatchery road – it is very burdensome with no sidewalks.

Kathy Schemers of 7000 Hatchery appreciates what the applicant has tried to present but she wants to preserve the greenspace. The Township needs to work together with them.

Steve Klein of 2740 N Williams Lake Rd agreed that the plan is better; he can appreciate the changes but wants the Township to help them purchase. New business and development is welcome, however, not at the expense of the residents and wildlife areas. He questioned the open space on the South side of the plan. It was identified as a water detention basin.

Resident came back up to say that most people are too busy to come to these meetings. It is said that one comment is equal to about 1000 more, and based on the turnout of people here against this, it should show that there are many more behind them.

Commissioner Bartolotta brought up that with the current zoning of public lands, the property can still be developed for a variety of other uses that do not need approval.

Mr. Loccrichio said that he does not yet own the land, if they don't proceed with residential development, they will develop into one of the other uses. He tried to prioritize a good use for this area. This is a very well located piece of property.

MOTION AND VOTE

*Moved by Bartolotta; Supported by Ray: to forward a **favorable** recommendation in Case No. 21-08-03 on to the Township Board, to rezone the subject property of this application from PL, Public Lands to R-1C, Single Family Residential District based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance approval recommendation guidelines which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.*

Findings:

A. *The requested zoning change **is** consistent with the adopted Master Plan as amended.*

- B. *The requested zoning change **is** consistent with existing uses and zoning classifications of properties within the general area of the subject zoning lot.*
- C. *The subject zoning lot **is** physically suitable to provide all dimensional and site requirements for the range of uses permitted under the proposed zoning classification.*
- D. *The trend of development in the general area of the subject zoning lot **is** consistent with the requested zoning change.*
- E. *The Township and other public agencies **do** possess the capacity to provide all utility and public safety services that would be required for the range of land uses permitted under the proposed zoning classification.*
- F. *The requested zoning change and the resulting range of uses permitted under the proposed zoning classification **will not** result in any significant environmental impacts.*
- G. *The proposed zoning amendment **will not** be detrimental to the public interest.*

Accepting the applicants conditions that:

- 1) *The inclusion and approval of site plan # PSP 21-1353-B.*
- 2) *The completion of the purchase and sale closing with the current property owner, the Board of County Road Commissioners of the County of Oakland. In the event the closing is not completed, the zoning would revert to its current zoning of PL-Public Lands.*

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(6 - 0)

4. PUBLIC HEARING - Special Approval No. 21-08-04

Requesting: Special Approval for Outdoor Storage as an Accessory use to a Vehicle Repair Facility and Commercial Storage Establishment with Outdoor Storage

Property Location: 2605 Dixie Hwy., Parcel #13-13-177-027

Property Zoned: M-1, Light Industrial

Applicant: Don Glush, Waterford Collision

Mr. Polkowski gave a brief history and stated that this will bring the property up into compliance.

During the public portion of the meeting, no one spoke regarding this request.

MOTION AND VOTE

Moved by Frasca

*Supported by Murphy: Resolved to **approve with conditions** the request for special approval in Case No. 21-08-04 Special Approval for Outdoor Storage as an Accessory use to a Vehicle Repair Facility and Commercial Storage Establishment*

with Outdoor Storage based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance review criteria and considerations, which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.

Findings:

- A. *The proposed use is in accordance with the objectives of the Master Plan and with future land use plans for the area as adopted or maintained by the Planning Commission.*
- B.1 *The proposed use will be compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of building and activity location, scope of activity, character, hours of operation, and compliance with the performance standards required under ARTICLE II, Division 2-2.*
- B.2 *The proposed use will not have an adverse effect on the environment or adjacent properties beyond the normal effects of permitted principal uses in the same zoning district.*
- B.3 *The proposed use will not result in an impairment, pollution, and/or destruction of air, water, natural resources and/or the public trust therein.*
- C. *The proposed use is not located in any Special Approval use service areas identified and adopted by the Planning Commission.*
- D. *The proposed use will not impose an unreasonable burden upon public services and utilities.*
- E. *The proposed use will be in compliance with the regulations of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be located.*

Conclusions:

- A.1 *The proposed use is of such location, size and character as to be compatible with the orderly development of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be situated.*
- A.2 *The proposed use will be compatible with the orderly development or use of adjacent zoning lots.*
- A.3 *Pedestrian circulation will not be hindered by the proposed use.*
- A.4 *Outdoor operations and display in connection with the proposed use will not burden and/or disrupt uses on adjacent properties.*
- A.5 *The natural and surrounding environment will not be negatively impacted by the proposed use.*
- B. *The proposed use will be within the capacity limitations of the existing or proposed public services and facilities which serve its proposed location.*
- C. *The proposed use will be conducive to fulfilling a gap in the geographic coverage of such services to Township residents.*

Conditions:

The conditions of this approval, which have considered the Planning Commission's ability to impose reasonable restrictions to ensure compliance with the performance standards established in the Zoning Ordinance, are as follows:

- 1. All comments will be addressed to the satisfaction of staff prior to final approval.*
- 2. Landscaping requirements, except for the Dixie Highway greenbelt area are waived.*
- 3. A screen wall is required to encircle the storage areas.*
- 4. Accessory structures in the rear must obtain a variance for location from the Zoning Board of Appeals.*
- 5. Staff may coordinate and finalize site plan details.*
- 6. The Planning Commission reserves the right to modify or revoke this special approval following complaints, safety concerns, or site plan violations.*

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(6 - 0)

5. PUBLIC HEARING - Special Approval No. 21-08-05

Requesting: Special Approval for Outdoor Storage as an accessory use to a Metal Products Factory

Property Location: Alliance Dr. east of Scott Lake Rd.; Parcel # 13-13-152-005

Property Zoned: HT-2, High Tech Industrial and Office

Applicant: Alliance Group Properties

Mr. Polkowski gave a brief summary.

Commissioners Kramer and Ray questioned the applicant regarding details about their business.

During the public portion of the meeting, the following spoke up regarding this request.

Mike Witkowski of 2095 Scott Lake Road voiced concerns regarding the storm drainage for chemicals and pollution on Watkins Lake.

The applicant said that the current Storm Drain is heavily used with large rains it is located well away from the drain to the lake. There will be no debris to the lake

Cindy Smith of 1860 Colonial Village Way #4 voiced a concern about chemicals, and wanted to know if this was a new or existing facility. She is concerned with a factory so close to residents.

Sandra Jones of 1850 Colonial Village Way #4 voiced concerns with landscaping.

Staff addressed landscaping concerns.

Pat Fisher of 1846 Colonial Village Way questioned the amount of green space on this plan.

Commissioner Bartolotta verified that the applicant will be servicing, not building or constructing anything.

Storm water drains to the back of the property to a retention basin that will not overflow and affect anything.

MOTION AND VOTE

Moved by Kramer

*Supported by Bartolotta: Resolved to **approve with conditions** the request for special approval in Case No. 21-08-05 Special Approval for Outdoor Storage as an accessory use to a Metal Products Factory based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance review criteria and considerations, which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.*

Findings:

- A. *The proposed use is in accordance with the objectives of the Master Plan and with future land use plans for the area as adopted or maintained by the Planning Commission.*
- B.1 *The proposed use will be compatible with adjacent uses of land in terms of building and activity location, scope of activity, character, hours of operation, and compliance with the performance standards required under ARTICLE II, Division 2-2.*
- B.2 *The proposed use will not have an adverse effect on the environment or adjacent properties beyond the normal effects of permitted principal uses in the same zoning district.*
- B.3 *The proposed use will not result in an impairment, pollution, and/or destruction of air, water, natural resources and/or the public trust therein.*
- C. *The proposed use is not located in any Special Approval use service areas identified and adopted by the Planning Commission.*
- D. *The proposed use will not impose an unreasonable burden upon public services and utilities.*
- E. *The proposed use will be in compliance with the regulations of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be located.*

Conclusions:

- A.1 *The proposed use is of such location, size and character as to be compatible with the orderly development of the Zoning District in which it is proposed to be situated.*
- A.2 *The proposed use will be compatible with the orderly development or use of adjacent zoning lots.*
- A.3 *Pedestrian circulation will not be hindered by the proposed use.*

