

**PLANNING COMMISSION  
CHARTER TOWNSHIP OF WATERFORD MAIN FLOOR AUDITORIUM  
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2021**

---

**MINUTES**

**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 4:35 p.m.
  
- II. Roll Call  
Present: Sandra Werth, Chairperson  
Colleen Murphy, Commissioner  
Matt Ray, Secretary  
Tony Bartolotta, Commissioner  
Art Frasca, Commissioner  
Dave Kramer, Commissioner  
Scott Sintkowski, Commissioner  
  
Absent: None  
  
Also Present: Jeffrey Polkowski, Superintendent/ Planning  
Scott Alef, Planner II  
Lisa Kane, Typist Clerk I  
  
Public Present: Approximately 55
  
- III. Approve the Agenda of the September 28, 2021, regular meeting of the Planning Commission as printed.

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Anthony Bartolotta*

*Supported by Art Frasca: Resolved to **Approve** the September 28, 2021 Planning Commission Meeting Agenda.*

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**(7 - 0)**

- IV. Approve the Minutes of the August 24, 2021, regular meeting of the Planning Commission as printed.

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Scott Sintkowski*

*Supported by Anthony Bartolotta: Resolved to **Approve** the August 24, 2021 Planning*

*Commission Meeting Minutes as printed.*

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY  
(7 - 0)**

V. Consent Agenda

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Art Frasca*

*Supported by Scott Sinkowski: Resolved to **Approve** the Consent Agenda.*

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY  
(7 - 0)**

VI. Site Plans and Public Hearings

**1. PUBLIC HEARING - Special Approval No. 21-09-02, Site Plan #21-0661-B**

**Requesting:** Special Approval for a Commercial Storage Establishment  
**Property Location:** 5100 Dixie Hwy, Parcel # 13-04-433-008  
**Property Zoned:** C-4, Extensive Business  
**Applicant:** W.P. Carey

Applicant or representative present: Robert Carson

**Mr. Polkowski** introduced the project as seeking approval to convert an existing retail storefront to climate-controlled storage and have non-climate controlled structures in front of the storefront, in an area where that use is not consistent with the Master Plan. The Master Plan specifically states that outdoor storage should be discouraged in this portion of the Township.

Staff concerns with this project are that the plans are not congruent with the long-term vision in this portion of the Township and recommends denying this application. Staff presented a map indicating 16 facilities with similar use in Waterford Township.

**Mr. Carson** presented to the board a new graphic and modified plan to address issues that were presented to them. Mr. Carson gave one presentation to cover both the Site Plan and Special Approval request. Mr. Carson believes that the choices for development of retail is not limitless and that the closure of large format, "Big Box", retail has rendered these locations valueless. Mr. Carson also believes that the litigation due to tax assessing of large format retail locations as single use entities renders them worthless.

Mr. Carson explained that the changing nature of retail has caused the Chapter 11 bankruptcy of Kmart and its "sister company" Sears to change from thousands of stores, to less than 100 stores nationwide. Lack of a strong retail market is not a criticism of the community. It is the applicant's burden to figure out what to do with a vacant building. Mr. Carson believes they have tried to find a use of this property that would benefit the community by using consultants and experts and have found no retail market for this location. Mr. Carson explained that other retail locations of this size are closing or declaring bankruptcy, such as, Nieman Marcus and Fairlane Mall.

Mr. Carson stated that this property is a burden to the applicant to determine how to repurpose it and that this project is an as zoned use, use that is permitted with a Special Approval. Mr. Carson stated that this property is deteriorating and is a deterrent to the neighborhood and

nearby retail. This project is realistic and highly advantageous opportunity; it is not “outside storage”, a warehouse or truck rental. This project proposes a climate controlled self-storage facility, which is not rampant throughout the township that will benefit residents and businesses. Proposed is a state of the art, attractive and well landscaped service facility. The applicant will fully comply with all safety and site plan requirements. It will present no obstacle to traffic flow or burden the current retail center in any way. Mr. Carson states that the Payless ShoeSource stand-alone store does well on its own and has a vested interest in the west entrance curb cut, that MDOT (Michigan Department of Transportation) would not be given the opportunity to remove it because the project improves this site. Mr. Carson states that Payless ShoeSource has never had a cross-traffic concern with respect to the site.

Mr. Carson believes the project raises the standard for redevelopment in the area is compatible with the adjacent use. No other review standards are at issue. They will be a benefit to local businesses for storage. States that not meeting the intended use is subjective. Applicants will address any other concerns regarding Site Plan and will be accommodated.

**Mr Polkowski** responded that in regard to the Site Plan, landscaping issues had been rectified but the sign requirements have not been submitted. Regarding the saturation of use, pointed out the close proximity of 16 storage establishments surrounding this location.

**Commissioner Ray** inquired about the intention of use of the former automotive repair facility on the site.

**Applicant’s representative Mr. Carson** responded that he did not believe the use could be split at this location.

**Commissioner Ray** inquired about the former restaurant atrium at the front of the building.

**Applicant Charlie Stocks** responded that he had been the owner of the property since 1991 and referred to the graphic submitted.

**Commissioner Murphy** asked if the applicant resided locally.

**Applicant Charlie Stocks** responded that he lived in Alabama and the company was based out of New York City. Pointed out that all other consultants in attendance were local to the region.

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

**Steven Darling** of 4138 Rural Street suggested other possible uses he would like to see at this location.

**Mary Craite of 3655 Mariner** stated that there were 16 other storage facilities near her, and she does not believe more storage will revitalize our Township.

**Nicolas Skrzypczak** of 2802 Riverside was concerned that this project will not bring jobs to the community.

**Bruce Wolford** of 5235 Eagle Lake voiced concern that the property has not been properly maintained for years by the applicant and was concerned about the noise and traffic in the evening hours. Mr. Wolford brought a petition signed by 5 neighbors who do not support this project.

**Ruthe Levy** of 5076 Harbor Oaks Dr. voiced concern about the horrible maintenance of the property for the past 23 years and does not believe Waterford needs more storage facilities. Ms. Levy brought a petition with 25 signatures of neighbors in Harbor Oaks Condominiums and nearby streets who do not support this project.

**William Allen** of 4305 South Shore voiced concern that this project would preclude any development for the area's highest potential use.

**Sue Camilleri** of 5544 Ashby Court voiced concern that this project would not add value to the adjacent properties and stated that there are 94 storage facilities in Waterford Township. Ms. Camilleri believes that this project does not benefit Waterford residents but does benefit adjacent communities who do not allow storage facilities.

**Bob Struck** of 3911 Lakewood and owner of Changing Places Moving at 4290 Hatchery Road voiced concern that there are vacancies in many storage facilities in the Township. Mr. Struck is also concerned that this use would not bring jobs to the area.

**Tim Nick** of 30 Dover and local restaurant owner voiced concern about the lack of trust in the applicant due to many years of not maintaining the property.

**Waterford Township Supervisor Wall** stated that he has grave concerns about how this property will be maintained when it has not been since it has been vacant. Mr. Wall has received 37 complaints this calendar year about the condition of this property, overgrown weeds and grass, at least 12 inches tall, garbage dumped and vandalism.

**Margie Gobler** of 3765 Dorothy Lane and local business owner stated that the property looks horrible and voiced concern about how the property will be maintained in the future.

**Dean Campbell** of 4370 Forest stated that he does not want more storage facilities in the Township.

**David Crow** of 4665 Charest stated that this use does not meet the Master Plan and he does not want a storage facility at this location.

**Kim Zwierzchowski** of 4976 Oakhill Drive voiced concern and displeasure with the current lack of maintenance at this location.

**Bill Smith** of 7496 Macedy Lake Road stated that this property is an eyesore, and this project is not going to attract the kind of businesses we need in Waterford Township.

**Mr. Polkowski** read comments submitted to the Township by email from the following:

**Andrew Schwartzenberger** of 4050 Ironside Drive messaged that he was against the proposed project at the old Kmart because he believes the area would be better served by a bookstore or specialty grocery.

**Chad Schloss** of 1592 Irwin Drive messaged that a storage facility in the heart of a retail and dining area with residential homes in close proximity is out of character for the area and believes that this area has exceptional potential to attract a developer who could bring a better suited project to the community.

**Dale Peterson** of 6607 Ridgeview Drive messaged in opposition to the project and states that a storage facility would have a negative impact on nearby property values.

**Denise Hart** of 2679 Silverside messaged in strong opposition to the development of a storage facility in an area that is already inundated with storage facilities, that they are unsightly and offer no value to our community.

**Elizabeth Kidwell** of 2373 Highfield Road messaged to ask that this valuable piece of property with another eyesore storage facility.

**Jonathan Lipovsky** of 4444 Lamson messaged in opposition to outdoor storage like the facility at M59 and Cass Lake Road.