- A.4 *Outdoor operations and display in connection with the proposed use will burden and/or disrupt uses on adjacent properties.*
- A.5 *The natural and surrounding environment will not be negatively impacted by the proposed use.*
- B. *The proposed use will be within the capacity limitations of the existing or proposed public services and facilities which serve its proposed location.*
- C. *The proposed use will be conducive to fulfilling a gap in the geographic coverage of such services to Township residents.*

Conditions:

The conditions of this approval, which have considered the Planning Commission's ability to impose reasonable restrictions to ensure compliance with the performance standards established in the Zoning Ordinance, are as follows:

1. *All comments will be addressed to the satisfaction of staff prior to final approval.*
2. *Coordinate with Fire to address deficiencies.*
3. *The modified landscape plan for the storage areas is accepted.*
4. *All outdoor storage areas require a screen wall.*
5. *The deficiency in parking must be addressed through a variance or updated plan.*
6. *Staff may coordinate and finalize site plan details.*
7. *Hours of operation in the storage yard, including loading and unloading, is restricted to between 7 am. and 9 pm.*
8. *The Planning Commission reserves the right to modify or revoke this special approval following complaints, safety concerns, or site plan violations.*
9. *This approval includes the proposed expansions so long as they follow the original design and intent of this site plan. Updated site plan showing final conditions will be required at that time.*

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

(6 - 0)

6. Site Plan No. 21-1395

Requesting: Major Site Plan Review for an Office Establishment: Banking project

Property Location: 4416 Dixie Hwy, 13-10-254-003, -004, -005, -025, -028

Property Zoned: O-1, Local Office

Applicant: Michelle Mattson c/o Genisys Credit Union

Mr. Polkowski gave a brief description of the plan to tear down and re-build. A portion of the lot to the North will be split off and re-zoned residential.

MOTION AND VOTE*Moved by Kramer*

*Supported by Frasca: Resolved to **approve with conditions** the request for site plan approval for Site Plan No. 21-1395 based on the following findings and conclusions under the Ordinance review criteria and considerations, which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by or for the Township Staff, Applicant, and members of the public.*

Conditions:

The conditions of this approval, which have considered the Planning Commission's ability to impose reasonable restrictions to ensure compliance with the performance standards established in the Zoning Ordinance, are as follows:

- 1. All comments will be addressed to the satisfaction of staff prior to final approval.*
- 2. A 5-foot landscape buffer will run between the proposed development and the proposed residential areas and between the proposed residential areas and the commercial and office areas to the east. All other required landscaping will be reduced to exclude the area north of the developed area. This requirement is dependent on the property being split and rezoned within the next 90 days or all landscaping requirements will be as required by the ordinance.*
- 3. Staff may coordinate and finalize site plan details.*

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**(6 - 0)****7. PUBLIC HEARING - Text Amendment No. 21-08-06**

Requesting: Text Amendment to permit outdoor dining patios as a Special Approval in the C-2, Small Business zoning district.

Applicant: Waterford Township

Mr. Polkowski gave a brief history.

During the public portion of the meeting, no one spoke regarding this request.

MOTION AND VOTE*Moved by Kramer*

*Supported by Frasca: Resolved to forward a **favorable** recommendation in Case No. 21-08-06 on to the Township Board, to amend the C-2, Small Business District on the findings and conclusions under the Ordinance approval recommendation guidelines which are based on assessment of the information and statements presented in this case by the Township Staff, and members of the public.*

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**(6 - 0)**

VII. Discussions

VIII. All Else

IX. Adjourn the Meeting

Chairperson Werth Adjourned the meeting at 7:59 p.m.

Members of the public will only be able to speak during the during the public comment period at the end each public comment agenda item and such comments will be limited to three minutes per person. To provide for orderly public participation, a person wishing to speak must first state their name and request to be recognized by the Chairperson of the meeting. The Chairperson will recognize all persons wishing to speak during the public comment period. Prior to the meeting, members of the public may contact the members of the Planning Division to provide input or ask questions by email or mail to the Township employee/official and at the addresses listed below. Persons with disabilities in need of accommodations to be able to participate in the meeting should provide at least 24-hour advance notice to the listed Township employee by phone, email, or mail and an attempt will be made to provide reasonable accommodations.