**Kathleen Lindsey** of 2810 Ironton messaged in opposition to storage facilities that would set precedence for other outdoor uses of higher density along our commercial corridors.

**Pam Zezula** of 3811 Dorothy Lane messaged in opposition to more storage facilities in Waterford Township.

**Roy Akers** of 1889 Crescent Lake Road messaged in opposition to a storage facility similar to the U-Haul at Cass Lake and M59 on Dixie Highway and that he believes it is a poor use of a prime piece of property.

**Chairperson Werth** closed the public hearing.

**Commissioner Sintkowski** recognized staff's comments that this use is over-represented in the Township and the residents' comments in opposition to the project. He asked the applicant if their research for the need of this use was based on local customer base or outside of Waterford Township.

**Applicant Charlie Stocks** responded that it was based on local customer base and that it was important to note that although there are 16 storage facilities in a five-mile radius, most of those are not climate controlled which are under-supplied. 1.5 square feet of climate-controlled storage per capita in Waterford and the national average is 5 to 6 square feet per capita.

**Commented [JS1]:** I thought he said that none of them were climate controlled.

**Commented [KL2R1]:**

**Commissioner Bartolotta** thanked the applicant for their presentation and stated that he was very discouraged by Supervisor Wall's comments about all of the complaints that were sent in regarding this property.

**Applicant's Representative Robert Carson** stated that he did not get an opportunity to respond to the public comment. Mr. Carson stated that the owners were not aware of the code enforcement complaints that were made against this property and that they were very disturbed by Supervisor Wall's comments. Mr. Carson stated that they scheduled a meeting with community but not many people attended. He went on to state that although the nearby residents are upset now, he believes that they will be the first ones to use the facility. And he stated that some of the suggested uses during the public comments were imaginative, they are not allowed in the current zoning. He states that this project is a viable, worthwhile use and would bring something different. They are proposing that climate control storage is new. They would like another opportunity to meet with the residents.

**Chairperson Werth** inquired where did all of the complaints go.

**Mr. Polkowski** responded that there are 19 code enforcement complaints since May 15, 2019. Complaints are mailed to the property management company hired by the applicant. On September 17, 2021 code enforcement received 3 complaints that have not been mitigated and there is a grass complaint from earlier this summer that has not been mitigated.

**Applicant Charlie Stocks** responded that he wasn't sure if the complaints were being sent to the property management company. He stated that as the property owner, he has not received any of these complaints. Mr. Stocks asked that the two outstanding code enforcement complaints, and any future complaints, be sent directly to him personally.

**Mr. Polkowski** responded that members of both the property ownership company and the property management company have been notified but he can send future complaints to Mr. Stocks directly.

#### **MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Anthony Bartolotta; Supported by Scott Sintkowski: Resolved to **Deny** the request for special approval in this case 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 for the reasons noted in the Staff report above.
- 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, for the reasons noted in the Staff report above.
- 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, for the reasons noted in the Staff report above.
- 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 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, for the reasons noted in the Staff report above.
- A.2 The proposed use will not be compatible with the orderly development or use of adjacent zoning lots, for the reasons noted in the Staff report above.
- 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 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 not be conducive to fulfilling a gap in the geographic coverage of such services to Township residents, for the reasons noted in the Staff report above.

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY  
(7-0)***

**2. PUBLIC HEARING - Special Approval No. 21-09-01, Site Plan #21-0699-A**

**Requesting:** Special Approval Modification for a Commercial fueling establishment  
**Property Location:** 6800 Highland Rd; Parcel # 13-17-351-006  
**Property Zoned:** C-3, General Business  
**Applicant:** George's Gasoline Company

Applicant or representative present: not present

**Mr. Polkowski** introduced the project as a minor amendment to the approved site plan.

Staff does not object with the exception for re-installing previously approved landscaping.

No public comments.

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Dave Kramer; Supported by Art Frasca:* Resolved to **approve with conditions** the request for special approval in this case 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 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 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. The original approved landscaping must be reinstalled per the previous site plan.

2. The Planning Commission reserves the right to modify or revoke this special approval following complaints, safety concerns, or site plan violations.

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY  
(7-0)***

**3. PUBLIC HEARING - Special Approval No. 21-08-02 (RE-REVIEW)**

**Requesting:** Special Approval for Outdoor Storage as an accessory use  
**Property Location:** 5233 Dixie Hwy, Parcel # 13-04-402-009  
**Property Zoned:** M-1, Light Industrial  
**Applicant:** Skipper Properties, LLC

Applicant or representative present: Todd Suchomel

**Mr. Polkowski** introduced the project as minor change to the previously submitted application, that would add accessory use of outdoor storage behind the principle use retail in the front building.

Staff does not have any objections to this project. There will be a significant investment in screening and landscaping.

**Applicant Todd Suchomel** stated that this accessory use was initially planned for the future. This is a prime location to open retail on Dixie Highway.

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

**Bill Smith** of 7496 Maceday Lake asked when the retail store would be open.

**Chairperson Werth** responded that the retail store would be open in April of 2022.

**Mr. Smith** asked if the outdoor boat storage would be allowed before the retail store was completed and if it was an approved use.

**Mr. Polkowski** responded that the landscaping and screening be required before they were allowed to operate as a boat storage facility and that would be completed in fall of 2021.

**Mr. Smith** asked if that included the areas in the back where the large sinkholes were forming and if a privacy fence would be included in the site plan.

**Applicant Todd Suchomel** responded that the sinkholes and privacy fence are included in the site plan.

**Nicolas Skrzypczak** of 2802 Riverside inquired about an issue with an existing fence and asked for a date be set for this to be completed.

**Commissioner Murphy** and Mr. Skrzypczak discussed whether setting a date was feasible.

Applicant Mark (NAME SP?) responded to Mr. Skrzypczak that they had no intentions to not live up to their expectations and apologized if they had not met expectations to this point.

#### **MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Art Frasca; Supported by Colleen Murphy: Resolved to **approve with conditions** the request for special approval in this case 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 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:

- 3. All comments will be addressed to the satisfaction of staff prior to final approval.
- 4. Parking deficiency must receive a variance or site amendment.
- 5. All landscaping and screening requirements must be met.
- 6. The western driveway must be closed and removed.
- 7. Parallel parking spots along the front of the building must be relocated.
- 8. A related principle use must exist on the site that is not outdoor storage. Failure to maintain a principle use will void any approval.
- 9. Staff may coordinate and finalize site plan details.
- 10. The Planning Commission reserves the right to modify or revoke this special approval following complaints, safety concerns, or site plan violations.

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY  
(7-0)***

**4. PUBLIC HEARING - Rezoning No. 21-09-03**

**Requesting:** Rezone from C-4, Extensive Business to C-3, General Business  
**Property Location:** North side Dixie Hwy, west of Telegraph Rd, Parcel #13-13-426-035  
**Property Zoned:** C-4, Extensive Business  
**Applicant:** Waterford Township

**Mr. Polkowski** presented the request to rezone the property to correct an oversight on a previous lot split in 2017.

Staff has no objections to this request.

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

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Anthony Bartolotta; Supported by Art Frasca: Resolved to forward a favorable recommendation in Case No. 21-09-03 on to the Township Board, to rezone*

the subject property of this application from C-4, Extensive Business to C-3, General Business 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** result in any significant environmental impacts.
- G. The proposed zoning amendment **will not** be detrimental to the public interest.

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY  
(7-0)***

**5. Site Plan No. 21-1401**

**Requesting:** Major Site Plan Review for Woodland Court Townhomes residential development  
**Property Location:** 1128 S. Hospital Rd, Parcel #13-31-200-005  
**Property Zoned:** R-M2, Multiple-Family Residential  
**Applicant:** Trademark Building Company, LLC

Applicant or representative present: Tony McGuckin

**Mr. Polkowski** introduced the request and stated that the use is consistent with the Master Plan. The project meets the required parking requirements and setbacks. Department of Public Works, Engineering and Fire Department's comments are provided and it is recommended that they are all addressed with the approval of this site plan.

**Applicant Tony McGuckin** presented eight attached single family buildings totaling 30 residential units. The plan includes maintaining the tree line on the north property line and goes beyond what is required for landscaping and screening. Mr. McGuckin presented 5 signed letters from neighbors residing in the condominiums adjacent to the project in support of the project.

**Mr. Polkowski** added that a variance would be required to increase the density of units from 21 to 30.

**Commissioner Bartolotta** asked for clarification on who owned the property and if these would be rentals or owned.

**Mr. McGuckin** stated that the plan is to rent these units for 5 or 10 years and then sell them as condominiums.

**Mr. Alef** clarified it is currently owned by a private trust.

**A member of the audience, Don Church** or 7092 Colonial Oaks, asked to address the Commissioners regarding the project. Mr. Church voiced concerns regarding the landscaping, parking and access from Hospital Road.

**Mr. McGuckin** addressed the resident's concerns regarding landscaping and the design of the buildings.

**Commissioner Sintkowski** stated that the Road Commission of Oakland County would need to address concerns about the passing lane on Hospital Road.

**Commissioner Murphy** inquired about a tree survey.

**Mr. Polkowski** stated that a Woodland Survey was not required.

#### **MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Matt Ray; Supported by Dave Kramer: Resolved to **approve with conditions*** the request for site plan approval in this case 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:

11. All comments will be addressed to the satisfaction of staff prior to final approval.
12. Staff may coordinate and finalize site plan details.
13. All variances must be obtained by Zoning Board of Approvals.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY  
(7-0)**

**6. Site Plan No. 21-1400**

**Requesting:** Major Site Plan Review for a Licensed Medical Marihuana Provisioning Center  
**Property Location:** East side of Tull Ct., north of Highland Rd, Parcel #13-18-376-005  
**Property Zoned:** C-2, Small Business  
**Applicant:** Harold Remlinger, DesignTeam Plus, LLC

Applicant or representative present: Eric Barnes

**Mr. Polkowski** gave a brief overview of the project that has already obtained the necessary licensing from the Township and meets the Township zoning requirements. This project has already been reviewed by DPW, Engineering and the Fire Department during the Waterford Township Board of Trustees review and any outstanding issues are being rectified.

**Applicant representative Eric Barnes** gave an overview of the Site Plan.

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Art Frasca; Supported by Colleen Murphy: Resolved to approve the Site Plan PSP #21-1400 for Quality Roots, Inc., Waterford, located at 7660 Tull Ct. subject to:*

1. That all staff, departmental, and agency comments are addressed to the satisfaction of the relevant authority prior to final site plan approval.
2. Staff would request authority to administratively approve any necessary minor modifications to the site plan for Final Site Plan approval.

**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY (7-0)**

**7. Site Plan No. 21-1405**

**Requesting:** Major Site Plan Review for a Licensed Medical Marihuana Provisioning Center  
**Property Location:** 2060 Dixie Hwy, Parcel #13-13-426-023  
**Property Zoned:** C-4, Extensive Business  
**Applicant:** MJ Highland LLC

Applicant or representative present: Evander Kizy

**Mr. Polkowski** gave a brief overview of the project that has already obtained the necessary licensing from the Township and meets the Township zoning requirements. This project has already been reviewed by DPW, Engineering and the Fire Department during the Waterford Township Board of Trustees review.

**MOTION AND VOTE**

*Moved by Art Frasca; Supported by Anthony Bartolotta: Resolved to approve the Site Plan PSP #21-1405 for MJ Highland, Waterford, located at 2060 Dixie Highway subject to:*

1. That all staff, departmental, and agency comments are addressed to the satisfaction of the relevant authority prior to final site plan approval.
2. Staff would request authority to administratively approve any necessary minor modifications to the site plan for Final Site Plan approval.

***MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY  
(7-0)***

VII. Discussions

1. CDBG PY 46 Performance Report

**Mr. Polkowski** reported on the use of Community Development Block Grant – Coronavirus funds, totaling \$535,507. Round one funds supported four activities; rental assistance for qualified renters impacted by Coronavirus, purchase of PPE for first responders, assistance for non-profits impacted by Coronavirus and program administration which is limited to 20% of grant. The final round of funds allocated supported the following activities; increased the assistance to qualified renters, addition of support to mortgage payment assistance, grants to small businesses to maintain operations and an increase for program administration. Due to a lack of interest in some activities, staff will request to the Board to reallocated unused funds to the Business Assistance Grant program. Funds need to be spent by September 30, 2022.

VIII. All Else

**Commissioner Dave Kramer** read a letter from the Planning Commission recommending that the Township Board of Trustees expand the allowance of additional Medical marijuana distribution centers. This letter was signed by all members of the Planning Commission, except Matt Ray.

IX. Adjourn the Meeting

Chairperson Werth adjourned the meeting at 7:46 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.

Jeffrey M. Polkowski, AICP  
Superintendent of Planning & Zoning  
5200 Civic Center Drive, Waterford, Michigan 48329  
Email: [jpolkowski@waterfordmi.gov](mailto:jpolkowski@waterfordmi.gov) Phone: (248) 618-7446

